

# The Plan for Stafford Borough Consultation Statement Appendices (January 2013)



APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF SPECIFIC CONSULTATION BODIES & GENERAL CONSULTATION BODIES.....	9
Specific Consultation Bodies .....	9
General Consultation Bodies .....	9
APPENDIX 2 – COMMENTS RECEIVED & OFFICER RESPONSES PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH – BOROUGH-WIDE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY .....	10
Summary of Main Issues .....	10
Introduction.....	11
Key question 1 .....	32
Key question 2 .....	34
Key question 3 .....	35
Issue 1.....	36
Issue 2.....	37
Key Question 4 .....	38
Issue 3.....	40
Issue 4.....	40
Issue 5.....	41
Key Question 5 .....	42
Issue 6.....	44
Issue 7.....	47
Issue 8.....	48
Issue 9.....	49
Issue 10 .....	49
APPENDIX 3 – COMMENTS RECEIVED & OFFICER RESPONSES PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH – PRINCIPLES FOR SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT.....	54
Responses to Principles for Settlement Development Consultation .....	55
General Comments .....	55
Question 1: Do you agree with the methodology being based on a scoring system of services and facilities? .....	107

Question 2	Do you agree with the three broad groups of settlements? .....	129
Question 3	- Are there any settlements which you consider should / should not be included in any of the 3 groups? If so please state the settlement and give reasons. ....	140
Question 4	Do you agree that settlements located within or adjacent to the Green Belt should not be considered for peripheral expansion? .....	150
Question 5	Do you agree that the settlements are identified in the appropriate group? If not please identify the settlement and give reasons .....	160
Appendix 1:	Principles for Settlement Development – Scoring.....	174
<b>APPENDIX 4 – SUMMARY OF RESPONSES &amp; OFFICER RESPONSES (ACTION) DELIVERING THE PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH – ISSUES &amp; OPTIONS.....</b>		
<b>CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION .....</b>		
<b>CHAPTER 2 – SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGIES .....</b>		
<b>CHAPTER 3 – SPATIAL VISION &amp; KEY OBJECTIVES.....</b>		
<b>CHAPTER 4 – SPATIAL PORTRAIT FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH.....</b>		
	The County Town of Stafford.....	190
	The Market Town of Stone .....	192
	Areas outside of Stafford & Stone .....	192
<b>CHAPTER 5 – NATIONAL &amp; REGIONAL POLICY.....</b>		
<b>CHAPTER 6 – PREPARING THE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY .....</b>		
<b>CHAPTER 7 – DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY SCENARIOS &amp; SPATIAL OPTIONS.....</b>		
<b>CHAPTER 8 – IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL LOCATIONS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT..</b>		
	Stafford (SF) – Housing and Employment Location Options.....	223
	Stone (SN) – Housing and Employment Location Options.....	231
	Eccleshall (EC) – Housing Location Options .....	255
	Gnosall (GN) – Housing Location Options.....	298
	Hixon (HI) – Housing Location Options .....	322
	Haywoods – Housing Location Options .....	375
	Haughton (HN) – Housing Location Options.....	404
	Weston (WN) – Housing Location Option.....	406

Woodseaves (WN) – Housing Location Options .....	407
Yarnfield (YN) and Tittensor (TT) – Housing Location Option.....	429
Employment Outside Stafford and Stone .....	431
CHAPTER 9 – DELIVERING A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE .....	433
Stafford Borough area .....	435
Climate change.....	435
Energy .....	436
On site renewable energy .....	436
Code for sustainable homes .....	437
Green Belt areas.....	438
Housing .....	439
Design.....	439
Residential Density.....	440
Housing Mix .....	441
Specialist Housing .....	443
Neighbourhood Policing .....	443
Location of Housing Development.....	443
Rural Areas and Conversions to Residential Use .....	443
Affordable Housing .....	444
Travelling Families.....	448
Employment.....	448
Transport.....	449
Green Infrastructure .....	449
Natural Environment .....	450
Flood Risk .....	451
Landscape Character .....	451
Open Space Sports and Recreation.....	452

Tourism .....	453
Telecommunications.....	454
The County Town of Stafford .....	454
Housing .....	455
A Changing Population.....	455
Education provision .....	455
Health Care .....	456
Flood Risk .....	456
Green Infrastructure .....	457
Provision of Utilities .....	458
Employment.....	458
Ministry of Defence.....	459
Town and District Centres.....	459
Historic Environment .....	460
Transport.....	460
Sustainable Communities Strategy .....	462
The Market Town of Stone .....	462
Housing .....	462
A Changing Population.....	463
Education Provision .....	463
Healthcare.....	463
Flood Risk .....	464
Open space, sport and recreation .....	464
North Staffordshire Green Belt.....	464
Provision of Utilities .....	464
Employment.....	464
Town Centre.....	465

Historic Environment .....	465
Transport.....	465
Sustainable Communities Strategy .....	465
Areas outside Stafford and Stone.....	465
Green Belt areas.....	465
Housing .....	466
A Changing Population.....	467
Educational Provision.....	468
Health care .....	468
Flood Risk .....	468
Open space sport and recreation .....	468
Provision of Utilities .....	469
Employment.....	469
Historic Environment .....	470
Transport.....	470
Rural Services and Facilities .....	471
Sustainable Communities Strategies .....	471
CHAPTER 10 – Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy.....	471
Community Infrastructure Levy .....	472
CHAPTER 11– Local Monitoring and Review .....	473
GENERAL RESPONSES .....	474
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES & ACTIONS.....	474
APPENDIX 5 – RESPONSES RECEIVED & COUNCIL RESPONSE.....	548
1 – Sustainable Development & Climate Change .....	548
Climate Change .....	548
Renewable Energy .....	549
2 – Environmental Protection & Management.....	549

Environmental Quality .....	549
Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) .....	549
Landscape Character.....	549
Safeguarding the Integrity of European Sites .....	550
Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation.....	550
Green Belt .....	550
3 – Housing.....	550
Range of Dwelling Types, Density and Sizes .....	550
Affordable Housing .....	550
Rural Exception Housing .....	551
Lifetime Homes .....	551
Specialist Housing .....	551
Gypsies and Travellers .....	551
4 – Economy.....	552
Local Economy .....	552
Retail .....	552
Tourism .....	552
5 – Design and the Historic Environment .....	552
Design.....	552
Historic Environment .....	553
6 – Open Space, Sport & Recreation Facilities.....	553
7 – Transport.....	553
APPENDIX 6 – RESPONSES & COUNCIL RESPONSE PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH – LOCAL CHOICES .....	555
Chapter 1 - Introduction.....	555
Chapter 2 – Development Strategy approach.....	555
• Housing Growth .....	555

• Question 1 – Do you agree that 500 new homes should be provided to meet local need across Stafford Borough each year for the Plan period, of which the majority of new homes should be at Stafford town? .....	555
• Question 3 – Do you agree that limited new housing should be identified in Stone to meet future local needs? .....	556
• Question 5 – Do you agree that Stafford town centre should see further growth in non-food shopping space, to provide for future population growth and remain competitive with other regional shopping centres? .....	556
• Question 6 – Do you agree that some new employment land should be allocated, in addition to the Meaford site, as an extension to the Stone Business Park? .....	557
• Question 7 – Do you feel that additional employment land should be allocated near Seighford and Eccleshall, in addition to the existing permissions at Hixon? .....	557
• The Importance of New Development .....	557
<b>Chapter 3 – Questions and Next Steps.....</b>	<b>557</b>
General.....	557
<b>APPENDIX 7 – RESPONSES &amp; OFFICER COMMENTS PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH – DRAFT PUBLICATION .....</b>	<b>559</b>
<b>APPENDIX 8 – RESPONSES RECEIVED &amp; OFFICER COMMENTS PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH – STRATEGIC POLICY CHOICES .....</b>	<b>778</b>
General comments.....	779
1 Introduction .....	788
2 The Context for Stafford Borough .....	788
3 The Scale of Housing and Employment- Borough Wide Development Strategy .....	791
Question 1.....	796
Question 2.....	809
4 The Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy .....	815
Question 3.....	818
Question 4.....	822
Question 5.....	826
5 The Distribution of Housing Growth .....	828
Question 6.....	830



Question 7.....	835
Question 8.....	838
6 Affordable Housing .....	841
Question 9.....	843
Question 10.....	848
7 The Means of Directing Growth.....	851
Question 11.....	854
Question 12.....	859
8 Next Steps and Further Information.....	861
APPENDIX 9 – LIST OF SPECIFIC AND GENERAL CONSULTEES .....	862

## APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF SPECIFIC CONSULTATION BODIES & GENERAL CONSULTATION BODIES

### Specific Consultation Bodies

- The Environment Agency
- English Heritage
- The Highways Agency
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Natural England
- Adjoining Local Planning Authorities
- Town and Parish Councils within Stafford Borough as well as those adjoining the Borough
- Staffordshire County Council
- Shropshire Council
- Staffordshire Police
- Staffordshire Primary Care Trust (PCT) Cluster
- Staffordshire & Shropshire Strategic Health Authority
- Network Rail
- Local gas and electricity providers
- Local sewerage and water providers

### General Consultation Bodies

- Amenity groups
- Civic Societies
- Community groups and residents' associations
- Countryside / conservation groups
- Development and property owning interests
- Disability groups
- Ethnic minority groups (including the National Association of Gypsy and Traveller Officers and the Gypsy Council)
- Health groups
- Housing interest groups and housing associations
- Local business groups
- Older persons' groups
- Other groups / individuals
- Local Canal Societies
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Airport Operators' Association
- Local telecommunication providers
- Local media
- Charities
- Ministry of Defence (Defence Estates)
- Local MPs
- The Theatres Trust

## APPENDIX 2 – COMMENTS RECEIVED & OFFICER RESPONSES PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH – BOROUGH-WIDE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

### Summary of Main Issues

1. **Infrastructure** There were many comments of concern that development would occur without prior investment and investigation into existing infrastructure, including roads, sewage, gas and electricity supply which could exacerbate existing problems.
2. **New settlement** A new settlement, in particular an eco-village was suggested in many responses, with several stating Norton Bridge as a possible sustainable location.
3. **Settlement Hierarchy and Residential Development Boundaries (RDBs)** Many responses focused on the need for the Local Development Framework (LDF) to provide a sustainable settlement hierarchy that clearly sets out the level of development across the Borough and certainty over RDB's. Several comments stated the importance of outlining the implications of each strategy option.
4. **Transport** In particular improved rail services (not just in Stafford but in other settlements such as Stone) and bus station and park and ride at Stafford were all raised in the consultation responses.
5. **Climate Change** Reference to climate change in the responses focused on energy use and supply, sustainable construction and design and adaptation and mitigation measures.
6. **Green Belt** Although there were mixed responses relating to the future of the Green Belt and Green Belt boundary, several sites in the Green Belt were suggested for development and redevelopment.
7. **Biodiversity** Several comments focused on the need to protect and enhance biodiversity, in general terms and on all designated sites. In addition there were many comments relating to the protection of the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
8. **Employment** There were comments relating to the need to have a right balance of housing and employment, in order to prevent a dormitory effect occurring. There was concern that recent employment has not focused on the creation of high quality skilled jobs and this needs to be addressed.
9. **Housing** General comments focused on local needs housing including affordable housing in the rural area and housing for the elderly. There was concern over development in back gardens and housing design in relation to the character of settlements.

10. **Leisure and Tourism** Several comments referred to the promotion of tourism across the Borough, especially canal related uses. Several comments focused on the lack of leisure offer in Stafford, the need to provide additional youth facilities, increasing obesity and sub-optimal recreational and access opportunities across the Borough.

## **Introduction**

- 1.1 The purpose of this document is to report on the responses received to the consultation paper titled 'The Plan for Stafford Borough - Borough Wide Development Strategy'. The consultation period commenced on the 4th January and remained open until Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2008.
- 1.2 Overall 484 individual comments were received, from 137 individuals and organisations.

### **General comments**

- 1.3 A high proportion of general comments were site-related. Where comments specifically answered questions throughout the document, these have been included in the summaries under each consultation question. Many consultees answered both the consultation questions and made general comments.

### **Government Office for the West Midlands**

- 1.4 The principal comment was that as Stafford is classed as "significantly rural", and consequently a greater emphasis should be made on rural issues such as: housing, employment, farm diversification, economy & communities, facilities in rural centres, use of vacant land for employment, the SBAP (Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan) and SSSI's.
- 1.5 Regarding the 6 development options, options 3 and 4 were favoured, with a suggestion that a detailed assessment of each option and justification for choosing the preferred option be given in due course.

### **Parish Cllr A Bevington, Gnosall Parish Council**

- 1.6 This response raised many points, including building an eco-community and environmentally friendly properties, improvements in infrastructure including rail transport, road transport, public transport and park and ride, affordable homes in the rural area, delivering homes for the elderly and redeveloping rural farms, in particular those owned by Staffordshire County Council. In addition there was strong opposition to the housing figures given in the RSS and it was suggested that Stafford Borough Council should resist such a high number.

### **Mr J Heath, MBD Architecture**

1.7 This response mainly concentrated on providing sites for development consideration within the LDF. The sites are listed below:

1. Sawpit Lane, Brocton
2. Tittensor Road, Barlaston
3. Intersection of A34 and A51, Stone
4. Church Lane, Hixon
5. Hopton Lane, Hopton
6. 2 areas of Stafford Road, Woodseaves
7. Pasturefields Lane, Hixon
8. Baulk Lane, Fulford

### **Miss A Smith, English Heritage**

1.8 General comments concentrate on the definition of the historic environment to be broadly defined in the LDF and also for the LDF to integrate the historic environment in policy development.

### **Philips Planning Services**

1.9 This response mainly concentrated on providing sites for development consideration within the LDF. The sites are listed below:

1. Land at Oldfields House, Walton-on-the-Hill on behalf of Mr C and Mrs P Sandy
2. Land at New Road, Hixon on behalf of Mr Jonathon Lloyd
3. Land at Marston Gables, Marston on behalf of Mr and Mrs F Cochran
4. Land at Hixon Airfield Industrial Estate on behalf of Mr Roly Tonge
5. Land at Audmore Road, Gnosall on behalf of Mr T Talbot
6. Land at Chebsey on behalf of Mrs B Jefferson

1.10 **Councillor M Carey** - Regarding Stone, it was commented that development along the canal is creating a tunnel effect and spoiling the character of Stone. A suggestion of re-introducing Margaret Street to Radford Street was given, as this would allow increased pedestrianisation of the shopping area. A suggestion of using S106 money to purchase areas of land on the outskirts of settlements to provide for open space and recreation was given.

- a. The response stated there are some uses of the river that are not supported and that the RDB should be retained in Stone. The preferred option was D, with an exception that housing for young people be provided.
- 
- 1.11 **Frederick Parr Associates on behalf of owners of Aston Bank Farm** - This response mainly concentrated on information supporting development at Aston Bank Farm, Aston-by-Doxey.
  - 1.12 **Frederick Parr Associates on behalf of owners of Bridgeford Hall Farm** -This response mainly concentrated on information supporting development at Bridgeford Hall Farm, Great Haywood.
  - 1.13 **Turley Associates on behalf of St Modwen Plc** -The response focused on selecting Stafford as the main focus for development, with a minor amount going to Stone, the principal and other settlements for local need. Development at Stafford should be focused on previously developed sites in and on the edge of the existing built up urban area, with new infrastructure being delivered if required.
  - 1.14 **Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of Miss C Harris**- Strategy options C and D were selected as being the preferred development strategies, with the reason that A and B would not allow needs of the Principal settlements to be met and F contrary to sustainable development. Gnosall is suggested as a key location for development, with 500 – 750 homes being delivered over the plan period. There was a concern that the settlements identified in option E are those with a population less than 1,000, smaller than the principal settlements.
  - 1.15 **Seabridge Developments**- This response mainly concentrated on information supporting developments at both Weston Road and Rickerscote. Both sites are unimplemented housing allocations from the 2001 Local Plan.
  - 1.16 **David Price Associates, on behalf of Trustees and W S and W T S Deceased**-This response mainly concentrated on providing information supporting development at Doxey Road, Stafford.
  - 1.17 **Hulme Upright Manning on behalf of H&H Holman Properties Ltd**- This response selected strategy options C and E as the preferred strategy options, in particular the settlements of Stafford, Stone and Eccleshall, which would be better placed to accommodate new development. Special needs housing, in particular for the elderly was raised as an important issue for the Borough and land to the north of Eccleshall was put forward for consideration of this type of development.
  - 1.18 **Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy on behalf of Nova Capital Management**- General comments concentrated on information supporting development at Barloworld, Stone.
  - 1.19 **Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy on behalf of Bentley Homes Limited**- General comments concentrated on information supporting development at Puddle Hill, Hixon.

- 1.20 **Fisher German LLP on behalf of Mr Thomas-** General comments concentrated on information supporting development at The Crescent, Doxey.
- 1.21 **Mr W Jakeman-** This response suggests an alternative strategy for the LDF, which would only allow housing development to satisfy local employees. The main basis for this is to reduce the need to travel elsewhere for employment and for housing and employment to be better linked to each other. Commenting on the 6 strategy options put forward, it is viewed that plan option F, dispersal across the Borough is impractical due to the inadequate road structure and resulting increased traffic.
- 1.22 **R Landon-** This response supports Strategy Option F for the following reasons; to reduce impact of development, increase usage of local services and facilities and less likelihood of increase of traffic on main roads. There needs to be adequate roads and bus routes already in place, prior to new development taking place.

The responses states that development in Stafford and Stone could dramatically increase their population, which in turn could spoil their character.

- 1.23 **P J Broom-** This comment offered a critique of the 6 development options put forward for consultation. Where as E and F are viewed as having merit, option B is viewed as the most realistic. It is commented that any village development must take into account local community needs.
- 1.24 **FG and Mrs J Whiston-** This comment focused on Stone, in particular that Stone has changed too quickly and is losing its identity as a small market town. With this in mind Option D was selected as the preferred development strategy.
- 1.25 **CT Planning on behalf of Mr P Bowen and Mr and Mrs Madders-** A supporting statement for development at Land South of Tixall Road, Stafford, was provided.
- 1.26 **A Pym on behalf of J Lloyd-** General comments concentrated on information supporting development at Hixon Airfield Industrial Estate, Hixon.
- 1.27 **King Sturge on behalf of Akzo Nobel-** General comments concentrated on information supporting development north of Stafford.
- 1.28 **CT Planning on behalf of Messrs Rawsthorne-** A supporting statement for development at Blackhole Lane, Derrington was provided.
- 1.29 **Home Builders Federation-** This response largely deals with issues of housing supply. Firstly, the LDF should be based on up to date evidence base including a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, which will demonstrate whether there is sufficient land to support the councils preferred option.

- a. The LDF needs to be flexible enough to accommodate any changes required from the RSS. Employment land needs to be accompanied by a recent Employment Land Survey. If employment land is no longer required, this should be considered for housing.

- b. The core strategy must ensure that, as a minimum, it makes provision for the housing requirement set out in the eventual adopted RSS.
- c. Regarding affordable housing, any Council policy on affordable housing should be evidence based and informed by a robust Housing Market Assessment, which has involved the industry in accordance with recent guidance. The targets for affordable housing should also take into account the provision of 100% affordable housing developments by Registered Social Landlords (RSL's). These have the ability to make significant and appropriate contributions to the need for housing within the area and must not be ignored in the formation of housing policy.
- d. The Council should not rely on windfall allowances albeit that it is accepted that some windfall development will come forward. Within the context of ten years post-adoption supply and regardless of the level of windfall development the LDF must identify sufficient sites on the proposals map to accommodate at least the first five years of housing proposed in the plan.
- e. The core strategy must include a Plan Monitor Manage policy that explains how the release of sites will be managed over the course of the plan period taking into account the results of trajectory planning and the annual monitoring reports.
- f. Finally the response discusses climate change, in particular that it is a global issue and needs a co-ordinated national approach. To this effect, the Council should not seek to impose strict environmental restraints on development that accelerates the industry's commitment to achieving zero carbon homes by 2016 and risk the delivery of much needed new homes. A recommendation is given in which the Council should focus attention on improvements to the existing built stock.

1.30 **Barton Willmore on behalf of Grainger PLC-** General comments concentrated on information supporting development at 3 sites in Great Bridgeford, a site in Ranton and at Ladford Industrial Estate.

1.31 **M Lunn-** General comments concentrated on information supporting development at Great Bridgeford.

1.32 **West Midlands Regional Assembly-** This response outlines the details in the phase 2 of the RSS relating to Stafford Borough. The main comment regarding the 6 development strategy options states that any development beyond Stafford should be directed towards settlements that have the capacity for balanced and sustainable growth and which support or have the potential to support a healthy service base. Option C is chosen as the most closely aligned to the phase 2 RSS. The following amendments were suggested

- Acknowledge that a 'limited' amount of development in smaller villages may be appropriate where justified on grounds of meeting local housing needs



- Introduce a mechanism to control release of additional housing in and around Stone to support the Renew agenda in North Staffordshire conurbation
- Assess the degree to which settlement hierarchy aligns with the hierarchy used in the RSS.

**1.33 Tetlow King Planning on behalf of the West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium-** The main issues raised from this response related to affordable housing. Where comments relate to individual questions, these have been included below. The following issues were raised as those to be addressed by the Core Strategy:

1. Affordable housing should be given sufficient weight and status within the core strategy
2. Links should be made between the core strategy and housing strategy
3. There should be strong links between the core strategy and other local authority strategic, such as the community strategy community care plan, economic development strategy and transport plans. Ensuring that affordable housing is given due prominence within a corporate approach.
4. Credible district wide and sub district wide affordable housing targets should be set
5. A local definition of affordable housing should be set encompassing intermediate and social rented housing and taking full account of local relationships between house prices and incomes
6. The sequential approach should not be so rigidly applied so as to impede the delivery of affordable housing
7. There should be proper targeting of individual sites for affordable housing, including identifying sites for 100% affordable housing
8. The opportunities for affordable housing should be maximised in the right locations
9. Full range of special needs housing including the provision of lifetime homes
10. There should be a reasonable amount of flexibility regarding design and development control standards, densities etc to assist in achieving affordable housing
11. The provision of affordable housing is recognised per se as both a positive material planning consideration and a planning benefit
12. The provision of affordable housing should be viewed within the context of achieving a balance community

13. Recognition should be given to the advantages of working with RSL's and a suitably flexible approach should be adopted towards S106 agreements

14. Policies should be included that maximise the reuse of empty properties for affordable housing

15. Housing demand factors should be taken into account. There is likely to be a continuing demand for family housing and this should be considered

16. Regular monitoring of the progress in meeting housing needs should take place. PPS3 discusses the requirements of Annual Monitoring Reports and sets out what the LPA should carry out on an annual basis. By referring to such indicators, the success or otherwise of the policies can be measured that such indicators are measurable against clearly defined targets, allowing measurements to be taken on an annual basis.

1.34 **Severn Trent Water-** This response sets out the statutory responsibilities for the provision of water and waste services, in particular the rolling five-year infrastructure investment programme, which sets out the position regarding water supply, water distribution, sewage treatment and sewerage.

1.35 **Staffordshire County Council-** This response comments on the issues and options document under the following headings; transport and access, education, climate change, ecology, landscape, historic built environment, historic landscape character and archaeology and rights of way.

a. In terms of specifying locations for development, western Stafford, at Castlefields and Burleyfields was identified as a location where an early regeneration phase of housing and employment in an accessible location could be achieved.

b. It was commented that the allocation of housing would have an impact on education provision.

1.36 **Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Partnership-** The level of development is likely to have an effect upon the AONB, in terms of additional recreational pressures and a requirement for associated transport to the AONB. The types of housing and employment development proposed for the settlements within the Borough should take account of their proximity to the AONB, particularly relevant to Brocton, Brocton A34, Great Haywood, Little Haywood, Colwich and Milford.

a. The Partnerships aspirations were set out; *The AONB will continue to be conserved and enhanced and will attract sufficient funding to sustain this task. The AONB will remain open to the (local) communities who wish to visit it for recreation. Those visitors will arrive to the area via means of sustainable transport, using the parts of the AONB where the habitat and landscape is less sensitive to potential harm, particularly the visitor centres. Visitors will also be directed to other recreational opportunities away from the AONB, within the*

*Borough and beyond, using positive messages. Residents, landowners and businesses within and close to the AONB will only undertake development that is appropriate to its designation and in keeping with the Cannock Chase AONB Management Plan objectives.*

- b. In terms of selecting a preferred strategy option, dispersal of development across the Borough, in particular focusing away from settlements close to the AONB, was favoured. In addition it was noted that should the majority of development be focused in Stafford, this would imply simpler practical delivery of sustainable transport and green route provision to and from the AONB.

1.37 **Network Rail-** The comments relate specifically to Network Rail's role as the agency responsible for delivering a reliable and safe rail network and also to maintain, improve and upgrade every aspect of the railway infrastructure. The response states that the strategy for the next 20 years needs to take into account the proposals for a significant improvement to rail capacity in and around Stafford. With regards to the West Coast One strategy, which is required to enhance the capacity of the West Coast Main Line, is the Stafford – Colwich line.

1.38 **Natural England-** The comments mainly respond to the consultation questions and have been included below. Additional comments focus on what the LDF should address; policy integration, capacity of the environment and priorities including climate change, green infrastructure, high standards of design, protecting and enhancing natural assets, designated sites, environmental assets that are not statutorily designated, landscape character, rural – urban fringe, accessibility to the countryside and sustainable recreation, sustainable transport and promoting renewable energy. Examples of good practice were also provided.

1.39 **Lichfield District Council-** The main point made in this response was for the Vision to consider giving greater significance to the role of the countryside and in particular its high quality and historic landscapes. Regarding the Cannock Chase AONB it is important to ensure a consistent of policy approach amongst the relevant planning authorities.

1.40 **Renew North Staffordshire-** The response is mainly concerned with the impact of housing development in the peripheral areas, especially in and around the Stone area and surrounding villages on the North Staffordshire housing market, and the impacts this may have on regeneration.

- a. A diagram indicating levels of migration in and out of the North Staffordshire housing market area was also provided.

1.41 **South Staffordshire Council-** The response states the Council's position regarding development south of Stafford in South Staffordshire, in particular that the Council would not support such a strategy. This area of land has previously been considered for development but rejected in the Local Plan 1996 due to environmental constraints.

1.42 **Environment Agency-** This response refers to previous comments made at key stakeholder meetings with the Council. The main comment focused on the knock-on implications of development in certain locations increasing the pressure for services and facilities in Stafford town centre's functional floodplain, which should be considered alongside the spatial strategy.

1.43 **Advantage West Midlands-** This response mainly concentrates on economic aims for the borough, in particular ensuring an appropriate supply of employment land and premises, utilising brownfield sites in sustainable locations, improving access between concentrations of local deprivation and areas of economic opportunity. In terms of a favoured development strategy, the Agency is supportive of a sustainable approach that would support the current hierarchy of settlements.

1.44 **The Woodland Trust-** This response firstly concentrates on the Vision, in particular how more weight could be given to the natural environment. Following on from this it is important to protect all priority habitats under the UK BAP target, not just designated sites. There is a concern that there is no reference to mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change, particularly with regard to the natural environment.

- a. Regarding the development strategy, the promotion of green space use and making a connection between the natural environment and improving the Borough's health is encouraged. Finally the Trust would like to see improved accessibility to woodland.

1.45 **Hixon Parish Council-** General comments focused on the high levels of housing development in Hixon in recent years with the following issues:

- Lack of medical facilities
- Lack of footpaths
- Road safety issues
- Lack of affordable housing available to local people with local connections
- Poor evening bus services

a. The following recommendations were suggested;

- no change to the RDB,
- maximum of 30 developments in any one development
- small scale development might be acceptable outside RDB if appropriate scale and has safe access
- no more than 30 properties in any one calendar year
- Total increase of no more than 10% current housing stock (75 units) between 2008 – 2026, growth in local amenities and services.

•

b. Option F is selected as the preferred strategy option.

1.46 High Offley Parish Council- The following issues were raised in this response

- The consideration of a new village at Norton Bridge should be given
- Major improvements should be carried out at Stafford Rail Station car park
- Transport, including new road links is a long term major issue
- Consideration of new railway station north of Stafford
- Build on brownfield sites
- Housing distribution to take into account survival of rural services
- Support development that would lead to increases in local infrastructure and facilities

Strategy D selected as the preferred strategy.

1.47 Eccleshall Business Focus Group

The following recommendations were given for Eccleshall:

- Housing in close proximity to the centre of Eccleshall for provision for housing for the elderly
- Affordable housing for local people to be provided near the centre of the town and in peripheral areas
- General housing to be provided on areas of land in the Gaol Butts and Community Hall area of Eccleshall

1.48 **Swynnerton Parish Council**- This response favoured development to be located in areas where there is adequate transport, leisure facilities and other services and facilities, not in areas where flooding occurs and not in large gardens. In reference to the Green Belt, there was support for its retention to stop the merging of settlements. Further suggestions included; more green space should be provided in all settlements and that Stone railway station and associated rail services should be fully reinstated prior to any further development in Stone. Option B is selected as the preferred Strategy option.

1.49 **Berkswich Parish Council**- This response raised concern over the level of housing proposed, in particular whether the number could be built in the timescale. Concern was also raised regarding services and facilities, and whether there would be sufficient provision to meet needs of expansion. A congested road network was raised as a current issue, which would increase. A suggested to overcome this was an improved bus system and bus station along with improved local train services.

- a. Option E was selected as the preferred option, with the provision that no housing should be built on flood plains or impinge on the AONB.
- b. The following suggestions / comments were also included in this response
  - Stafford town should provide shopping facilities which do not reflect every other town centre
  - County Council offices should move to Junction 14, reducing journeys into the town centre

- Stafford College should move to a site close to Staffordshire University, combining many facilities such as catering and sports
- Both the college and county offices should be redevelopment as retail / offices
- Adequate bus service and station near to railway station, along with park and ride from M6 should be considered
- Provision of separate cycle routes and cycle facilities should be considered alongside other public transport provision
- Prioritise affordable housing for young people
- Housing should be built in small clusters within existing settlements
- St Georges and RAF Stafford to be considered for housing in Stafford
- Creation of a manufacturing / highly skilled technical jobs

1.50 **Hilderstone Parish Council-** This response highlighted issues / comments relating firstly to Hilderstone itself, then to Stone and Stafford.

a. Hilderstone

- Retain Green Belt boundary to the north and west of the village
- Retain village envelope, keeping conservation status
- No infill in existing gardens
- New build and alterations to be in keeping with existing character
- No new housing to be in Hilderstone
- Any housing to be low cost housing local needs housing, minimised to the North and East of the village
- Encourage small business development in farm buildings
- Keep Green Lea school open
- Improve roads and surfaces between Hilderstone, Sandon and Stone
- Improve sewage and drainage
- Eliminate HGV vehicles through the village
- Improve police presence in the village
- Enforce occupancy of unoccupied houses

b. Stone and Stafford

- Maintain greenbelt
- Stop further building in Stone Town, e.g. infill of gardens
- Provide more parking in town centres
- Reduce pressure on Stafford and Stone by delivering houses in villages
- Resist any increase above 10,000 houses over the plan period
- Limit blight of warehouses along A34
- Maintain Stafford as a County Town and Stone as Market Town
- Restrict use of brownfield land for apartments in Stone
- Increase manufacturing base in County
- No wind farms to be erected in County
- Introduce park and Ride to Stafford
- Reinstate Stone Station

Overall, Strategy D was selected as the preferred strategy option.

**1.51 Cllr F Chapman-** These comments have been confined to Eccleshall. Reference is made to the Vision for the Borough, in particular for it to be a pleasant place to live and work, the historical character of the centres of Stafford, Stone and Eccleshall to be preserved and enhanced with development having regard to Town Design Statements.

- a. Adequate infrastructure is raised as an issue, in particular how Eccleshall is already at saturation point traffic wise. A suggestion of a by-pass linking the Newport, Stone and Newcastle Roads would reduce traffic congestion in the town. It is recognised that while development on the Swynnerton Road would be contentious it could facilitate further enhancement of the town centre.
- b. In general, limited sympathetic expansion of Eccleshall is encouraged, in particular to preserve viability of the town and realise potential in tourism terms.
- c. An aim to see an increase in sheltered accommodation within easy reach of local facilities is given. Affordable housing should be matched to employment and transport facilities and is probably better suited to Stafford and Stone.

**1.52 Mr M Smith-** In general, Stafford is selected as the main centre for additional homes and employment. Additional car parking will be required at the railway station, and plans of Railtrack to avoid trains being delayed should not result in less services calling at Stafford. Regarding road transport it is suggested that the Ring Road at Stafford be completed along with a park and ride scheme.

- a. Housing development should be distributed around the borough, but concentrated on Stafford and Stone, with some villages taking a proportion relevant to the level of services present. Small settlements such as Adbaston should not be expanded except for affordable local needs housing.
- b. Sutton is recommended for an RDB.
- c. A new village is suggested, possibly at Norton Bridge.
- d. Finally the response discusses tourism across the Borough and that advantage should be taken of all existing assets e.g. rivers and canals to promote tourism activities.

**1.53 Hyde Lea Parish Council-** This response lists Borough wide issues / objectives

- Infrastructure needs to be in place prior to any development
- Must be able to demonstrate that utility companies can deliver required infrastructure, such as sewage, water etc
- Increased pressure on medical facilities, major facilities must be kept open
- Need for affordable starter homes and retirement housing for the elderly

- Brownfield sites must be used in preference to greenfield sites, being as eco-friendly as possible
- Liaison with neighbouring districts is essential, especially for areas such as Hyde Lea which live adjacent to the Borough Boundary

Plan D is selected as the preferred strategy option.

**1.54 Seighford Parish Council-** This response lists Borough wide issues

- Infrastructure needs to be in place prior to any development, including community facilities and facilities for young people
- Must be able to demonstrate that utility companies can deliver required infrastructure, such as sewage, water etc
- Increased pressure on medical facilities, major facilities must be kept open
- Need for affordable homes
- Brownfield sites must be used in preference to greenfield sites, being as eco-friendly as possible,
- S106 agreements are essential
- Park and Ride scheme should be considered

Plan C is selected as the preferred strategy option, with the comment that option F would happen of its own accord due to infill and barn conversions

**1.55 Ms Hembrough, Barlaston Parish Council-** This response states that Barlaston will be able to sustain a small amount of new development in the village, but this should be focussed on the centre. There is poor transport links within the village and the Councils Vision should include an improvement in transport both in and out of the village. There is little employment in the village and new development should be aimed at the over 55-age group.

- a. The Council would like to see high quality, energy efficient new homes in safe, and clean neighbourhoods within easy reach of the road networks. In Stafford, the land between the Eccleshall Road and Stone Road (opposite the Audi Garage) is within easy reach of the M6 and A34. New development should be concentrated on brownfield sites already identified in the Local Plan before
- b. Green Belt land is considered. A 'Park and Ride' bus service located around this area would help to reduce congestion in the town. Improved public transport is a must for the future and there will need to be considerable input from local authorities into education, highways etc.

**1.56 Brocton Parish Council-** This response begins by supporting the Green Belt and the maintenance of the Greenfield "buffer" land between the Stafford urban area and the villages. The importance of retain character of rural villages is described alongside the need to protect farmland. Regarding the type of land that should be used for new development brownfield land is chosen.

- a. The response states that infrastructure, including road networks, public transport provision, central bus station and park and ride schemes should be



considered along with community services and facilities. Some must be in place before any further housing or industrial development. In addition, there is concern over the possible resurrection of the EDR. Regarding employment, industrial sites should utilise full use and 100% capacity of existing developments, must provide good quality, well paid jobs. All employers should be encouraged to forge strong links with education facilities to provide long term prospects for young people and to retain a skilled workforce. In relation to Stafford and Stone town centres, these need to be vibrant places where people can meet, shop, eat and spend leisure time in a safe, clean and pleasant environment. The response states that sympathetic development in rural villages, which respects the character of the village and contains the boundary, could help to preserve and possibly improve existing services and facilities for that community.

b. Strategy E is selected as the Preferred Strategy Option

1.57 **The Ecclian Society-** This response focuses on Eccleshall; in particular that any development should be in line with the Eccleshall Town Design Statement. Development that would result in a ribbon development to the town would be out of context. The response also raises the issue that infrastructure must be in place to support any increase in housing and employment development.

1.58 **Indigo Planning on behalf of Commercial Estates Group (CEG)-** General comments concentrated on information supporting development at Tixall Road.

1.59 **Defence Estates-** This response highlights the position of the MOD land at Stafford, in particular that the MOD has no intention of releasing any MOD sites within the Borough for alternative uses. This is to maintain flexibility, bearing in mind that the West Midlands is one of the areas within the UK with the potential to develop a super-garrison.

a. Regarding the Vision, the MOD wish to see an inclusion of the Ministry of Defence in relation to specialist industries and wish to see the opportunities presented by the use of MOD sites within the development strategy. Such opportunities include the potential for further military development at MOD Stafford and the continued use of Swynnerton Training Area.

b. Regarding the level of housing required in the Borough, Defence Estates considers that these requirements exclude any additional provision that may arise to meet Ministry of Defence requirements and this should be recognised in the development strategy.

1.60 **Mr T Midgley-** This response raises many issues for the Borough, such as rural highways, rural housing, in particular affordable housing, rural based industries and sustainable housing. Regarding how areas should change, Stafford Castle and historic sites should be used as tourist sites to bring more people into the town.

1.61 **Mr L Lee-** This response focused on the following areas:

1. Green Belt - It is important that the green belts around Stafford Town are kept, particularly the green belt shielding Cannock Chase AONB. There must be no further urban sprawl south. The buffer between Stafford and Cannock Chase should be maintained.

2. Out of Town Development. An increase of 10/12,000 new homes in Greater Stafford will bring with it demands for increased industrial, commercial, retail and leisure developments. It is important that retail and leisure developments in particular should be WITHIN the Borough, not edge of town / out of town developments.

3. Transport.

a. Motor vehicles - an increase of 10/12,000 new homes could bring with it 12/36,000 new motor cars on our roads. Stafford will need to a much improved road system. NOT so much an improved system of roads around Stafford, better roads INTO and OUT of Stafford.

b. Park and Ride – such an increase in population will put immense strain on town centre roads and parking. An efficient Park and Ride system will be essential. Not just from the outskirts to a town centre stop, but a looped system.

c. Railway – Stafford is a railway town. A fully functioning town centre railway station with high-speed links to other major centres is essential for attracting (and retaining) business and commerce in Stafford. Any plans by Railtrack to divert the west Coast Main Line around Stafford should be vigorously opposed.

d. Bus station - an enlarged, modern Stafford will require an efficient, well-located bus and coach station. A suggestion of providing this service at Sainsburys car park is given.

4. Health care – increase in population will put pressure on these services. An essential part of any Local Development Framework must surely include an enlarged and improved Accident and Emergency facility and enlarged Primary care Trusts.

5. Employment. Stafford must avoid becoming simply a ‘commuter belt’, and plan for the need for considerable job creation. Wherever possible these extra jobs should be spread around the greater borough.

1.62 **Mr J Edwards-** This comment recognises the level of development required within the Borough and states it is important that these changes retain the character of the various locations. Infrastructure should be in place prior to development taking place and the following issues are outlined for Church Eaton; poor access roads, flooding, sewage system breakdowns, constant telephone problems, no mains gas, minimal public transport, poor internet access, dangerous parking on the main street, no shops or local

medical services. The development strategy should consider such factors before deciding how development is to be distributed.

1.63 **Mr J Eld-** This comment focuses on the introduction, in particular the concern that it does not include the impacts on farming/food supplies and flood control.

1.64 **Ms K Davies, LA21-** General comments focus on the introduction, with the recommendation that reference be made to climate change, impacts on environmental systems, as well as changes to the countryside and the farming sector. Regarding areas that should have less change the following are listed; areas of high landscape, agricultural, aesthetic, recreational and biodiversity value, where heavy traffic pressure would be generated i.e where roads least able to cope. In reference to roads and traffic, a 'Quiet Lanes' initiative is suggested. Finally, in relation to the Vision, agricultural land, recreational opportunities, biodiversity, need to maintain 'environmental services' are all suggested for inclusion.

1.65 **Hilderstone Parish Council-** The first issue raised in this response is the level of empty properties across the Borough. The Parish Council state that these should be taken into account before making decisions regarding how much new development is delivered. Traffic through Hilderstone is raised as problem, along with the impact this has on local community activities and a feeling of isolation amongst many residents. The opportunity for villagers to work in the village should be encouraged and the wider use of the village hall and pub, maybe providing some form of local shop/farm shop should be looked at. The response suggests the following:

- To improve the roads and surfaces between Hilderstone and Sandon and Hilderstone and Stone. To improve the sewage and drainage systems in the village.
- To eliminate HCV vehicles through the village.
- All builds and alterations to be in keeping with existing character of the village
- Increased police presence in the village

1.66 The Parish Council would like to ensure the current village envelope in Hilderstone is maintained – whilst the village has experienced a high increase in population between 1991 and the 2001, there has been no increase in services or facilities. In reference to services and facilities, the bus services have diminished, 1 pub ceased trading and the previously sanctioned formal Open Space area for children 'disappeared'. Previously the village had lost the school, Police post, Post Office and local shops. The response refers to The Settlement Assessment document, which states that Severn Trent Water

- a. had concerns with water supply and that there was “ a sewerage scheme in the Capital Works Programme, and a flooding problem in the settlement”.
- b. There is an issue for local young adults being unable to get on the housing ladder in the village and consequently need to move away to find starter

homes. A small increase in the number of affordable homes would be welcomed as long as these could be developed on brown field sites.

- c. Overall Hilderstone Parish Council would encourage the example D as specified as a preferred strategy option.

1.67 **Creswell Parish Council-** The first issue covered in this response is in relation to the Vision for the LDF, in particular that the consultation document lacked a forward-thinking practical Vision, nothing that refers to particular locations across the Borough. There is a concern that the LDF has already been forced to become a 'reactionary process' in relation to the RSS and development targets that take little account of actual local need nor indeed of the local capacity to accept such dramatic change(s).

1.68 **Dr A Bloor-** The response begins by describing the distinctive character of Colwich, Great & Little Haywood and the hamlets within Colwich Parish. The response states how there has been several major housing developments in recent years, with the latest being some questionable in-fill sites. Issues such as flooding and sewerage problems, are raised, in particular how these have been made worse by recent additional housing. It is deemed that there is very little room, if any, for further expansion without destroying the very character and attractiveness of the area that attracts people to it. New developments (mainly of housing) within the Borough should, as a matter of principle, include or even be restricted to, new settlements with pre-installed utilities and amenities corresponding to the minimum requirements set out elsewhere for "RDB" settlements. The utilities should include local power and heat generation. The Borough Council should actively seek to overturn national and regional policy impediments to this form of development.

1.69 **Cllr J Russell-** The response begins in favour of preserving the Green Belt, especially in the north of the Borough.

- a. The issue of food supply is raised along with the need to protect farms from redevelopment. The issue of back garden development is discussed, with the view that sympathetic redevelopment should be actively supported as this type of development will provide housing near to town centre facilities with a reduced need for a car. Development in Stone is discussed; in particular the view that some development in the Stone area is possible (along the A34 and A51 as far south as Aston and the railway), and that employment opportunities at Stone Business Park should be supplemented at Meaford. The issue of a new village, in particular an Eco village is encouraged, with the suggestion that the eco aspect could be based on a combined heat and power plant using coal bed methane (least polluting in terms of carbon output). The current situation regarding coal bed methane is provided, in particular that the County Council have given consent for a trial drilling at Willoughbridge. The response encourages the LDF to keep options regarding energy production open to take account of these recent developments.

1.70 **Mr D Shepherd**- This response focuses on distinctive areas, in particular that they should remain distinctive and nearby development should be in sympathy with it. The response provides a Vision for the Borough;

*a. A widespread population providing opportunities to live and work in towns, villages and hamlets, all well-served with affordable public transport.*

1.71 **Mr R Hammerton, CAMRA**-This response is concerned with the loss and potential loss in both urban and rural areas of viable community public houses. Should they be lost due to pressures for housing development, it would be a loss to whole communities. It is recommended that a policy should be developed to address this issue. In reference to the Vision for the Borough the following is recommended;

*a. 'the availability of accessible and visually attractive high quality basic services and facilities (including community pubs) in all settlements and local neighbourhoods'.*

1.72 **Cala Homes Ltd**- The response mainly relates to development at the BT Training Centre at Yarnfield, in particular development of affordable housing. Regarding the strategy options, the response states it is important that proper provision is made for housing and employment in villages, not just the RSC, in order to have any chance of addressing the problem of affordable housing. Option E is the selected strategy option, as it most accords with the draft community strategy and will maintain the unique characteristics of the Borough. In relation to selecting the proportions of development, the following is recommended; the amount allocated to Stafford needs to follow the RSS. Of the remainder, 10% should go to Stone and the remaining 20% to be shared between the rural settlements (not just the principle settlements but larger villages such as Yarnfield). The employment should follow the housing.

1.73 **Cllr A J Perkins**- This response focuses on the need for Stafford to keep and improve upon its transportation links (Road and Rail) if it is to have the status of County Town.

1.74 **Mr R Gough, Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd**- Relating to the Vision for the Borough, the Vision provided in the consultation document is supported, along with the suggestion of the following;

*a. 'The market town of Stone will retain its unique attractive character providing housing development to meet local housing needs. A limited number of selected larger villages (Rural Service Centres), such as Gnosall and Hixon, will accommodate strictly limited additional housing development to serve their own needs and those of their rural catchments. The provision of affordable housing is particularly important in this respect. The expansion of services and facilities in these Rural Service Centres will be encouraged. Haughton, Weston, and Barlaston will not be selected as Rural Service Centres.'*

The following development proportions were recommended:-

	Housing	Employment
Stafford Town	75%	80%
Stone and Rural Service Centres (Gnosall, 20% 15% Hixon, Eccleshall, Yarnfield/Cold Meece)	20%	15%
Elsewhere	Maximum 5%	Maximum 5%

- b. In addition, the response states that it may be appropriate for some residential development to be allowed on the edge of Rugeley, if such development would support and assist the strategy for development in Cannock Chase District. It is not considered that there is any need for development, particularly housing development, to be directed to South Staffordshire District.

Further information is given in support of development at the Burleyfields area

1.75 **Mr R Gough, Lord Staffords Estates-** Relating to the Vision for the Borough, the Vision provided in the consultation document is supported, along with the suggestion of the following;

- a. *'The market town of Stone will retain its unique attractive character providing housing development t to meet local housing needs. A limited number of selected larger villages (Rural Service Centres), such as Gnosall and Hixon, will accommodate strictly limited additional housing development to serve their own needs and those of their rural catchments.The provision of affordable housing is particularly important in this respect. The expansion of services and facilities in these Rural Service Centres will be encouraged. Haughton, Weston, and Barlaston will not be selected as Rural Service Centres.'*

The following development proportions were recommended:-

	Housing	Employment
Stafford Town	75%	80%
Stone and Rural Service Centres (Gnosall, 20% 15% Hixon, Eccleshall, Yarnfield/Cold Meece)	20%	15%
Elsewhere	Maximum 5%	Maximum 5%

- c. In addition, the response states that it may be appropriate for some residential development to be allowed on the edge of Rugeley, if such development would support and assist the strategy for development in Cannock Chase District. It is not considered that there is any need for development, particularly housing development, to be directed to South Staffordshire District.
- d. Further information is given in support of development at the Burleyfields area

1.76 **Staffordshire Police-** Relating to the Vision for the Borough, the Vision provided in the consultation document is supported, along with the suggestion of the following;

- a. *'The market town of Stone will retain its unique attractive character providing housing development to meet local housing needs. A limited number of selected larger villages (Rural Service Centres), such as Gnosall and Hixon, will accommodate strictly limited additional housing development to serve their own needs and those of their rural catchments. The provision of affordable housing is particularly important in this respect. The expansion of services and facilities in these Rural Service Centres will be encouraged. Haughton, Weston, and Barlaston will not be selected as Rural Service Centres.'*
- b. The following development proportions were recommended:-

	Housing	Employment
Stafford Town	75%	80%
Stone and Rural Service Centres (Gnosall, 20% 15% Hixon, Eccleshall, Yarnfield/Cold Meece)	20%	15%
Elsewhere	Maximum 5%	Maximum 5%

- c. In addition, the response states that it may be appropriate for some residential development to be allowed on the edge of Rugeley, if such development would support and assist the strategy for development in Cannock Chase District. It is not considered that there is any need for development, particularly housing development, to be directed to South Staffordshire District.

1.77 **Fisher German on behalf of the Inglewood Investment Company-** General comments focused on the Vision and proportion of development across the Borough. Whilst support is given to the comments on the County town of Stafford, it is suggested that development in Stone will be limited due to the environmental and physical capacity of

the settlement being reached. The following was suggested for inclusion within the strategy;

- a. *'Larger Villages such as Barlaston, Great Haywood, Eccleshall, Hixon, Gnosall and Little Haywood and Colwich will have some growth proportionate to the scale of the settlement and its facilities. The rural areas will see limited growth reflective of the limited facilities and services available.'*
- b. The response states that there should be correspondence with the settlements listed in the development strategy and those listed on page 6 of the Settlement Assessment. The following proportions were recommended

	Housing	Employment
Stafford Town	65%	70%
Stone	10%	15%
Principal settlement	15%	10%
Other - villages	10%	5%

- c. Other comments refer mainly to the Vision, in particular the suggestion that Stafford needs to recognize the spatial advantages of concentrating new growth in and on the edge of the town. The response also focuses on the need for the Core Strategy to make the serious spatial choices about where in broad terms large-scale development should take place in and around Stafford.

1.78 **C Shenton-** This response mainly deals with local need housing, in particular how development across the Borough should be allowed in order for villages to survive and meet local needs, including starter homes and for those wishing to downsize properties.

1.79 **Stoke-on-Trent City Council-** The main issue raised by this response is that the development strategy for Stafford Borough should not compromise the regeneration of the Major Urban Area of the North Staffordshire conurbation - for example by providing significant development opportunities in locations which could continue to draw out the local population away from the Major Urban Area.

1.80 **Sandon and Burston Parish Council-** Sandon & Burston Parish Council opt for Strategy D, E, or F, welcoming some controlled development over the plan period.

1.81 **Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council-**This response combines the views of both parish councils. Overall option F is the preferred development strategy. Milwich Parish wish to see the possibility of providing controlled growth of 20 dwellings in the plan period, scattered throughout the Parish of Milwich, in the main settlement and in the hamlets, e.g. Coton, Coton Hayes, Garshall Green. Fradswell Parish Council are generally opposed to new development.



1.82 **Fisher German on behalf of Mr Thomas-** The following proportions were recommended

	Housing	Employment
Stafford Town	65%	70%
Stone	10%	15%
Other	25%	15%

1.83 **Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates-** The following proportions are recommended

Stafford - 50%

Stone - 35%

Other - 15% other targeted settlements requiring new housing development to underpin the viability of community infrastructure

- a. This response also raised a consultation issue in that the paper response form differed from the online questions which caused some confusion.

1.84 **National Trust-** This response deals mainly Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, in particular that the Core Strategy should be informed by a Borough wide one, and that it should also consider existing threats as well as possible threats such as climate change and impacts of major development.

1.85 **Mr A Twamley, Savills on behalf of Kier Ventures-** This response favours development in and adjoining Stafford, and provides information supporting development at the Castle Works Site, Stafford.

1.86 **Ranton Parish Council-** The Councils preferred option is C, development at Stafford, Stone and the principal settlements. The main reason for selecting this option is the existing level of services, facilities and infrastructure these settlements have.

## Key question 1

---

1.87 **What do you want Stafford to look like in 20 years time?-** There was a variety in comments to this question, with a total of 42 comments. In particular there were several responses of support for Stafford Borough to be a sustainable and unique Borough, which is healthy, has a low level of crime and is an enjoyable place to live, work and study. Several responses focused on safeguarding and enhancing the quality of habitats and the environment, in particular high quality landscapes (including the historic environment), countryside and open spaces and the protection of Green Belt. There was

a particular focus on reducing the need to travel within the Borough, energy efficient buildings and a growing supply of renewable energy.

- a. There was some focus on Stafford, in particular for it to be a vibrant County Town with a mix of residential, office and retail development, that promotes community cohesion and fosters a sense of well-being.
- b. One comment stated that the University will have a role to play in contributing to the attractiveness of the Borough as a place to live, work and study. Regarding transport, responses focused on town centres being traffic free, improved options and links for sustainable travel and the development of a network of major routes.
- c. Elements relating to future development focused on maintaining the balanced mix of rural and urban communities, meeting the needs of all communities, maintaining and in some areas improving community services and facilities, including play areas and youth facilities, improving built infrastructure, improving the mix of employment opportunities including agricultural diversification and rural businesses within the Borough, have a thriving economy which promotes innovation and nurtures enterprise, and to provide a focus on regeneration.
- d. One comment stated that the rate of economic land provision is too low and should be increased to support future economic prosperity in the Borough.

1.88 **Council Response-** The Borough-wide Development Strategy asked whether the Vision from the Draft Community Strategy should be used as the Vision for the Spatial Strategy in the LDF. Following responses to this question and responses to Issue 2 (see below) a separate Vision has been drafted, drawing out many of these issues to be included in Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options..

- a. *“By 2026 Stafford Borough will have retained and enhanced its high quality unique character made up of the County Town of Stafford, the market town of Stone and extensive rural area containing smaller towns and historic villages whilst providing development to meet the local needs of all communities in the area including affordable and quality housing. The Borough will have a rich natural environment which is resilient to the effects of climate change, is well maintained and enhanced with more people enjoying the area through a greater sense of health and well being. A high quality strategic network of accessible green space will have been developed in and around Stafford, Stone and other areas as well as an enhanced and managed built and natural resources providing a clean, safe and fun place to live.*
- b. *Stafford will have achieved a strengthened economy based on specialist industries, including the Ministry of Defence, by retaining the high quality skills delivered by further education facilities and bolstered by significant inward*

*investment. This will be supported by high quality housing and exceptional levels of community services and facilities.*

- c. Stone will have high quality residential developments supporting first class business development as well as an increasing number of retirement complexes making provision for an ageing population whilst not undermining the local character of the town with its canal side vistas and vibrant local economy and community activities.*
- d. The larger villages of Eccleshall, Gnosall, Hixon, Great Haywood and Little Haywood will have expanded their services and facilities to sustain the surrounding rural areas as well as provided high quality housing for local people, supported by local employment opportunities.*
- e. The rural areas will have been protected, conserved and enhanced to provide an exceptionally high quality of environmental and landscape character supported through biodiversity enhancement schemes. In particular locations affordable housing will have been delivered to provide for local needs to support a diverse and regenerated rural economy and renewable technologies. The availability of accessible and enhanced high quality services and facilities will have been provided across the rural area.*
- f. The Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Green Belt areas within Stafford Borough will not have had any significant development affecting their local character or openness".*

## **Key question 2**

---

**1.89 How should places such as the County Town of Stafford, the market town of Stone and the rural areas change when new development takes place?**- This question received 47 comments. A main issue was whether settlements would be able to accommodate further growth, and in particular what additional services will be required. It was suggested that development in the larger settlements should be geared towards promoting their long-term sustainability. Stafford, it was suggested would be able to accommodate more growth due to existing infrastructure, with some suggesting that an extension to the town centre, in particular its retail and leisure uses would be required to support future development. In addition Staffords role will be enhanced by the presence of the University.

- a. It was noted that there will be different issues for different settlements within the Borough, but there was general concern that community services and facilities would be lost to new housing development and that infrastructure needs to be greatly improved. Support was given to new development being a high quality and standard, in order to maintain local identity and character.
- b. Comments stated that both larger and smaller villages such as Haughton and Salt should have wider development boundaries to accommodate housing growth.

- c. One response stated that any changes must be based on a full and robust understanding of the environment, including the historic environment. One comment stated that the directions for growth need to be strongly indicated to ensure that development happens in a sustainable way. There was support for canal-based regeneration in Stone and the rural areas to further development tourist attractions. Support was given for green infrastructure and sustainable communities, as a way to reduce impact of new development. There was debate surrounding a 'settlement hierarchy' in particular the level of housing development, including affordable housing that could be located in Stone, larger and small rural settlements. Housing in the rural area should be limited to meet local needs.
- d. There was support for policies to allow for adaptation of redundant rural buildings to meet the needs of rural communities and businesses. Hixon was suggested as a settlement that should receive an appropriate proportion of housing.

1.90 **Council Response-** The structure of Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options separates Stafford, Stone and the rural area and outlines detailed policy issues relating to each in turn.

### Key question 3

---

1.91 **Are there any areas of the Borough which should have less change because of their distinctive character?**- 44 responses were received for this question. There was support for and against development across the Borough as part of this question, due to some areas being more sensitive to change than others. Some suggested that areas such as the Green Belt, ecological sites and areas with biodiversity value, archaeological and historical areas (local as well as nationally designated) including Stafford Castle, Historic Parks and Gardens, the old railway routes; canal banks and river walks, open space and conservation areas be protected from future development. It was further suggested that an adequate surrounding buffer should be applied to conservation areas to offer further protection.

- a. Detailed locations were listed due to their special interest for their species, habitats or importance protection;
  - River corridors and floodplains
  - Catchment of Aqualate Mere and Chartley Moss
  - Woodlands in the northwest of the Borough
  - Heathlands in the north of the Borough.
- b. There was support to protect ecological sites such as Cannock Chase AONB, Doxey Marshes, Barlaston Downs and SSSI's. In relation to particular locations, the following were suggested as areas that should be protected from future development, Castle Fields, Stone, Stafford Town to the eastern side of Walton on the Hill because of its proximity to the Cannock Chase AONB, Barlaston (east of the railway line), Brocton, Milford, small villages with no amenities / services, and the rural area between Stafford and Stone.

- c. It was suggested that some areas such as the AONB and conservation areas be appraised to have a greater understanding of the level of development that may be appropriate. Some respondees felt that only AONB's and SSSI's warrant protection and that the Green Belt in particular should not preclude development.
- d. In relation to character of settlements within the Borough, the issue of retaining local character was made, in particular Stafford, which should maintain and develop its own. The issue of Stone railway was raised, with the view that increased use of the network will improve the economic growth and sustainability of the area in the future. One response stated that rural areas should be protected, but not prevent rural diversification and reuse of farm buildings for appropriate uses.
- e. Where there is insufficient previously developed land, the suggestion that the Council should follow a sequential approach to considering the release of Greenfield sites was given.

1.92 Council Response- The paper outlines, in detail, those areas that are designated, nationally, regionally, or in some cases at a European level. The responses have been considered when selecting the development strategy and deciding on the future of Residential Development Boundaries through Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options.

- a. Regarding the Cannock Chase AONB this is also a SAC (European designated) and no development as part of the LDF should have a significant negative impact on it. This may mean that certain areas, such as Milford are precluded from future development.

## Issue 1

---

1.93 **What are the positive and negative aspects of the Borough and / or the area in which you live?**- This question received 18 responses, with the majority of positive aspects focusing on high quality countryside and settlements, location of the Borough as an attractive and accessible location for business, historic character and assets, a rich natural environment including AONB, SSSI's, open spaces, canal and transport links, a diverse and productive agricultural sector, lower levels of car commuting from Stafford and level of use of community services.

- a. Negative aspects of Stafford were considered to be lack of retail and leisure offer, with a high number of vacant units, high level of traffic and congestion, lack of a bus station and an increase in warehouse distribution as both the main employment offer in Stafford and loss of character at the edge of the town.
- b. In relation to Stone, negative aspects focused on the loss of openness alongside the canal.
- c. For the rural areas high speeds and 'rat running' on rural roads is a negative aspect.
- d. The following were given as Borough wide negative aspects; poor quality and maintenance of public highways and pavements in certain areas in the Borough,

increasing obesity, sub-optimal recreational and access opportunities and a decline in young people accessing and experiencing the natural environment.

- e. Several comments were made with specific reference to biodiversity, in particular the fragmentation of habitats, including alteration of natural flood alleviation, the need to prevent flooding and to provide access to natural greenspace.

## Issue 2

---

### 1.94 **Should this Vision be used to guide future development of the area and if not what is your vision and key objectives for the Stafford Borough area?**

- a. There were 34 responses to this question, with some overlap with responses made to Key Question 1.
- b. Those who disagreed with the Vision from the Community Strategy were concerned that a fixed vision cannot offer flexibility over the 20 years, that it does not fully integrate housing development issues, that it does not provide an indication of the level of development in particular locations, is not locally distinctive to different settlements and locations within the Borough, does not grasp the concept of sustainable development and does not include issues of climate change and cultural activities.
- c. There were several comments of support for the vision, where as some respondees offered alternatives and suggestions relating to locally distinctive elements of the Vision. High quality environment, sustainable living, enhanced green infrastructure, protection and enhancement of valuable natural and built resources were suggested for inclusion within the Vision.
- d. One comment stated how the Spatial Vision should stem from the spatial portrait and how this should give a succinct overview of the Borough, including positive features and tackling issues.
- e. Regarding the Cannock Chase AONB, it was suggested that the vision incorporates protection of the quality of the landscape and peace and tranquillity with particular reference to the AONB.
- f. The following text was suggested for inclusion in the Vision- *'New strategic mixed use and sustainable communities adjacent to the town of Stafford will assist in contributing to the revitalisation of the town. Such new communities will ensure a sustainably high quality of life in which the benefits of the unique character of the Borough are equally available to all residents, workers and visitors'.*

1.95 There was concern that the environment is not a key topic in the vision from the community strategy.

- a. The following text was recommended:
  - *Stafford Borough to be a quality environment where:*

- *All areas of designated habitat are protected and enhanced*
- *Key habitats are linked*
- *Adequate access is provided for all to the environment by implementation of recommend targets (ANGST)*
- *All floodplains and rivers are protected*
- Flooding is reduced by sustainable measures rather than hard engineering solutions

1.96 Council Response- Clearly the high quality of the environment within the Borough was a key issue raised by a number of respondents which lead to a significant focus on environmental policies as part of Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options.

## Key Question 4

---

1.97 **What issues and objectives do you have for the area?**- This question received 45 comments.

- a. Responses can generally be divided into issues and objectives. Firstly existing issues were outlined; Housing, in particular lack of affordable housing across the Borough, particularly in rural areas, housing design and layout, including pedestrian links and character was raised as an issue along with the loss of historical buildings and expansion of certain settlements impacting on country parks and other designated sites. An ageing population was raised as a major issue for the Borough.
- b. Traffic congestion in Stafford was raised as an issue, with a suggested solution of creating a by-pass to link Eccleshall Road, Doxey Road, Newport Road and Wolverhampton Road.
  - Objectives for the spatial strategy were suggested. Several of these referred to Stafford, in particular:
    - Concentrate development at Stafford to enhance its County Town function
    - Improve the amount, range and quality of retail, leisure, services, and facilities available
    - Improve traffic circulation around Stafford Town Centre
    - Provide new employment opportunities at Stafford Town, in locations proximate to the Motorway junctions, particularly Junction 14
    - Provide a wide range of high quality housing at Stafford Town to meet all components of housing demand in sustainable locations, as proximate to the Town Centre as possible
    - Less reliance on windfalls but focus development at strategic locations
    - Protect rural areas from major new infrastructure, particularly any high speed rail link to the East of Stafford.
- c. Other suggested objectives related to Stone in particular
  - Provide development in a limited number of suitable Rural Service Centres and at Stone, primarily to meet local needs
- d. Elsewhere in the Borough suggested objectives included

- Achieve the right balance in terms of housing, employment and amenity in order to attract the right people and skills to the Borough
  - Restrict development elsewhere in order to protect the character of settlements and the countryside and to move towards a more sustainable pattern of development
  - Maintain the distinctive feeling of rural settlements and better utilise the larger villages as secondary centres
  - Protect and improve existing services, facilities and employment areas in rural settlements
  - Meet the RSS requirements
  - Protect designated areas
  - Improve transport links to existing and new development
  - Enhance the environment and encourage energy efficiency
  - Reduce the level of commuting
  - Achieve a vibrant economy
  - Enhance and manage the built and natural resources of the Stafford Borough in a sustainable and integrated manner. To bring about a step change in biodiversity management and the adoption of a Green Infrastructure planning approach that will lead to net gain; retaining and enhancing landscape character and distinctiveness.
  - Ensure that development in Stafford Borough follows good practice for ‘green living’ and makes it easy for people to live in an environmentally friendly way by using the highest standards of design (including energy efficiency / renewable energy, sustainable construction methods and green technologies), and ensuring sustainable transport choice. This will maximise environmental performance and encourage healthy lifestyles. Create a development framework which is based on maintaining distinctive and separate settlements which will encourage a ‘sense of place’ and maintain local character.
- e. One response raised the issue of development within Stafford Borough adjacent to Rugeley in order to meet the housing needs of Cannock Chase District Council.
- f. In reference to the type of land used for development, one comment stated that the LDF should recognise as a main objective that brownfield sites will be preferable locations to greenfield locations.
- g. A separate response focused on the insufficient capacity to accommodate all new development on previously developed land in existing urban areas, and greenfield land will need to be released.
- h. An overall comment stated that the LDF strategy and objectives must be robust, comprehensive and flexible to help create a successful and sustainable Borough.

1.98 Council Response- Issues raised have been incorporated into Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options, under various topics. The objectives, which will stem from the vision have also been drawn up.



### Issue 3

---

1.99 **Over the next 20 years what should the area be aiming to achieve both in terms of what we have now as well as new resources and opportunities for the future?**- This question received 17 comments.

- a. Generally, comments referred to achieving a sustainable pattern of development, taking advantage of opportunities that currently exist and achieving the right balance of employment and housing for the benefit of all communities. The issue of energy efficiency and resource use was raised along with renewable energy.
- b. The topic of coal-bed methane technologies was raised as potential major energy source for Staffordshire in the future.
- c. Regarding particular locations within the Borough, several comments sought Stafford Town to better fulfil its County Town role, acting as the principal service centre not only for the Borough, but also for central Staffordshire. Development, primarily to meet local needs arising outside of Stafford Town, should be directed to Stone and a few of the larger, more sustainable villages.
- d. In reference to Stone, the issue of job availability and affordable housing was raised in order to retain local young people already living in the area. Any development in Stone should be located within the current urban parameters of the town and should be retained within the limits of the valley ridge.
- e. The following visionary statement regarding the natural environment was suggested:- *A rich natural environment, resilient to the effects of climate change, well maintained and enhanced with more people enjoying it, more often for health and well being with Cannock Chase, key rivers, floodplains and wetlands, and the landscape areas supporting the main Biodiversity Action Plan habitat concentrations (e.g. lowland semi natural woodlands, meadows) being linked, improved and sustainably managed. A high quality strategic network of accessible greenspace will be developed with an emphasis in and around Stafford, Stone and other communities.*

1.100 Council Response- Issues raised have been incorporated into Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options, under various topics. The objectives, which will stem from the vision have also been drawn up.

### Issue 4

---

1.101 **What changes would you like to make?**- This question received 15 responses.

- a. Responses raised issues relating to possible marina developments, park and ride at Stafford, the Stafford Eastern Distributory Road and renewable energy.
- b. Other comments referred to planning application issues, including testing the viability of community facilities, such as pubs before they are granted development

for housing, and the issue and cost of biodiversity and ecological surveys required alongside planning applications

- c. The issue of ensuring that there is sufficient infrastructure prior to future development being allocated and built was a large concern in this section and throughout the document. Several comments stated that the LDF must provide developers with certainty over its 20 lifespan.

1.102 Council Response- The issue of existing infrastructure and other current issues across the Borough have been raised in separate categories in Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options. In addition questions regarding renewable energy and transport have also been raised throughout the document.

## Issue 5

---

1.103 **Area there any issues, problems or opportunities either Borough-wide or in your particular area, which you would like to draw to our attention? (For example, affordable housing, lack of services and facilities, transport provision, new tourism or leisure opportunities)-**  
This question received 30 comments.

- a. Responses to this were quite varied and some tended to be site specific. General comments relating to the Borough included sewerage capacity in particular locations as an issue and how this could limit the amount of future development without sufficient improvement, high level of cars traveling to the rural areas, in particular to the industrial estates. The issue of RDB's was raised here, in particular that they should be redrawn to allow housing in rural areas where there is a local need. It was felt that some smaller rural settlements have had a lack of development, which has lead to stagnation.
- b. Lack of affordable housing, in particular in the rural areas, along with lack of parking in new developments across the Borough was raised as an issue.
- c. The issue of healthcare and education was raised as a concern that it would not be sufficient to meet the level of future housing.
- d. There were several comments supporting the use of brownfield land before greenfield land is made available for development.
- e. The issue of employment opportunities in areas, such as Brocton and Milford where there is a hotspot for visitors to the AONB was raised.
- f. Regarding Stafford, comments concentrated on a lack of retail and leisure choice and it was suggested that such uses should expand beyond their current limitations up to and beyond the present 'collar' formed by the Queensway, Newport Road, Tenterbanks, and Chell Road network. The view that Stafford is seen as a dormitory town was raised.
- g. Also the traffic and congestion problems within Stafford were raised, with suggested solutions being railways and other public transport, a proper integrated public

transport (Bus) and rail interchange, a proper bus station, parking and genuine provision for pedestrian and cycle routes. Highway maintenance was raised as a borough wide issue

- h. Housing in Stone was raised as an issue, in particular the recent development housing for the elderly without consideration of the infrastructure or housing provision for younger people. One comment stated the current housing data on housing demand is out of date and should be replaced by a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to address need of affordable housing.
- i. Traffic issues were raised as a particular problem in Colwich Parish.
- j. Eccleshall was regarded as having many facilities, but additional development would also justify other improvements such as better public transport, road improvements (especially the A519 and A5013), more public open space and youth facilities.
- k. The following areas were suggested for development:
  - Land at Doxey
  - Land north of Castlefields – ‘Burleyfields’
  - RAF Stafford
  - Hixon Airfield
  - Newcastle
  - Seighford
  - BT training school, Yarnfield
  - North of Stafford, at Beaconside
- l. One comment stated that there is a need to consider biodiversity value of previously development land, in particular whether it has ‘open mosaic habitat’ which is now a UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Habitat.

1.104 Council Response- A wide range of individual sites were promoted at the Borough-wide Development Strategy consultation including significant details and supporting evidence. Based on the approach of focusing new development on Stafford, Stone and a number of principal settlements together with information on physical and environmental constraints the Borough Council identified a number of location options to accommodate new housing, employment and town centre uses as part of Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough – Issues & Options document. Other issues raised under this question have been incorporated into the Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options.

## Key Question 5

---

1.105 **Where should new housing and employment development be built and what level of new services and facilities needs providing as community support?-** This question received 72 comments. Views regarding where new development should go were varied but overall themes were for new development to be balanced with adequate infrastructure development including good rail links, new roads and sustainable transport links, open space, including natural open space and allotments, education, health care, local services

and facilities and also to be of high quality design, that electricity, water, sewage and gas supplies need to be improved to meet demand. Several comments stated that development should not occur on floodplains.

- a. Planning obligations were raised as way to secure infrastructure improvements and as an issue to be addressed in the LDF, in particular to set down clearly what is required of the developer and other funding partners.
- b. The requirement to balance housing with employment development, such as through mixed-use developments was made in a number of comments, in order to reduce the need to travel elsewhere for employment.
- c. Regarding housing development, several comments referred to developing a range of housing types and tenures, to cater for all members of society. Concern was raised over housing in private gardens. MOD accommodation needs was also raised as an issue that needs to be considered when deciding the location and level of new housing development.
- d. In relation to employment development, several comments referred to the recognised industrial estates. Whilst some felt that these areas should not be expanded, others felt like those such as Hixon Airfield and other redundant airfields could provide sufficient land for employment development.
- e. Many respondents highlighted their preferred development strategy option to this question. All options received some level of support, apart from Option A. Many of the comments favoured Option F, a spread of development across the Borough, citing reasons of existing development of barn conversions, less detriment to settlement character, over development and increased crime levels at Stafford, and particularly Stone. One comment stated that option E requires greater clarification regarding the 'selected settlements'.
- f. Comments favouring development in Stafford, Stone and the larger settlements cited existing infrastructure, transport links, retail, leisure and services and facilities as a reason to support the option. A suggestion for the proportions of development was 70% at Stafford and Stone and 30% spread across other settlements in the Borough.
- g. Areas that were suggested for development were Norton Bridge for an eco-town, Salt, Barlaston, Yarnfield, Raleigh Hall, Tittensor, Eccleshall, Hixon, Haughton, Great Bridgeford and Weston and on peripheral sites at the edge of Stafford, in particularly at the existing housing allocation (Local Plan HP13), Hyde Lea, and Walton on the Hill.
- h. It was suggested that the Green Belt boundary is reviewed around the North Staffordshire conurbation. A range of potential housing allocation options should be explored to ensure sufficient land is available. Eccleshall, it was suggested could accommodate some further growth, but only after sites in Stafford and Stone have been completed. One response used the same proportion of allocations in the Local

Plan to state that Stone should deliver 1,957 dwellings over the RSS period. The provision of 20 dwellings per year, or 400 over the RSS period would be a reasonable expectation for a settlement the size of Hixon.

- i. One comment raised the issue of existing planning permissions, of which 34% are in the rural area.
- j. The following table was included in one response

	<b>Stafford Total</b>	<b>Borough</b>	<b>Stafford Town</b>	<b>Outside Stafford</b>
Proposed Total (Net) 2006 – 2026	10,300		7,000 (68%)	3,300 (32%)
Annual Average	515		350	165
Completions 2006 – 07	449		█	█
Requirement 2007 – 2026 with apportionment used above	9,851		6,699	3,152
Annual average	518.5		352.5	165.9

1.106 Council Response- The views of which strategy option should be pursued have been taken into account with the development strategy approach focusing on Stafford, Stone and principal settlements in the Borough. Issues of infrastructure have been discussed in more detail in Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options.

- a. Regarding the issue of Norton Bridge as an eco-town, this has not been progressed further due to the Government short listing areas which they will be considering for an eco-town and also the RSS not making reference to a new town or settlement in Stafford Borough.

## Issue 6

---

1.107 **Are there any strategy alternatives which the Council should be considering?**- This question received 28 comments, with the majority focusing on the proportions of development. Below is a table highlighting views on the distribution of development:

Stafford	Stone	Larger Settlements	Other Settlements	Other location in the Borough
75%	15% (local needs)	Eccleshall, Gnosall, Great Haywood, Hixon  "generally" local needs  only 10%		
75%	For local needs	Gnosall, Hixon, Eccleshall, Yarnfield/Cold Meece – Service Centres – local needs	Affordable housing in smaller settlements with RDB	Adbaston; Aston by Stone; Bradley; Cotes  Heath; Croxton/Croxton  Bank; Hopton; Milford; Milwich; Norbury, Ranton, Salt, and Seighford to have RDB removed
75%	For local needs	Gnosall 7 – 10%	Affordable housing in smaller settlements with RDB	Adbaston; Aston by Stone; Bradley; Cotes  Heath; Croxton/Croxton  Bank; Hopton; Milford; Milwich; Norbury, Ranton, Salt, and Seighford to have RDB removed
75%	For local needs	Gnosall, Hixon, Eccleshall, Yarnfield/Cold	Affordable housing in smaller	Adbaston; Aston by Stone; Bradley; Cotes  Heath;

		Meece – Service Centres – local needs	settlements with RDB	Croxton/Croxton Bank; Hopton; Milford; Milwich; Norbury, Ranton, Salt, and Seighford to have RDB removed
60% employment and housing	20% employment and housing	10% employment and housing	Affordable housing in smaller settlements with RDB	10% employment
30% housing 40% employment	20% housing 15% employment	20% housing 10% employment at Gnosall, Barlaston, Haywoods and Hixon	10 – 15%	5% housing 5% employment cross border location – South Staffs.
Housing 70%	10%	18%	15% housing 15% employment at Yarnfield, Brocton A34 and Seighford	
Housing 70%	10%	18%	2% Haughton	
Housing 80% Employment 80%	Housing 10% Employment 10%	Housing 10% Employment 10% within principal settlements	2%	

- a. Some comments, under this question showed preference to strategy option C, A, B. One comment suggested an alternative strategy which would see development focused on main towns as well as being spread across the Borough as a whole to allow all settlements to take advantage of growth. Other comments concentrated on development of a sustainable settlement hierarchy and consideration of the environmental implications of development. One comment stated that there will additional development alternatives to consider if potential urban extensions and accommodation within the existing urban area are taken into account.

1.108 Council Response- Having considered the responses to the six options, evidence through the Regional Spatial Strategy and the recommendations from the Sustainability Appraisal Commentary – Volume 1 the Council progressed with an approach based on Option C with the focus of new development on Stafford, Stone and a number of principle settlement within the Borough. The number of sites being promoted in these areas identified that there was capacity to deliver a strategy based on this approach. Further details were set out in Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough – Issues & Options document.

## Issue 7

---

1.109 **What particular pressures do you anticipate?**- This question received 16 comments. Pressures were identified on the following; existing services and facilities, lack of basic infrastructure, lack of investment into local resources, loss of green fields and open countryside, increased road traffic, safety and good education, lack of public transport. Recreational pressure on the AONB was raised as an issue, due to additional housing. This will result in a greater need to conserve the AONB through careful management. Some pressures were identified to have an effect locally and beyond; materials, resources, energy, land, water, open space, farmland, air quality, biodiversity, sewage treatment and flooding.

- a. The issue of a possible lack of builders and trades to meet demand was also raised. In addition it was suggested that there will be a need for development to take place on Greenfield locations.
- b. The following pressures were highlighted for Stafford town; transport, education, health, leisure, social and community services.
- c. Some solutions to these pressures were to expand facilities and services in rural service centres. It was also suggested that baseline surveys to establish existing recreation, education, retail, community, road, public transport, landscape and other environmental capacity be carried out in order to identify needs that will arise.

1.110 Council Response- The Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options document has drawn on the most up to date evidence and information from infrastructure providers to identify needs and issues that will arise from future development.

- a. The document also includes information and policy approaches for sustainable drainage systems and flooding. The issue of builders and trade has not been addressed in the paper.



## Issue 8

---

### 1.111 What levels and types of new services and facilities, including roads and public transport provision do you consider are necessary to support your preferred or suggested strategy?-

This question received 14 comments. Some of recommendations referred to Borough wide services and facilities including water, gas and electricity supplies, green infrastructure, waste disposal, sewage treatment and sewerage capacity, safe routes for pedestrians and cycle-ways. It was recommended that for the various outlying communities the re-introduction of appropriate rail services and the provision of 'off-site' leisure and recreation facilities, health facilities and community centres would be required. Services and facilities considered for Stafford included; expansion of Stafford town centre, new road linking Newport Road and Doxey Road, office based employment, leisure and retail on older employment areas, improvements to Stafford railway station and access to it and expansion of police services in Stafford town.

- a. The suggestion of new development in Stafford at Burleyfields would require a new local centre, a primary school, improvements to health service provision and new sport and recreation provision.
- b. For Creswell, a new road at Creswell Grove and all points accessed to the Northwest along the A5013 was suggested. It was commented that development should be focused in areas that already have a good level of existing services that could be supported and enhanced by new development. Providing further services and facilities in some smaller settlements could have a negative impact on the character of villages and in effect turn them into 'small towns'.
- c. Improvements to public transport links between Stafford, Rugeley and Lichfield and from rural settlements such as Hixon, Little Haywood, Great Haywood and Colwich into Rugeley were supported.
- d. Under this question there was one response highlighting the preferred approach to the distribution of development;

	Housing	Employment
Stafford	65%	70%
Stone	10%	15%
Principal settlements	15%	10%
Other- villages	10%	5%

1.112 Council Response- Having considered the responses to the six options, evidence through the Regional Spatial Strategy and the recommendations from the Sustainability Appraisal Commentary – Volume 1 the Council progressed with an approach based on Option C with the focus of new development on Stafford, Stone and a number of principle settlement within the Borough. The number of sites being promoted in these areas identified that there was capacity to deliver a strategy based on this approach. Further details were set out in Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough – Issues & Options document.

## Issue 9

---

1.113 **Do you consider any smaller settlements without Residential Development Boundaries to be suitable for new development in the future?**- This question received 13 comments, with the majority stating that settlements without Residential Development Boundaries should not be considered for development.

- a. One comment stated that RDB's are out of step with the RSS and that RDB's could remain as long as they are not used to create a presumption in favour of unsustainable development.
- b. One comment stated that settlements without RDB's should only be considered if there are transport infrastructures and other fundamental services to cope to enable a decent quality of life to be maintained for those living in these smaller communities.
- c. Moreton, Sandon and Gayton were suggested as settlements which have a role to play even though they do not currently have a Residential Development Boundary.
- d. Regarding affordable housing in small rural areas, it was commented that rural exception schemes should be allowed and they should provide 100% affordable housing.

1.114 Council Response- Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options paper does not list any changes to those RDB's listed in the Local Plan 2001. It continues with the general policy that development within the RDB's would be limited infill. It does ask questions regarding whether RDB's should remain.

## Issue 10

---

1.115 **Do you consider any of the settlements listed with Residential Development Boundaries should not be considered for new development in the future?**- This question received 10 comments. The RDB's at the following settlements were recommended for removal:

- Adbaston
- Aston by Stone
- Bradley
- Cotes Heath
- Croxton/Croxton Bank
- Hopton
- Milford
- Milwich
- Norbury
- Ranton
- Salt
- Seighford

- a. It was commented that the RDB at Brocton does not fully represent the full extent of the built development west of the A34 and should be extended to include the existing Brocton industrial estate.
- b. One comment stated that all RDB's should be removed and reconsidered in order to achieve a realistic distribution of housing and employment. Tittensor was recommended for no further development.

1.116 Council Response- Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Issues and Options paper does not list any changes to those Residential Development Boundaries (RDB's) listed in the Local Plan 2001. It continues with the general policy that development within the RDB's would be limited infill. It does ask questions regarding whether RDB's should remain.

- a. **What land should be built on for housing and employment development?-** This question received 41 comments, many of which referred to particular locations and detailed sites. General comments stated that development should be built on derelict / old use-outdated buildings and previously developed land. Others felt that the extent and location of PDL land is insufficient and that greenfield and some Green Belt should be considered where this would contribute to local needs or be a sustainable development. Land near existing transport routes, which would enable community based energy and heating schemes should be built on for future development. When searching for appropriate sites for development, it was recommended that the LDF should focus within and immediately adjoining the settlements of Stafford, Stone, Eccleshall and Gnosall.
- b. One comment stated that redundant industrial areas should not be developed for housing, but for creating new employment opportunities.
- c. Land not considered suitable for development included agricultural land, commercial land, recreational land, land of agricultural, biodiversity or landscape value, community facilities and services or land in the floodplain.
- d. In terms of general locations, the following were suggested as areas for development; land at Doxey, Barlaston, Great Haywood, Hopton, north of Beaconside, Stafford, Burleyfields, Stafford, Crown Wharf, Stone, Salt, Land east of Stafford, former police ground off Silkmore Lane, Stafford, PDL land at Hixon, Stone, Oulton, Clayton, Aston Lodge Park and land adjacent to Rugeley within Stafford Borough. The following list of detailed sites were also put forward as part of this consultation exercise:

1. Land at Oldfields House, Walton-on-the-Hill
2. Land at New Road, Hixon
3. Land at Marston Gables, Marston
4. Land at Hixon Airfield Industrial Estate
5. Land at Audmore Road, Gnosall

6. Land at Chebsey
7. Land at Aston Bank Farm
8. Land at Bridgeford Hall Farm, Great Bridgeford
9. Land at Great Bridgeford (GB1)
10. Land opposite the Tollgate Industrial Estate
11. Land at Tixall Road, Stafford
12. Land at Church Lane, Moreton
13. Land at Great Bridgeford (GB2)
14. Land at Ranton
15. Land at Ladford Industrial Estate
16. Land at Puddle Hill, Hixon
17. Land north of Beaconside, Stafford
18. Land north of The Crescent, Doxey
19. Land north of Barlaston
20. Land at Hopton
22. Newstead Sewage treatment Works
23. Land at Eccleshall
24. Land at HP11, Stafford
25. Land at HP3, Stafford
26. Land south of Tixall Road
27. Land north of Beaconside
28. Land at Hixon Airfield
29. Land at Barloworld Scientific, Stone
30. Land at Hyde Lea
31. Land at Walton-on-the-Hill
32. Land at Tittensor
33. Land at Raleigh Hall, Eccleshall

- 34. Land south of Doxey
- 35. Land at Laburnum House, Newport Road, Haughton
- 36. Land at Great Bridgeford (GB3)
- 37. Site at Sawpit Lane, Brocton
- 38. Site at Tittensor Road, Barlaston
- 39. Site at intersection of A34 and A51, Aston by Stone
- 40. Site at Church Lane, Hixon
- 41. Site off Hopton Lane, Hopton
- 42. 2 Sites at Stafford Road, Woodseaves
- 43. Site at Pasturefields Lane, Hixon
- 44. Site at Baulk Lane, Fulford
- 45. Land West of Derrington

1.117 Council Response- A wide range of individual sites were promoted at the Borough-wide Development Strategy consultation including significant details and supporting evidence. Based on the approach of focusing new development on Stafford, Stone and a number of principal settlements together with information on physical and environmental constraints the Borough Council identified a number of location options to accommodate new housing, employment and town centre uses as part of Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough – Issues & Options document.

1.118 Identifying Potential Locations- 18 Responses were received to this section, the majority of which were an overlap / providing further information regarding sites and locations suggested in previous questions. A site in the Green Belt, at Newstead Sewage Treatment Works, was suggested for development along with other locations at Seighford airfield, Old Road Barlaston, Hixon airfield, north of Stafford, Great Bridgeford, Ranton and Ladford Industrial Estate.

- a. The point of making sure sufficient infrastructure, especially road / highway links and improvements is provided for before any development commences was again made along with comments that each area should be considered on its own merits, taking into consideration biodiversity value and opportunity.

1.119 Council Response- A wide range of individual sites were promoted at the Borough-wide Development Strategy consultation including significant details and supporting evidence. Based on the approach of focusing new development on Stafford, Stone and a number of principal settlements together with information on physical and environmental constraints the Borough Council identified a number of location options to accommodate new housing,

employment and town centre uses as part of Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough – Issues & Options document.

- 1.120 **Map of Stafford Borough and Strategy Options-** 7 responses were received regarding the Borough wide map and the development strategy options map. The majority of which used the maps to highlight the preferred strategy option. There were 3 comments supporting C and 1 supporting A. Other views stated that there needs to be development outside of Stafford and Stone, in order to meet local needs – this may result in the RDB’s being amended. One comment stated that rural development should be focused where there is a reasonable level of services and facilities, such as Tittensor.

APPENDIX 3 – COMMENTS RECEIVED & OFFICER RESPONSES PLAN FOR  
STAFFORD BOROUGH – PRINCIPLES FOR SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT

## Responses to Principles for Settlement Development Consultation

---

General Comments	
<b>The Theatres Trust</b>	<p>Thank you for the email of 20 June from Limehouse and letter from Forward Planning of 19 June consulting The Theatres Trust on the Principles for Settlement Development.</p> <p>The Theatres Trust is The National Advisory Public Body for Theatres. The Town &amp; Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995, Article 10, Para (v) requires the Trust to be consulted on planning applications which include ‘development involving any land on which there is a theatre.’ It was established by The Theatres Trust Act 1976 'to promote the better protection of theatres'. This applies to all theatre buildings, old and new, in current use, in other uses, or disused. It also includes buildings or structures that have been converted to theatre, circus buildings and performing art centres. Our main objective is to safeguard theatre use, or the potential for such use, but we also provide expert advice on design, conservation, property and planning matters to theatre operators, local authorities and official bodies.</p> <p>Due to the specific nature of the Trust’s remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and having perused the pdf document we find this consultation is not directly relevant to the Trust’s work.</p> <p>We therefore have no specific comment to make that may be useful or pertinent but look forward to being consulted on further LDF documents in due course.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> - No change	
<b>Mrs L Bricknell</b>	More provision for community land use (there is no provision for church development in current local plan)



**Officer Response**

Community land provision to be addressed in the Core Strategy.

**Mrs C Hawley on behalf of Chebsey, Weston with Gayton and Swynnerton Parish Councils**

New housing development should be directed away from small villages washed over by the green belt or surrounded by open countryside and without any development boundary.

In particular both national and regional policies emphasise the need for new development to be located within large urban areas using land efficiently and effectively and, where appropriate, using previously developed land.

More specifically PPS 3 states that housing developments should be in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure.

The principle of sustainability should be a key consideration when deciding where to locate housing developments.

National and regional planning policy places great emphasis on the preservation and safeguarding of rural areas. PPS 7 states that local authorities must strictly control new house building (including single dwellings) in the countryside, away from established settlements and that isolated new houses in the countryside will require special justification for planning permission to be granted.

These principles should be reflected in the emerging Core Strategy policies on the location of housing development.

If development in small villages is necessary to meet an identified local need for housing then this should be based upon an up to date housing capacity study carried out by the Council.

If such a study identified a need then regard should first be had to larger settlements in the locality with a development boundary which may have the ability to expand without extending into the open countryside or green belt.

If no alternatives can be found then the housing should be small scale and designed to meet the needs of local people in perpetuity. Such housing would therefore be more appropriately targeted in areas in decline where it is necessary to support villages losing local services. This is the approach laid down by policy CF2 of the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy 'Housing beyond the Major Urban Areas'.

Villages designated as falling within conservation areas require greater protection from inappropriate development. Policies should be more rigorously applied and new housing only permitted in very exceptional circumstances.

	<p>Policies should be included within Stafford Borough Council’s Core Strategy to reflect the provisions of PPS 7, PPS 15 and Policy QE5 of the West Midlands RSS which seek to ensure the protection and conservation of the historic environment.</p> <p>PPS 15 highlights the importance of preserving the historic environment by stating that the protection of the historic environment, whether individual listed buildings or conservation areas, is a key aspect of wider environmental responsibilities, and will need to be fully taken into account in the formulation of authorities planning policies. Policy QE5 of the West Midlands RSS ‘Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment’ states that development plans should identify, protect, conserve and enhance the region’s diverse historic environment and manage change in such a way that respects local character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>Policies should be included within Stafford Borough Council’s Core Strategy that state that if development is to be permitted within a conservation area the planning authority must ensure that it respects and, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  The matters raised, including the principle for the future location of housing development and the approach to development in Conservation Areas are to be addressed in the Core Strategy.</p>	
<p><b>Dr A Andrews on behalf of Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council</b></p>	<p>We are very concerned at the possible inclusion of Great and Little Haywood as potential sites for substantial housing development. The dangerous road from the Haywoods to Stafford through Tixall is already very heavily used by commuters, especially in the morning and evening rush hours. It is the scene of frequent road accidents due to its narrowness, numerous bends, and the volume of traffic using it, often travelling too fast for the prevailing road conditions.</p> <p>It is essential that any further development to the east of Stafford Town is preceded by the building of the Eastern Distributor Road from Beaconside to the Lichfield Road at Baswich. Traffic from the Haywoods and Rugeley could then be encouraged to use this in preference to the Tixall Road.</p>

**Officer Response**

Transport infrastructure will be considered in the Core Strategy. Stafford Borough Council and Staffordshire County Council have commissioned a Stafford Transport Study to evaluate the implications of future development in and around Stafford on the road and public transport system. Recommendations from the Stafford Transport Study will be considered through the Core Strategy process.

**English Heritage**

Thank you for your letter of 19 June and the invitation to comment on the above document.

Our response is primarily directed at Question 1 on the methodology for informing settlement development. In the revised Settlement Assessment of services and facilities, the supporting descriptions for settlements usefully identify key designated sites, such as listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments and other significant buildings and features. Whilst this coverage is welcomed, it remains unclear how these and other environmental considerations have been and will be taken into account in determining the final selection and grouping of settlements.

As highlighted in the introduction to the document 'development should be keeping with the character of the village'. It is further acknowledged that across the Borough area 'there are a range of settlements with locally distinctive characteristics'. In assessing the capacity of settlements to accommodate development environmental considerations, including the sensitivity of their historic environment resource, should hence be taken into account together with socio-economic factors. A full understanding of what contributes to the distinctive character of a place is vital to ensuring that it is sustained through informing appropriate levels of development, its location and design. Characterisation approaches offer a means to establish this. Of the settlement groupings proposed, this would appear to be a priority in the first instance for possible Group 1 settlements which are likely to accommodate significant Greenfield development and new housing allocations. However, depending on the level of significant development for Group 2 settlements a similar approach may also be relevant.

Overall, we recommend that environmental considerations, including potential implications for the historic environment, are explicitly included in the methodology and used to inform the selection of settlements.

Please contact me if you would like to discuss any of our comments in more detail.

**Officer Response**

Accepted that the historic environment needs to be considered in the Core Strategy. Staffordshire County Council have completed specific evidenced base work titled 'Historic Landscape Characterisation Assessment' which evaluates the historic environment around principal settlements in the Borough and highlights areas that may be sensitive to new development in terms of historic landscape character.

**Miss Hughes on behalf of Gnosall Parish Council**

Gnosall Parish Council organised a public open meeting on Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> July 2008 to discuss Stafford Borough Council's Local Development Framework, in relation to the principles of settlement development. Approximately 150 people attended. The report below gives a summary of the main points expressed, set under headings.

**Scoring System** for facilities etc. in settlements: Gnosall came out top of all the "villages" in the rural areas of the Borough, including the town of Eccleshall, according to the scoring system used.

It was agreed that the scoring system was fundamentally wrong for the following reasons:

- Points were given for facilities such as retail provision, leisure facilities, health centre, but these facilities were all given equal weighting, so Gnosall, with no bank or 24 hour cash points, got more points than Eccleshall with two banks and at least two cash points.
- National planning policy documents state that "in the case of housing, only a limited amount of growth should be expected through the expansion of villages, with significant development only being appropriate where: a) it can be shown to be necessary for maintaining local services; b) the houses are required to meet local needs; and c) it will be in keeping with character of the village.
- Facilities in Gnosall are already overstretched, serving the local community and those in the outlying rural areas. There is an A road (A518) but two HGVs cannot pass each other in Gnosall Heath, because the road is so narrow, without going on the pavement.
- Sewers cannot cope with the existing population, let alone more. This argument also applies to other infrastructure in Gnosall.

The system of scoring therefore does not take into account the capacity of existing settlements to absorb further development. Settlements with facilities such as Post Offices under threat should have more points than those with well-used facilities, in order to help keep them viable. These villages would benefit from more inhabitants.

**Greenfield development:** the meeting strongly opposed the possibility of significant greenfield development being allowed, and the residential development boundary moved as regards settlements in Group 1, for the following reasons:

- Gnosall has had major development in the recent past, including the Brookhouse estate built in the 1970s, which led to the village becoming one of the largest in England. Yet the infrastructure promised for the support of that housing never materialised.
- The current proposals for housing in Gnosall could be regarded as “Round Two”, with a repeat of all the arguments used in the 1960s when the Brookhouse estate was proposed – “Why Gnosall? Why so many houses? Where will the people come from? What jobs are there for them locally? What about the infrastructure? Why lose good agricultural land?”

**Towns as centres for development:** Stafford Town has been identified in the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy as a strategic centre and a settlement of significant development, which should be enhanced in order to provide services for local communities, and act as a driver of growth. This is in accordance with national policy guidance which states: “most new development should be directed to existing towns and cities, to help maximise accessibility to employment and services by walking, cycling, and public transport”.

Massive expansion (an increase of approximately 33%) of a village like Gnosall would lead to greater car use and long distance commuting, as jobs are limited in the immediate area. Several residents at the meeting expressed concern at the prospect of Gnosall becoming urbanised through sprawl and excessive development. Many people had moved out of urban areas to be near the country. They want Gnosall to stay as a village, not become a town.

**Conclusion:** Residents urged Gnosall Parish Council and their Borough Councillors to fight the proposals, and argue against the methodology used in “The Plan for Stafford Borough: Principles for Settlement Development”. They in turn were requested to keep in touch with proposals in the Local Development Framework via the website, and respond at every stage.

It was explained that the housing figures had not been finalised by Central Government, and could be increased. There should be plenty of opportunity to argue our case. However, the Chairman of the Parish Council complained that not all can access the information via the Stafford Borough Council website, and consultation papers should be available in paper format also. He said that there was no record whatsoever of the Parish Council receiving notice of this consultation by post, despite what was said in the press, and this had caused considerable difficulty.

	<p>This report has been prepared following the meeting, in order to meet the deadline of 1<sup>st</sup> August. It will be presented to Gnosall Parish Council at its September meeting.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p>	<p>Gnosall is considered a Group 1 settlement. The scale of development to be located at Gnosall has yet to be determined. The source of the 33% growth stated in this response is unknown. The suitability of Gnosall and other settlements for future growth will draw on employment opportunities and environment considerations, not just the scoring approach set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document.</p>
<p><b>Staffordshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the LDF ‘Principles for Settlement Development’. The method of using the level of service provision as a measure for assessing the development potential of different settlements is a reasonable approach to initiate debate on potential locations for accommodating new development.</p> <p>With respect to further refinements of the approach it is suggested that consideration might also be given to how the proximity of higher order services and employment opportunities could influence decisions on settlement development potential. Promoting dormitory settlements where employment and significant service opportunities are located some distance from new residential growth points could prove counter-productive to the aim of promoting sustainable communities.</p> <p>A clearer context with respect to the terms ‘significant’ and ‘less significant’ development as they apply to Group one and Group two settlements would also be welcomed.</p> <p>The Environmental policy unit of the County Council have provided the following comments:</p> <p><b>Archaeology</b></p> <p>The document identifies the presence of Scheduled Ancient Monuments within specific settlements and where works are likely to impact these nationally important Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) may be required. No details are provided for numbers or location of housing within this document and it should be noted that several Scheduled Ancient Monuments are recorded in close proximity to several settlements (ie Alleys Lane moated site (SM No.21527) north of Church Eaton, Hyde Lea moated site and fishpond to the west of Hyde Lea (SM No.21529). Care should be taken when numbers and direction of growth are being considered to ensure that Scheduled Ancient Monuments and their setting are not unduly impacted either</p>

directly or indirectly. English Heritage are able to advise on all aspects of Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Non-scheduled remains (be they nationally important or otherwise) can be adequately considered within the normal planning process.

The West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Policy QE1 B iv) states that within their plans and policies Local Authorities should 'protect and enhance the distinctive character of different parts of the region as recognised by the natural and character areas and associated local landscape character assessments, and through historic landscape characterisation.' This baseline data set is held by Staffordshire County Council and should be used to inform the 'framework for managing the scale of settlement development in different locations'.

With specific reference to settlement descriptions I have the following comments to make:

#### Creswell

The Chapel at Creswell is identified as a Grade 1 listed building. This is incorrect; the chapel is a Grade II listed building but is also designated a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SM No.26).

#### Great Haywood

Immediately to the south and west of Great Haywood lies the Shugborough Estate. This significant landscape feature is part of the Shugborough and Great Haywood Conservation Area (CA No.007) identified within the text. It is also a Grade 1 Registered park on the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. This may involve constraints on development and require appropriate levels of assessment and mitigation to be agreed.

#### Hopton

The text for this settlement makes no reference to the nearby Hopton Heath Civil War battlefield (PRN 00753) which is included on the English Heritage Register of Historic Battlefields. This may involve constraints on development and require appropriate levels of assessment and mitigation to be agreed.

Little Haywood

To the west of Little Haywood lies the Shugborough Estate. This significant landscape feature is part of the Shugborough and Great Haywood Conservation Area (CA No.007). It is also a Grade 1 Registered park on the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. This may involve constraints on development and require appropriate levels of assessment and mitigation to be agreed.

Trentham/Dairyfields

To the north lies the Trentham Estate. This significant landscape feature is part of the Trentham Park Conservation Area (CA No.136). It is also a Grade II\* Registered park on the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. This may involve constraints on development and require appropriate levels of assessment and mitigation to be agreed.

**Ecology**

Brocton

The location of the settlement on the edge of Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation is not noted. This may involve constraints on development and Appropriate Assessment requirements.

Milford

The location of the settlement on the edge of Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation is not noted. This may involve constraints on development and Appropriate Assessment requirements.

Section V Sport and Recreation omits reference to informal recreational facilities such as Cannock Chase Country Park (Brocton & Milford) and Barlaston Common Local Nature Reserve. The Borough Council's Biodiversity Officer Bill Waller should be consulted to add these recreational assets to the database and consulted on settlement constraints in terms of protected nature conservation sites.



### **Historic Built Environment**

With particular reference to Section 2, page 4: 'The Settlement Assessment will be used to inform decision-making in terms of managing future development to different locations within Stafford Borough...'. Future development within Stafford Borough should also be shaped by the following policies within the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy:

#### **Policy QE5: 'Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment'**

'A) Development plans and other strategies should identify, protect, conserve and enhance the Region's diverse historic environment and manage change in such a way that respects local character and distinctiveness.

B) Of particular historic significance to the West Midlands are:

- i. the historic rural landscapes and their settlement patterns;...
- iii conservation areas...

C) Development plans and other strategies should recognise the value of conservation led regeneration in contributing to the social and economic vitality of communities and the positive role that buildings of historic and architectural value can play as a focus on an area's regeneration...'

There are 10 Conservation Areas mentioned in the assessment. Conservation Areas are designated due to their historic character and appearance, and development should not adversely affect this. They can help identify 'local distinctiveness', which should help to guide future development.

Developments should also be shaped by the policies NC18 (Listed Buildings) and NC19 (Conservation Areas) of the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan:

**NC19** - Areas of architectural or historic interest will be designated as Conservation Areas. There will be a presumption in favour of retaining and enhancing buildings, groups of buildings, or other features, including open spaces and views through, into or out of the areas which contribute to their special character, appearance or interest. New development within or adjacent to Conservation Areas should respect, protect and enhance their character and appearance with respect to its height,

scale, intensity and materials, and only generate levels of activity which will support their preservation and economic viability. Proposals which would result in over-development, undue disturbance and traffic movement detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area will not be permitted.

There are a number of Listed Buildings within the Conservation Areas, as well as within some of the older historic settlements. These should be protected through their designation, and also by the following policy within the Structure Plan:

**NC18** - There will be a presumption in favour of preserving Listed Buildings and protecting their settings and historic context. In exceptional circumstances, other planning policies may be relaxed to enable the retention or sympathetic reuse of Listed Buildings, or to maintain the integrity of their settings. An historical and architectural evaluation of Listed Buildings may be required as part of the planning process to ensure decision-making is based on a proper understanding of their fabric and structure.

The formulation of 'Local Lists', detailing local buildings of historic or aesthetic interest, (coupled with the addition of relevant policies to the LDF), can also help provide some protection for structures that are important locally. This will aid the planning process.

### **Landscape**

It is interesting to note that Special Landscape Area designation has been used in the descriptions for a number of settlements. Whilst it is recognised that in this instance, the descriptions are reflecting existing policies, PPS 7, Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, indicates little support by Government for local designations and that they should only be maintained where criteria based planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection. Following recent joint working between the District and County on landscape issues, it would have been expected that Landscape Character Type/quality information from the County-wide landscape assessment would have provided more relevant and up to date information. The reference to "draft SLA" in the Hilderstone settlement description raises the question of whether this designation is to be retained in some form.

	<p><b>Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows</b></p> <p>There are no Forestry related issues that need to be raised in this LDF. However, it should be stressed that this does not mean that each development location is not affected by constraints. There are a number of Woodlands recorded as Ancient semi natural woodland and a number of significant trees which are protected through Conservation Areas and Tree Preservation Orders. As well as other veteran trees and species rich hedgerows that may be present.</p> <p><b>Rights of Way</b></p> <p>Rights of Way response unavailable at this time and will follow shortly</p> <p>Passenger transport have made a number of comments with respect to local bus service information which I have forwarded by post.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>To reflect the points set out above a number of amendments have been made to the Settlement Assessment of Services and Facilities. Staffordshire County Council have completed specific evidenced base work titled 'Historic Landscape Characterisation Assessment' which evaluates the historic environment around principal settlements in the Borough and highlights areas that may be sensitive to new development in terms of historic landscape character. All available evidence will be considered when preparing the strategic approach in the Core Strategy document.</p>	
<p><b>Centro</b></p>	<p>Thank you for consulting Centro on the Stafford Borough – Principles for Settlement Development, which we received on 20th June 2008.</p> <p>Centro welcomes and supports the overall vision and objectives of this document and would like to emphasise that it is important that there is strong correlation between this document and the principles set out in the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (WMRSS) as outlined through Policies T1-T12, the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) and the West Midlands Local Transport Plan. This is especially important in relation to land use planning and reducing the need to travel, with emphasis on regenerating the area and locating intense development in places that are well served by public transport.</p> <p>Although this plan covers an area outside of the Centro area, cross boundary issues should be given further consideration, for example the rail links to Birmingham and the Black Country. The area of the plan falls within the West Midlands 'journey to work' area and it is</p>

	<p>important that residents of any new development have sustainable access to key region services and wider employment and education opportunities. A high quality public transport network can also assist in sustainable economic growth and regeneration, whilst also ensuring that the West Midlands transport sector contributes to the wider challenges including reducing climate-changing emissions. Transport and in particular public transport should therefore be a key theme throughout this document in order to promote accessible developments and sustainable regeneration. Key questions for consideration should therefore be whether there is capacity on the current public transport network and if not, what measures are in place to provide for any increase in patronage or new infrastructure needed. Centro are happy to assist and provide further information if required.</p> <p>I would appreciate you keeping me informed on the progress of this development plan and if you have any further queries, would like any further information or would like to set up a meeting, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  The capacity of the public transport network for Stafford town is currently being assessed through a Stafford Transport Study, commissioned by Stafford Borough Council and Staffordshire County Council. Transport and public transport will be important element of the Core Strategy, which will be closely linked to the Local Transport Plan.</p>	
<p><b>Government Office for the West Midlands</b></p>	<p>Thank you for you letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> June 2008 and the enclosed documents. I am pleased to have had the opportunity to look at the documents and to see that you have sort views to guide preparation on the new plan for Stafford.</p> <p>I have discussed the document with colleagues in the Government Office and have considered the content of the document. However at this stage as the AAP is looking at the principle and methodology for identifying future development we do not have any specific comments to make. I look forward to seeing the detailed development strategy for the Borough later in the year.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  Comments noted.</p>	
<p><b>Vivienne Harrison on behalf of Colwich Parish Council</b></p>	<p>My Council at its Special Meeting of the 24<sup>th</sup> July 2008 discussed the above document and I detail its stance:</p> <p><b>'Council is unanimous in its view that the village, due to lack of infrastructure could not sustain further development. Of particular concern to the Council is the long-standing flooding and sewage problems experienced, which have never been resolved.</b></p>

Council feels that any housing development in Colwich would not enhance its economy. New residents would undoubtedly work outside the village and as such would obviously use shops and schools outside the village. Notwithstanding the lack of infrastructure any housing development would not benefit the village and create further traffic congestion. This goes against the 'sustainability' principles of the Borough.

Within the locality there are areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, sites of Biological/Geographic interests and Protected Open Spaces Areas. These along with Floodplains are reason enough for no further development within the village.'

The Chairman of the Council guided members through the SBC Documents / Questionnaire:

#### **SBC LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

##### **a) Principles for Settlement Development**

It was noted by members that the 'Assessment of Services and Facilities' criteria was based on those already in existence and did not take into account any future village changes.

**Question 1** Do you agree with the methodology being based on a scoring system of services and facilities?

**Answer:** No

**Question 2** Do you agree with the three broad groups of settlements?

**Answer:** No

**Question 3** Are there any settlements which you consider should/should not be included in any of the 3 groups?  
If so state the settlement and give reasons

**Answer:** Yes

Great Haywood and Little Haywood should not be grouped together as the services listed are not spread evenly between the two villages.

**Question 4** Do you agree that settlements located within or adjacent to the Green Belt should not be considered for peripheral expansion?

**Answer:** Yes

**Question 5** Do you agree that the settlements are identified in the appropriate group? If not please identify the settlement and give reasons:

**Answer:** See Question 3

**b) Revised Settlement Assessment of Services & Facilities**

**Great Haywood**

Initial perusal of the Services and Facilities listed for the community appeared to show numerous inaccuracies

Under this heading the main items brought up for discussion, were as follows:

**Environment Agency:** "It had no objections, in principle, to development proposed in the Gt. Haywood settlement provided that Severn Trent Water Ltd was satisfied that sufficient capacity was available within the system. The agency was aware that the area suffered from surface water drainage problems but was unable to specify exact locations. Check with Severn Trent Water whether any of these problems had been solved."

**Severn Trent Water:** "It states that there is a flooding problem in the settlement."

**Cannock Chase Area of Natural Beauty:** This lies to the south west immediately adjacent to the settlement and the floodplains of the Rivers Sow and Trent to the west.

Members were mindful that evidence was already recorded of the problems the community suffers through flooding and that Severn Trent Water had not sorted out the problems from the last two developments in the village.

	<p><b>Little Haywood and Colwich</b></p> <p>Inaccuracies were again identified in the Services and Facilities listed.</p> <p>The main items of interest for discussion were the following:</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> ‘It has no objections in principle to development proposed in this settlement provided that Severn Trent Water is satisfied that sufficient capacity is available within the system.’</p> <p><b>Severn Trent Water:</b> ‘It has stated that Colwich is an area of possible concern for water supply and that there is a flooding problem in the settlement.</p> <p>It has also indicated that there is a sewage scheme in the Capital Works Programme.’</p> <p>Members agreed that the severe flooding and sewage problems required heavy financial investment to correct the problems. STW had not, however, informed the Parish Council that such a scheme had been identified in its Capital Works Programme.</p> <p><b>The Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty:</b> This lies at the south of the settlement. There is also Biological/Geological Interests within the locality. The village also contains Protected Open Space areas.</p> <p>Members were unanimous that these areas required protection from the encroachment of any further development.</p> <p>Members of my Council request that they are furnished with a detailed programme/timescale of all the stages of this Consultation.</p>
	<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Environmental constraints in relation to particular settlements will be considered when preparing the Core Strategy. The Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water will establish further information regarding water resources and water infrastructure. It is considered that Great Haywood and Little Haywood with Colwich have sufficient services and facilities to warrant their current grouping.</p>
<p><b>Mrs A Evans on behalf of Norbury Parish Council</b></p>	<p>We considered the 5 questions at our monthly meeting on Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> July.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We do agree that that there has to be a methodology and therefore the scoring system works well enough.</li> <li>2. We agree with the three broad groups of settlements (with reservations)</li> </ol>

	<p>3. No, there are no settlements which we consider should be elsewhere, although Sutton, High Offley and Forton are not mentioned because they do not have a residential development boundary which perhaps should be considered.</p> <p>4. As there is no green belt near to Norbury we did not consider this question.</p> <p>5. Although the settlements are in the appropriate groups based on a scoring system as Norbury is in Group 3 we have some points to make – “no development other than for Rural Exception Sites to deliver affordable housing” – this, we feel, is too tight a ruling and within our Parish Council we feel we would like the wording in Group 2 where boundaries may be adjusted to accommodate a small amount of housing. Otherwise our village will not grow and we do not feel that the rural exception sites actually deliver for Norbury.</p> <p>Having consulted farmers locally the view is that they will offer land for sale but not at considerably reduced prices therefore it would be necessary for developers to purchase land at market price. The only way we would then be able to have affordable housing in Norbury would be to have a mix of housing, say from 2 bedroom upto 5 bedroom, for example 16 to the acre (semi detached and affordable, say part rent part owned) and two or three to the acre (detached and wholly owned) to allow the developer to fund the affordable housing.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our views.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  Norbury is classified as a Group 3 settlement, where boundaries will be retained to provide for development in the future but it is not envisaged that expansion would be appropriate other than for Rural Exception Sites to deliver affordable housing. Issues concerning the scale and location of affordable and market housing will be addressed through the Core Strategy.</p>	
<p><b>Berrys Property and Business on behalf of Mr G Tavernor</b></p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of my client Mr G Tavernor to make representations for the recently published Principles of Settlement Development document.</p> <p>I have looked through the Limehouse document which asks for comments and have the following comments to make:</p> <p><b>Paragraph 1.2</b> : The principle of having settlement development boundaries is accepted however there are a number of settlements where boundaries need to be extended to allow for new development.</p>



**Paragraph 2.1** : The principle of sustainable development is being led by national planning policy but care must be taken not allow some of the small to medium rural communities to suffer through lack of new housing and infrastructure.

**Paragraph 2.3** : Weston is a rural village but with excellent road communication links. The village is a key service centre for a wider hinterland. The addition of further housing will help to maintain local services, meet local needs and provide new housing in an accessible location.

**Paragraph 2.4** : Weston is not in the Green Belt and therefore could accommodate additional edge of village development.

**Paragraph 2.8** : It is agreed that priority should be given to those villages with some services. However villages such as Weston which have excellent access links to the wider road network should also be a focus for development. Paragraph 36 of PPS3 states that “the Government’s policy is to ensure that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure”.

**Paragraph 2.9** : Mentions the Rural Renaissance section of the Regional Spatial Strategy. It is agreed that access to services is one of the most important determinants of quality of life in rural areas, however, simply ruling out whole categories of settlements as unsustainable, as many planning authorities appear to be doing, ignores the potential for enhancing the sustainability of many smaller rural communities, and the real needs of those who live and work there. A mix of open market and affordable housing sites should be considered.

The village of Weston has a good range of facilities (see below) and these should be built upon to provide additional services and mixed-use development. For example, there is land to the north of the village that could be used for employment land and there is land to the south-east of the village that is ideal for new housing land.

**Paragraph 3.4** : It is agreed that a methodology needs to be formulated to assess how and where development is allocated. It is recognised that smaller rural communities face housing pressure, but historically delivery has been low and there is now a need for new boundary adjustments to accommodate some Greenfield development to help meet demand for new housing.

**Question 1** – we agree that the methodology for assessing settlements should be based upon a scoring system. Services and facilities is a useful way of scoring settlements, although the location of settlements and their accessibility is also important.

**Paragraph 3.5** : explains that there are a number of settlements where boundaries may be adjusted to accommodate significant Greenfield development, although many of these are in the Greenbelt. This group of settlements numbers six and the scoring levels range from 21 – 33 points.

**Question 2** – we agree with the broad grouping of settlements – as long as the scoring is accurate.

**Question 4** – settlements located within or adjacent to the Greenbelt should only be considered for peripheral expansion where it is essential and where the impact on the Green Belt can be mitigated.

**Questions 3 and 5 : *The case for Weston***

Weston is number seven in the hierarchy and has, according to the assessment, scored 20 points. However, we challenge this score and suggest that it should be increased, thus placing it in the list of Group 1 settlements.

A number of services and facilities for Weston have not been taken into account by the scoring process. This includes the following :

- The village has more than 1 community hall – there is the main village hall off Green Road but also the Chapel Hall off the A51 which is used by groups such as the W.I.
- There is a vets surgery : John Broberg at The Croft, Weston, Stafford, ST18 0HR
- There is a restaurant at Weston Hall, which also caters for weddings and functions.

The two other issues to consider are the population of the village which is detailed in the revised settlement assessment of services and facilities and the village recreation areas.

The report gives a population of 849. This however is a historic figure going back to the 2001 census. Since 2001 there have been a number of new developments, not least the most recent planning permission for the redevelopment of the old Salt Works lane site for another 90 dwellings. Assuming an average of say 3 people in each of these new properties, this will mean the population will be over 1000 people, which give the village a higher scoring rating.

As regards the recreation facilities the revised settlement assessment of services and facilities indicates that the village only has one informal recreation area. In fact, there is the village green, a children's play area and a football pitch which equals 3 sport and recreation resources.

I have therefore recalculated the score for Weston based upon the additional information above and detailed below:

Primary School - 3 points

Medical Facility (weekly visits) - 1 point

Retail provision (general convenience store and post office) plus cash point - 1 point

Community facilities (2 village halls) - 2 points

Church and Chapel - 2 points

Pubs x 2 - 2 points

Library (mobile)- 1 point

Public transport (hourly bus service) - 3 points

Other facilities (vet, restaurant) - 2 points

Population (1000+ people) - 3 points

Access to A roads (A518 and A51) - 2 points

Open space, Sport and Recreation (3 resources) - 2 points

	<p>The total score for the village of Weston is therefore 24 points which would put Weston fourth in the scoring list set out in Appendix 2 of the consultation document.</p> <p>Clearly there is a very good case to suggest that Weston should be a Tier 1 settlement based on the variety of services, the location and the good public transport provision. Please take into account this representation as part of the overall LDF review.</p> <p>If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  The scoring for Weston has been amended and the settlement has moved into Group 1. The population for each settlement was established from the 2001 Census and the scoring does not take into account any development that has occurred since that date.</p>	
<p><b>Mrs C Hawley on behalf of Chebsey, Weston with Gayton and Swynnerton Parish Councils</b></p>	<p><b>SWYNNERTON PARISH COUNCIL</b></p> <p><b>Stafford Borough Local Development Framework</b></p> <p><b>Principles for Settlement Development</b></p> <p>The following are the comments from the Swynnerton Parish Councillors as Ward members, in relation to the above mentioned document:</p> <p><b>Swynnerton Ward</b></p> <p><b>Tittensor Ward</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Miss Fieldhouse:</b></p> <p>Agreed on Group 1, but do not agree where the land is Green Belt – in these areas Doctors, Chemists and more amenities</p> <p>Most of Group 2 and 3 do not have these amenities and as the ageing population is growing, residents do not always drive and find it difficult to use public transport.</p> <p>I feel that Green Belt is vital in these days of high pollution.</p>

Housing is needed but what is affordable in today's climate.

**Councillor S. Riddle:**

Not a good idea for houses as there is no place for children to play from the ages of 4 – 16 years old.

If houses were to be built where would the children play?

I feel at present there is no room for any more houses in Tittensor.

Question 1 – No, I do not agree.

Question 2 – OK, I think.

Question 3 – Tittensor, for the reasons I have given above.

Question 4 – Yes.

Question 5 - Yes.

**Trentham Ward**

**Councillor B. Eyre:**

Agree in principle with Development Framework methodology but capacity, opportunity to develop and expand the existing services and facilities should be a major consideration as well as the future of local post offices and stores.

There appears to be no consideration for the effect an increase in population will have on issues of policing, road use (especially on one main exit/entry road Village), and the potential flooding and sewerage problems.

The question should be asked why take agricultural and Green Belt land with its effect on the environment and wildlife, and use more efficiently existing derelict sites.

Who determines 'affordable properties' especially in light of the present financial situation?

**Councillor M. Beardmore:**

Question1 –

1. No account is taken of other areas of concern i.e. air pollution – particularly settlements in close proximity to the east side of the M6. One settlement of particular concern Tittensor where there has been and still is a very high incidence of cancer amongst its residents, some of whom have sadly passed away. It is about time some research is undertaken to determine if this severe problem is linked to pollution from the M6 motorway.
2. No account is taken of potential flooding and inadequate sewerage capacity i.e. no points deducted.
3. We should think very carefully about developing on agricultural and Green belt land, particularly considering world food shortages – it would be very foolish to rely on imported food to feed the nation. Cover the country in concrete, then what?

Questions 2, 3, 4 and 5 –

In light of the above comments they all need reassessing.

What is the price of an 'affordable home'? and in the advent of the 'credit crunch' who is going to lend the money to prospective buyers?, also who is going to build the houses that very few people can afford? Even as I write this, major builders are in great difficulty and laying off construction workers.

Even before the 'credit crunch' 88 – 95% of the employed residents in the Borough were unable to get on the housing ladder as first time buyers. What is that figure now?

**Yarnfield Ward**

**Councillor F. Cromey:**

**4. Assessment of Services and Facilities**

**Yarnfield Services and Facilities**

	<p>2 football pitches are private.</p> <p>Yarnfield does not have sufficient infrastructure to absorb any further development. (The ASBO problem will reoccur). Although the Environmental Agency flood prevention scheme is finished and will protect existing development, any further development will be prone to flooding due to the high water table. The road infrastructure in and out of the Village is insignificant to cope with any further development.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  The Settlement Assessment of Services and Facilities has been amended in light of matters raised above. Environmental constraints and the implications for the scale of development to particular settlements will be considered in preparing the Core Strategy, along with other matters. The Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water will establish further information regarding water resources and water infrastructure.</p>	
<p><b>Mrs A Gould on behalf of Hixon Parish Council</b></p>	<p>In response to the local services information regarding the local development framework strategy Hixon Parish Council would like to make the following comments.</p> <p>1 of the educational establishments listed (Little Apple nursery) is about to close down giving a total number of facilities 2 rather than 3</p> <p>The playing field is listed as belonging to Stafford Borough Council when in fact it belongs to Hixon Parish Council</p> <p>The bus service in Hixon is not hourly during the evenings</p> <p>Finally the council feel that the timing of this response deadline being in the summer when many parish councils do not meet and councillors take annual holidays is questionable.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The Settlement Assessment of Services and Facilities has been amended in light of matters raised above. The score for Hixon has been amended and the settlement is now included in Group 1.	
<b>Mr P Cope</b>	We agree with the comments made in CS86 (comment made by Mr R J Simcock) with regard to future development of Yarnfield.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The scale and location of development will be considered alongside Green Belt issues in the subsequent Core Strategy document in Spring 2009. Amendments to the Green belt will be considered in the context of national and regional policy. The document has been amended to give greater clarification on those settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Mr Ken Williamson</b>	<p>I believe this methodology is fundamentally flawed for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It results in the larger villages getting significant new housing allocations, which is in direct contravention of National Policy Statements and Guidance, which state that in the case of housing, only a limited amount of growth should be expected through the expansion of villages, with significant development, only being appropriate where: (a) it can be shown to be necessary for maintaining local services; (b) the houses are required to meet local needs; and (c) it will be in keeping with the character of the village.</li> <li>• It is clear that any significant development would destroy the existing character of any village. In Gnosall's case there is no need for extra housing to support local services and there is no proven requirement of houses to meet local needs.</li> <li>• There is an argument that some smaller settlements would benefit from extra housing, in that there would be benefit in terms of maintaining or creating local services, or that houses are required to meet local need. The methodology cannot and does not take account of this.</li> <li>• The consultation document states that villages perform an essential role in maintaining and enhancing the rural way of life. The methodology if adopted will result in destroying the larger villages by creating towns, in all but name, out of what are attractive villages, bringing all the associated problems of our current towns.</li> </ul>



	<p>It seems to me that the consultation document is designed to avoid asking the obvious question, and that is, do you want significant development to take place in and around your village. The answer to this, if asked, would be no in most cases.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The scale and location of development, including local need housing, will be considered through the Core Strategy consultation process, scheduled for Spring 2009. The suitability of settlements for future growth will draw on employment opportunities, infrastructure requirements and environment considerations, not just the scoring approach set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document.</p>	
<p><b>Mr A Barnes on behalf of Stone Rural Parish Council</b></p>	<p>In the document entitled 'Revised Settlement Assessment of Services and Facilities', Aston By Stone is shown as having one Public House. This actually closed some 12 months ago and is now on the market.</p> <p>There is no BP garage on the A34. The Bakerbus XI service travels from Stone to Stafford along A51 so is not relevant to the settlement of Aston By Stone. First 101 service travels on A34 between Stone and Stafford. The A34 is remoted from the main settlement with some residences 500m away from the A34. How far away do houses have to be from the bus service to make it irrelevant as a service?</p> <p>Councillors from Oulton were concerned that the analysis showed there being 1 Informal Play area in the village. They were not aware of this facility's existence.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Amendments will be made to the Settlement Assessment of Services and Facilities document.</p>	
<p><b>Mr D Jones on behalf of Seighford Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Your letter of 19<sup>th</sup> June was considered at our last parish council meeting.</p> <p>The councillors have no problems on the methodology for selecting the settlements for development, but reserve their comments for the document that will be published next; Delivering the Development Strategy.</p> <p>However they would like the changes that have occurred recently in the parish to be noted and the points scored amended accordingly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Great Bridgeford; Post office and shop to close shortly.</li> <li>2. Seighford, Public House has closed</li> </ol>

	3. Derrington; Post office and shop have closed. Post office to be relocated in Village hall subject to permission from Charity Commissioners.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> Amendments have been made to the Settlement Assessment of Services and Facilities document and the scoring for these settlements have been changed to reflect this response.	
<b>Mr D Jones on behalf of Hyde Lea Parish Council</b>	<p>Your letter of 19<sup>th</sup> June was considered at our last parish council meeting.</p> <p>The councillors have no problems on the methodology for selecting the settlements for development, Section 3.</p> <p>However they would like the changes that have occurred recently in the parish to be noted and the assessment of service and facilities amended accordingly.</p> <p>Public House has now closed. This also means the general store within the pub has also gone.</p> <p>Daily bus service has ceased. Serve 483 is not a public services it is for schools only and needs deleting.</p> <p>The education facility if a private school (Stafford Grammar) and not available for the general public.</p> <p>The Environmental agency has commented that foul drainage should discharge into the public sewerage system. Those properties that do not do so at present, will they have to be changed at some time in the future?</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> Amendments have been made to the Settlement Assessment of Services and Facilities document and the scoring for this settlement has been changed to reflect this response.	
<b>Advantage West Midlands</b>	<p>Thank you for consulting Advantage West Midlands (the Agency) on the principle and methodology for identifying future development potential at settlements in Stafford Borough.</p> <p>The Agency's role involves commenting on both major planning applications and acting as a consultee on the regional and local planning process. It takes as its reasoned basis, and main justification for comment, the aims and objectives of the West Midlands Economic Strategy (WMES).</p>

	<p>The WMES focuses on three main components: business, place and people. One of the strategic objectives of the Place theme is 'Sustainable Communities' which seeks to provide 'a network of high-quality, sustainable urban and rural communities which attract and retain a diverse and thriving workforce, encourage enterprise, provide access to services and are designed to the highest quality'. The assessment of settlements within Stafford Borough will enable a hierarchy of settlements to be established and will inform the scale of development that each could sustain. This approach is generally supportive of the objective of maintaining and creating sustainable communities, it does however need to be mindful of the fact that some of the smaller settlements may need some expansion in order to retain services and deliver an appropriate level of affordable housing. Any settlement expansion will require an appropriate increase in service provision in order to maintain the sustainability of the settlement. Objective 2.5 of the WMES is concerned with developing sustainable communities and highlights the need for a balanced and co-ordinated approach to housing and employment land development. Any new development in Stafford Borough needs to take account of this approach and ensure that this balance is created, providing communities and needs to be achieved in a way that reduced transport demands and energy use.</p> <p>Thank you again for consulting the Agency and we look forward to commenting on any future consultations you bring forward in support of your Local Development Framework and associated documents.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  The balance of housing, employment and the sustainability of settlements will be addressed in the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Mr Gordon Scott  on behalf of  Staffordshire  Police</b></p>	<p>In response to the Stafford Borough Development Framework Principles for Settlement Development I wish the following to be taken into account when deciding on planning applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the Secured-by Design, and Crime Prevention through Environmental Design principles are adopted to create a safer environment for both residents and visitors. Both measures have been proven to reduce crime and the fear of crime.</li> <li>• That the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 is consulted prior to any town centre re-development, or crowded place development.</li> <li>• CCTV with ANPR facility is developed around the town centre link roads to provide a "ring of steel".</li> <li>• That the Staffordshire Police Authority Supplementary Planning Document pertaining to Section 106 (S106) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, be adopted when large developments or re-developments are considered.</li> </ul>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Issues of development and building design will be considered through the Core Strategy.	
<b>Mr J Eld</b>	<p>The principle of expanding where services exist seems back to front to me, especially at a time when public houses and post offices are closing.</p> <p>It must be recognised that where post offices close then basic banking facilities are lost and there is a consequent increase in travel requirements.</p> <p>Development of businesses and employment opportunities in and around villages would reduce the need for daily transport to the Stafford, Stone and other work places.</p> <p>If villages are allowed to expand in a manner that takes in the character of the village in question, then the existing services and facilities would be better supported and the expansion of facilities would be encouraged.</p> <p>I believe that expansion on the basis of the facilities available is not the best way forward.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Consideration about the appropriate scale and location of development in particular settlements across the Stafford Borough area will be assessed through the Core Strategy process, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Councillor P E Jones, Stafford Borough Council</b>	<p>Thank you for your letter of the 19<sup>th</sup> June. I have two observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In Appendix 1 (principles for scoring) you include a dentist's surgery and a doctor's surgery whereas in the Borough Local Plan page 6 para 3.3 reference is also made to a chemist</li> <li>2. You score a density slightly less than a doctor and, as above, no score is given to a pharmacist. In my opinion a pharmacy will provide a much wider spectrum of medical advice than a dentist's surgery. The Government is encouraging more use to be made of the expertise and training of pharmacists by, for example, removing drugs from prescription only to dispensing by a pharmacist and by advising the public to see their pharmacist in cases of minor ailments.</li> </ol>

	<p>As you know the establishment and location of both doctor's surgeries and pharmacists remains controlled by the PCT (Primary Care Trust) whereas dentists may go where the market dictates. It is the duty of the PCT to provide, or rather seek to provide, in every neighbourhood, general pharmaceutical services but this is in the first instance a market-led decision by a pharmacist to make application.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Pharmacists are commonly associated with local medical facilities and therefore no change to the scoring methodology is proposed. Information from the Primary Care Trust is being sought to provide information on current and future health provision, which will be considered through preparation of the Core Strategy.</p>	
<p><b>Mrs B Metcalf</b></p>	<p>This is a much better and more location sensitive approach than before and the issues are set out in a reasonably succinct and entirely comprehensible form. It doesn't seem to be here but isn't there a set of options to focus on Stafford, or on Stafford and Stone or distributed? That seems an entirely reasonable analysis but a difficult question to answer. Although the major development will have to be in towns, we probably need some distributed development if our communities are to grow organically which is the best for sustainability since jobs and homes would come in tandem. This includes all three tiers of villages but with the smallest settlements only accommodating natural local growth.</p> <p>It seems to me that any new settlements need to be grafted on to old ones as the new towns did, rather than being isolated in the countryside where car travel is essential to daily life. This would need considerable local consultation way beyond this document.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Detailed options on the scale and location of development will be considered in the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. In January and February 2008 the 'Borough-wide Development Strategy' set out six broad options for the future development strategy of Stafford Borough.</p>	
<p><b>Mr J Perks</b></p>	<p>I write to you because of my views on residential development in general and because of my views in development of village and small settlements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In general I am strongly against the idea of concentrating more and more development into small areas of land in existing townships. Cramming people into ever smaller space lead to a poorer quality of life and intolerance to one another. This policy</li> </ol>

	<p>is often defended in the name of “protecting the countryside” and “affordable housing”. A proportional expansion in all areas is justified if we are to recognise increase in population and the increase in desire to own ones home.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Meretown, where I have lived for 42 years is a typical example of rural development restriction. The village is in the Domesday book and in 1975 there were more houses than there are today. The last house to be built in Meretown was 1839 (mine). The only development since in 169 years has been the conversion of farm buildings.</li> <li>3. I believe proportional development (subject to being reasonably in keeping with what existing) for both town and rural areas to be correct.</li> <li>4. We could learn a lot from Switzerland. They have their urban areas, but small villages and rural properties are spaced over the entire landscape without spoiling the countryside. Employment exists in most villages so that people in general do not travel long distances to and from work. They tend to live and work in the same area – thereby creating less traffic and pollution. These villages have grown with the population and form recognisable communities.</li> </ol> <p>My view – spread development do not concentrate it completely into existing townships.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  Consideration about the appropriate scale and location of development in particular settlements across the Stafford Borough area will be assessed through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Messrs P and D Ricketts</b></p>	<p>Brocton (Tar Hill) should be considered in the LDF. It is not in the flood plain. It is ideally situated on the main A34, very close to Stafford Town Centre, only 5 miles from Cannock. Emergency services, fire, ambulance, police would be quickly in attendance unlike isolated settlements 6 miles apart. The bus service is every 1/2 hour all day, Arriva would quickly upgrade this to 15mins if necessity arose. It is very convenient for people of Brocton to choose which hospital to use either Cannock or Stafford. All the infrastructures are in place, electric sub station, gas, water, sewerage ie Severn Trent's Lower Drayton sewerage works are close as well as Brancote and sympathetic comments from Environment Agency and utility services have been received. It would create extra business for all; post office, public house, MoT and petrol station and industrial estate. Village hall could be extended to primary school, doctors surgery. Bridle way could be converted to cycle way so people could cycle to Stafford without using main road. Brocton has a unique quality and opportunity for all to prosper sociably and financially.</p>

**Officer Response**

Brocton is listed within the Principles for Settlement Development document. Consideration about the appropriate scale and location of development in particular settlements across the Stafford Borough area will be assessed through the Core Strategy process, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.

**Commission For  
Architecture &  
The Built  
Environment**

Thank you for consulting the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE).

Unfortunately, due to limited resources, we are unable to comment on this document. However we would like to make some general comments which you should consider.

1. Design is now well established in planning policy at national and regional levels, and LDFs offer an opportunity to secure high-quality development, of the right type, in the right place, at the right time.
2. Robust design policies should be included within all LDF document and the Community Strategy, embedding design as a priority from strategic frameworks to site-specific scales.
3. To take aspiration to implementation, local planning authorities' officers and members should champion good design.
4. treat design as a cross-cutting issue – consider how other policy areas relate to urban design, social infrastructure and the public realm.
5. Design should reflect understanding of local context, character and aspirations.
6. You should include adequate wording or 'hook' within your policies that enable you to develop and use other design tools and mechanisms, such as design guides, site briefs, and design codes.

You might also find the following CABE Guidance helpful.

- *"making design policy work: How to deliver good design through your local development framework"*
- *"Protecting Design Quality in Planning"*
- *Design at a glance: A quick reference wall chart guide to national design policy"*

These, and other publications, are available from our website [www.cabe.org.uk](http://www.cabe.org.uk)

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> Issues of development and building design to be addressed in the Core Strategy.	
<b>South Staffordshire Primary Care Trust</b>	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> June 2008, giving the PCT an opportunity to comment on Stafford Borough Council's Local Development Framework. I have asked the PCT's Locality Director Geraint Griffiths to reply formally should he feel that a response would add value to your plans.</p> <p>The expansion of housing numbers throughout Staffordshire and in particular Stafford Borough will require consequential expansion of the health service infrastructure. The PCT currently is working through its estates strategy and I have asked that the planned increase in housing and its consequential population be taken into account.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> The Council have been working with the South Staffordshire Primary Care Trust on future healthcare provision in Stafford Borough's area which will be taken into account when preparing the Core Strategy.	
<b>Mr S Hodson</b>	See attached document
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> The scale and location of development, along with housing and Green Belt issues, will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>NJL Consulting Ltd</b>	See attached document



<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The scale and location of development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Core Strategy use evidence and information regarding the deliverability of housing land from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.	
<b>Phillips Planning Services Ltd on behalf of Mr T Talbot</b>	See attached letter
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Consideration about the appropriate scale and location of development in particular settlements across the Stafford Borough area will be assessed through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Phillips Planning Services Ltd on behalf of Mr C Sandy and Mrs P Sandy</b>	See attached letter
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
In July 2008 Stafford was announced as a 'New Growth Point'. Consideration about the scale and location of development in and around Stafford and the rest of the Borough will be assessed through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Hallam Land Management Ltd</b>	See attached document

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Accepted. Further consideration on the suitability of settlements and locations for development based on criteria including employment, the Green Belt, infrastructure, physical and environment constraints will be assessed through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Hulme Upright Manning on behalf of H&amp;H Holman Properties</b>	See attached document
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
In February 2008 a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment was completed for the Stafford Borough area. This information and other evidence will be used to assess the scale and location of new development in Stafford Borough through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Hulme Upright Manning on behalf of Staffordshire University</b>	See attached document
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
No change	
<b>Walton Homes, JVH Planning</b>	See attached document

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
In February 2008 a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment was completed for the Stafford Borough area. This information and other evidence will be used to assess the scale and location of new development in Stafford Borough through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. It is accepted that other factors will affect the suitability of a settlement or location for development beyond services and facilities.	
<b>Mr R J Simcock</b>	See attached document
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues, including Major Development Sites in the Green Belt will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Paragraph 1.1</b>	
<b>Mrs S Starr</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 1.1?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>The Parish Councillors are concerned about the adequate infrastructure needed to deal with 'new build'. Sprawling warehousing will intrude into the countryside.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
New infrastructure to meet future development requirements is currently being considered. Further information and assessment will take place through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 1.1?</b></p> <p>No. The use of the phrase “unprecedented change” over-dramatises the situation. The current need to accommodate change is not materially different to that required of the planning system, including successive local plans, over the last 60 years. The use of more temperate phraseology is advocated.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The word 'unprecedented' to be replaced with the word 'significant' in paragraph 1.1.	
<b>Paragraph 1.2</b>	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd</b>	<p>The inference in this question is that outside towns and villages no development will be allowed. In general terms, that approach is correct but there are particular situations where development could be allowed outside the towns and villages and we have in mind the particular situation at Raleigh Hall, near Eccleshall, where a Biomass Renewable Energy Unit is now well established and heating the existing industrial estate.</p> <p>We set out the principles of the Biomass Unit in our response on behalf of Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd to your Boroughwide Development Strategy in January of this year.</p> <p>We stated that there was a good case for promoting 4 ha. of greenfield land adjoining the existing Biomass Unit and the industrial estate, either for further employment or housing development, or indeed a combination of both in the form of a mixed use development. The Biomass power plant now established at the Raleigh Hall Industrial Estate would be able to serve the new development land.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The potential expansion of employment areas for future employment will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 1.2?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>The approach described in this paragraph must lead to the conclusion that the Council is not approaching the issue with an open mind and has already decided on an approach based on (a) allocations and (b) Residential Development Boundaries. The Core Strategy has not yet concluded on whether an RDB based approach is appropriate. In our view, it is a rather simplistic and mechanistic approach to the distribution of housing when national and regional policy for rural development, particularly housing development, now indicates</p>

	a more flexible and responsive approach to rural planning issues.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
At this stage no decision has been made in terms of delivering the level and distribution of development outlined in the Regional Spatial Strategy, including the future of Residential Development Boundaries in Stafford Borough's area.	
<b>Paragraph 1.3</b>	
<b>Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 1.3?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Comments relating to para 1.2 above apply.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
At this stage no decision has been made in terms of delivering the level and distribution of development outlined in the Regional Spatial Strategy, including the future of Residential Development Boundaries in Stafford Borough's area.	
<b>Paragraph 2.1</b>	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd</b>	Raleigh Hall lies about 1.5km from Eccleshall, which has a full range of facilities. A bus service passes by Raleigh Hall with services between Eccleshall, Newcastle and Stafford. Eccleshall is within comfortable cycling distance and for some people, reasonable walking distance
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The potential expansion of employment areas for future employment will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	

Mr D Pimble	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.1?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>These comments are based on the well rehearsed Government line of sustainability. If followed to its ultimate conclusion, we would all live in Stafford so that we would not have to travel outside the town. In practice, we should encourage development throughout the borough so that each town becomes more self sufficient in its own way. This means that the proposed additional houses should be spread around the borough but in a way that stimulates each individual town or village. Obviously, this will still mean a concentration in Stafford and Stone but not to the detriment of surrounding areas. People in surrounding areas still want to have their sustainable facilities such as the local church and shop, etc...</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The scale and location of new development at Stafford, Stone and the rural area will be considered in line with national and regional planning policies, through the Core Strategy scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
Cllr. J A Russell	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.1?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Paragraph 2.2</b></p>	
Councillor Mrs J E Tabernor	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.2?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Paragraph 2.3</b></p>	
McDyre and Co on behalf of Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd	<p>There should be a further category of development which allows in special cases, such as Raleigh Hall, further development. The existing industrial estate at Raleigh Hall is successful, well run and provides many jobs. It is a good principle of planning to bring together housing and employment in the drive to reduce vehicular journeys and therefore vehicle emissions.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The potential expansion of employment areas for future employment will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of J F Bostock Settlement</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.3?</b> Yes</p> <p>J F Bostock Settlement Ltd agree that most development should be directed to existing towns and cities in accordance with national and regional policy. However there should be more than a "limited" amount of growth expected through the expansion of villages. The West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS, Preferred Option December 2007) proposes some 3,300 new dwellings 2006-2026 in the villages, some 32% of the total for the Borough. This means that the villages identified in groups 1, 2 and 3 will need to accommodate significant development.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The Regional Spatial Strategy states that 10,100 houses (net) are to be delivered in Stafford Borough between 2006-2026, of which 7,000 are to be located at Stafford. At this stage no decision has been made on the scale and location of new development beyond Stafford to accommodate the remaining homes. Further consideration will be made through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings Ltd</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.3?</b> Yes</p> <p>We agree with the general thrust of directing most development to existing towns and cities, but Bassett Group Holdings Ltd consider that there should be more than just a limited amount of growth through the expansion of villages. The West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) proposes 3,300 new dwellings in the rural areas, for the period 2006-2026, some 32% of the total for the Borough.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The Regional Spatial Strategy states that 10,100 houses (net) are to be delivered in Stafford Borough between 2006-2026, of which 7,000 are to be located at Stafford. At this stage no decision has been made on the scale and location of new development beyond Stafford to accommodate the remaining homes. Further consideration will be made through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of Mr G Edwards</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.3?</b> Yes</p> <p>We agree that most new development should be directed to existing towns and cities, in this case Stafford, which is the County town and the largest settlement within the Borough. It has a vast range of services and facilities and should be the focus for new development in accordance with the Urban Renaissance principles of the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (Preferred Option, December 2007).</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The RSS states that 10,300 houses are to be delivered in Stafford Borough, 7,000 of which are to be located at Stafford. In July 2008 Stafford was announced as a New Growth Point by the Government.	
<b>Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.3?</b> No</p> <p>With regard to the second bullet point in particular, this is an overly restrictive interpretation of national policy, is inconsistent with Rural Renaissance and even inconsistent with the more permissive approach to housing in rural areas, described in paras 2.8 and 2.10 below. This approach precludes the possibility of new housing distribution based on village clusters with complementary service roles (even though individual settlements may not be service centres in their own right).</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Remove the bullet points under paragraph 2.3. The approach to settlement development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	



<p><b>Mr D Pimble</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.3?</b>  No    I agree completely with the comments of Paul Sharpe Associates.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Remove the bullet points under paragraph 2.3. The approach to settlement development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Paragraph 2.4</b></p>	
<p><b>McDyre and Co on behalf of Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd</b></p>	<p>The West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) has moved on since its June 2004 adoption. RSS has been subject to a Phase 2 Revision (Draft) - Preferred Option, December 2007. It strengthens the advice on creating sustainable communities, introducing policies to that effect, absent in the June 2004 version.</p> <p>Policy SR1 (Climate Change) (A) (i) asks Local Authorities to include policies and proposals in their plans for "developing and using renewable energy to supply both new and existing development."</p> <p>Policy SR2 (G) states that one of the objectives is to:-</p> <p>"Provide the environmental infrastructure needed to support new development ... including combined heat and power, and community heating systems ...".</p> <p>These renewable energy and sustainability initiatives would be well served by new housing/employment development at Raleigh Hall, extending the area served by the Biomass Unit and improving its efficiency and economies of scale in the process.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The Regional Spatial Strategy for the West Midlands was adopted in 2004 and is part of the current Development Plan covering the Stafford Borough area. The provision of renewable energy and energy efficient design along with potential expansion of employment areas for employment use will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Councillor Mrs J E Tabernor</b>	<p><b>Do you agree in Paragraph 2.4?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Housing in the rural areas should meet local needs and be affordable as most rural houses are now too large and expenses for first time buyers, especially the local younger generation who, although they don't wish too, have to move to the urban areas to buy a house they can afford. Houses should be in keeping with the local area.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Consideration of affordable housing policy and delivery, including Rural Exception Sites, will take place through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. In April 2008 the Strategic Housing Market Assessment setting out housing need for Stafford Borough was published.	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings Ltd</b>	However, where there are significant areas which are currently inappropriately located in Green Belt then their potential to provide for new development should be considered. An example is the Bassett Group Holdings Ltd Transport Site at Stone Road, Tittensor, details of which we submitted on behalf of the Bassett Group in January of this year in response to the Borough-Wide Development Strategy. Half of this built up transport depot site lies within Green Belt. The Principles for Settlement Development should also recognise the scope for redevelopment of "major developed sites" in the Green Belt in accordance with the advice in Annex C of PPG2 (Green Belts).
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt will considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	

<p><b>Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.4?</b> No  Is there a typing error in the second sentence...“This approach is set...”?</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b> Confirm that no typing error has occurred.</p>	
<p><b>Cllr. J A Russell</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.4?</b> Yes</p>
<p><b>Paragraph 2.5</b></p>	
<p><b>McDyre and Co on behalf of Mr G Edwards</b></p>	<p>The West Midlands Spatial Strategy (RSS) proposes for the period 2006-2026 10,300 new houses in Stafford Borough, of which 7,000 new houses are earmarked for the County town, Stafford, with the balance, 3,300 spread across Stone and the rural areas. Stafford will provide a major role in delivering new housing because of its considerable range of services and facilities and choice of transport mode.</p> <p>In our view settlement boundaries will have to be adjusted to accommodate significant greenfield development, particularly housing, especially in Stafford where over 70% of the borough housing requirement is planned to be accommodated in line with RSS guidance.</p> <p>Our client, Mr G Edwards, owns a substantial tranch of greenfield land on the edge of Stafford at Old Croft Road, Walton-on-the-Hill. We submitted details in January 2008 on behalf of Mr Edwards in response to the Borough Wide Development Strategy, which included a plan of the proposed housing allocation including about 17 ha. owned by Mr Edwards. It represents a sustainable rounding-off of the urban area of Stafford.</p>

	<p>Para. 3.53 of RSS (Phase 2, Preferred Option) states that Stafford provides an opportunity to help meet the housing and local regeneration needs of the County, going on to say:-</p> <p>"Whilst there are opportunities for significant development within the urban area, some greenfield development will be required ...".</p> <p>As mentioned in the January representation, the 25 ha. site was proposed as a housing allocation in the Stafford Borough Local Plan (Consultation Draft) of November 1991 (Proposal H3). The time has arrived to bring the site forward for housing development.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer response</u></b>  The Regional Spatial Strategy states that 10,100 houses (net) are to be delivered in Stafford Borough between 2006-2026, of which 7,000 are to be located at Stafford. At this stage no decision has been made on the scale and location of new development beyond Stafford to accommodate the remaining homes. Further consideration will be made through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. In July 2008 Stafford was announced as a New Growth Point.</p>	
<p><b>Cllr. J A Russell</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.5?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Paragraph 2.6</b></p>	
<p><b>McDyre and Co on behalf of J F Bostock Settlement</b></p>	<p>Stone is identified as a market town, helping to regenerate the rural area. However, it can only regenerate its own hinterland and the villages in the rural area further afield will have to provide for themselves in the way of new development to sustain their local economies. Hyde Lea is a typical example.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The Regional Spatial Strategy states that 10,100 houses (net) are to be delivered in Stafford Borough between 2006-2026, of which 7,000 are to be located at Stafford. At this stage no decision has been made on the scale and location of new development beyond Stafford to accommodate the remaining homes. Further consideration will be made through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings Ltd</b>	The market town, Stone, will only regenerate its immediate hinterland and other villages will need to provide for their own development to help regenerate the rural areas. Tittensor is an example.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The Regional Spatial Strategy states that 10,100 houses (net) are to be delivered in Stafford Borough between 2006-2026, of which 7,000 are to be located at Stafford. At this stage no decision has been made on the scale and location of new development beyond Stafford to accommodate the remaining homes. Further consideration will be made through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Paragraph 2.8</b>	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of J F Bostock Settlement</b>	<b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.8?</b> Yes J F Bostock Settlement Ltd agree with this statement. Hyde Lea is an example of a village with a good existing service base
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The Regional Spatial Strategy states that 10,100 houses (net) are to be delivered in Stafford Borough between 2006-2026, of which 7,000 are to be located at Stafford. At this stage no decision has been made on the scale and location of new development beyond Stafford to accommodate the remaining homes. Further consideration will be made through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Councillor Mrs J E Tabernor</b>	<b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.8?</b> Yes

<b>Mr David Pimble</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.8?</b></p> <p>Yes but within the context of additional development outside these two towns which should not preclude reasonable development.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The scale and location of new development at Stafford and Stone will be considered in line with national and regional planning policies, through the Core Strategy scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings Ltd</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.8?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.8?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>With regard to the last sentence, surely this comment is premature pending the preparation of the Core Strategy in that, at face value, it precludes the identification of the village cluster approach to housing distribution (see comments re para 2.3 above).</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Delete the last sentence of paragraph 2.8.</p>	
<b>Cllr. J A Russell</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.8?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>

## Paragraph 2.9

**McDyre and Co on behalf of Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd**

"Rural Renaissance" isn't just about villages, it's about sustainable development in the wider rural area. Raleigh Hall may not be within a settlement boundary but it is close (1.5km) to Eccleshall with its full range of services. Development at Raleigh Hall would, in our view, be more sustainable than in smaller villages with only a basic level of services, so that people residing there would have to make a greater number of journeys to various towns and villages to secure the level of service that is provided by Eccleshall. That is an unsustainable situation and development at Raleigh Hall is to be preferred.

PPS22 (Renewable Energy) aims to put the UK on a path to cut its carbon dioxide emissions by 60% by 2050, with real progress by 2020. It goes on to state that "development of combined heat and power will make a vital contribution to these aims."

Under "Key Principles", PS22 advises that "renewable energy development should be capable of being accommodated throughout England.

Para, 8 of PPS22 states "Local Planning Authorities may include policies in Local Development documents that require a percentage of the energy to be used in new residential, commercial and industrial developments to come from on-site renewable energy developments."

Para. 18 further states "Local Planning Authorities and Developers should consider the opportunity for incorporating renewable energy projects in all developments. Small scale renewable energy schemes that utilise technologies such as solar panels, biomass heating ... can be incorporated both into new developments and some existing buildings. Local Planning Authorities should specifically encourage such schemes through positively expressed policies in Local Development Documents."

My clients, Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd are seeking a positive policy in the LDF to promote new development served by renewable energy sources. The Biomass Unit to serve adjoining potential development land at Raleigh Hall is an obvious example.

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> The potential expansion of employment areas for future employment as well as the delivery and provision of renewable energy will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of J F Bostock Settlement</b>	<b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.9?</b> Yes
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> The Regional Spatial Strategy states that 10,100 houses (net) are to be delivered in Stafford Borough between 2006-2026, of which 7,000 are to be located at Stafford. At this stage no decision has been made on the scale and location of new development beyond Stafford to accommodate the remaining homes. Further consideration will be made through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Councillor Mrs J E Tabernor</b>	<b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.9?</b> Yes  Before housing is permitted the infrastructure needs to be updated. An example is before any housing is considered in Colwich and The Haywoods the sewerage systems needs to be updated as there are residents who regularly have raw sewage overflowing in their toilets.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> A key element of the Core Strategy will be the consideration of infrastructure needs for new development. Specific matters concerning settlements to be addressed by the Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water.	
<b>Cllr. J A Russell</b>	<b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.9?</b> Yes
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings</b>	<b>Do you agree with Paragraph 2.9?</b> Yes



**Paragraph 2.10**

**Cllr. J A Russell**

**Do you agree with Paragraph 2.10?**

No

There should be opportunities to create a new settlement where there is an existing road system and a scattered pattern of development that provides space for sustainable infill. As the price of oil rises there will be development of coal bed methane extraction in the Borough. Although this is not zero carbon it is the nearest to it and no different to north sea gas.

**Officer Response**

The creation of a new settlement will not be progressed through the Core Strategy unless there are significant changes to the Regional Spatial Strategy. The scale and location of new development together with utility and infrastructure requirements will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.

**McDyre and Co on behalf of J F Bostock Settlement**

**Do you agree with Paragraph 2.10?**

Yes

**McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings Ltd**

**Do you agree with Paragraph 2.10?**

Yes

<b>Paragraph 3.1</b>	
<b>Mr D Pimble</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.1?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Each surrounding settlement has its own characteristics and therefore each should have its own supplementary planning guidance to give a positive guide to the type and style of development required.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b> The Core Strategy will consider existing information on the characteristics of individual settlements including design guides and landscape assessments.</p>	
<b>Mrs C Heelis on behalf of Eccleshall Parish Council</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.1?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Eccleshall Parish Council agrees that there are a range of settlements with locally distinctive characteristics. In Eccleshall, the Parish Council believes that the Town Design Statement prepared by the local community should form an influential basis for the design principles of future development to maintain the architectural qualities of the town.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b> Noted.</p>	
<b>Cllr. J A Russell</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.1?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>

<b>Paragraph 3.2</b>	
<b>Mr D Pimble</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.2?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Although scoring has been carried out, I believe Eccleshall scores the following. 3 5 3 2 2 2 2 3 1 3 3 2 3 giving a total of 34 points. I may be wrong but I believe Eccleshall has a good case for the most new houses outside Stafford and Stone.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b> The score for Eccleshall has been amended as a result of consultation process on the Principles for Settlement Development document.</p>	
<b>Sport England</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.2?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Am pleased the Council is undertaking a PPG17 assessment and hope the results of this will inform and be part of the methodology.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b> The results and implications of the recently completed PPG17 Assessment for Stafford Borough will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<b>Cllr. J A Russell</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.2?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>

**Question 1: Do you agree with the methodology being based on a scoring system of services and facilities?**

**Cllr R Greatrex,  
Gnosall Parish  
Council**

The principles of the scoring system are deeply flawed in that they do not take into account in depth details of the facilities that are being recorded. It is too broad based and does not reflect the true position on the ground, or include items as sewage, drainage, surface water dispersal and natural water dispersal.

**Officer Response**

It is considered that the methodology for the scoring system is sound. The scale and location of new development will be considered in relation to infrastructure matters through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.

**Mrs L Bricknell**

**Do you agree?**

Yes

**Moore Family  
Trust**

**Do you agree?**

Yes

Generally agree but consider points for retail provision on the low side.

Local convenience store/Post Office should have been 2:

Two to five convenience stores 3:

More than local convenience store 4:

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> No change proposed to the scoring system.	
<b>Mr J Perks</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I think that it is a sensible way forward to cover the majority of cases and development. However there will be a number of sites available for development which might have 'low' scores, which if the Borough fail to take advantage of will make it all the more difficult to achieve the new build requirement for the Borough as a whole going forward. So the policy should not become a straight jacket for sensible development elsewhere - possibly this needs to be under a set of criteria as that alleviates the need to declassify land in the future. After all this plan will be superseded by something in ten or twenty years time and you will want a sustainable bank of land coming forward on an ongoing basis - small amounts regularly is better than big requirements periodically to ensure the community acceptance and cohesion. There is a question as to whether you have identified all the relevant criteria linkage for example there is little consideration given to the ease of access which for some of the smaller villages is not good and even if you encourage local employment, there will always be the need for transportation to some extent. Equally a view as to the impact of growth would be an interesting criteria.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> Policies relating to the scale and location of new development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Aragon Land and Planning</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Because it does not take on board any improvements offered by sustainable urban extensions</p>

**Officer Response**

The Principles for Settlement Development document considered existing settlements within the Stafford Borough area but did not consider sustainable urban extensions. The scale and location of new development, including significant urban extensions will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.

**Mr R Gough on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd**

**Do you agree?**

No

It is recognised that any assessment methodology used will be imperfect. The broad principles of examining settlement size (which should relate potential future local housing demand) and facilities are considered to provide a useful snapshot of the relative sustainability of settlements. However, this assessment alone is considered inadequate to act as a determinant of planning policy in respect of the formulation of Principles for Settlement Development.

The purpose of providing additional housing primarily to meet local needs is supported. It is recognised that development ought properly to be directed to the larger, more sustainable, settlements, which benefit from the necessary range of services and facilities to support additional housing.

It is accepted that the sustainability of many of the smaller settlements would be improved if additional housing were to be provided to support new rural facilities and services. However, in order to support the provision of the range of services and facilities, which would be required to make many of the smaller settlements more sustainable, significant levels of additional housing would be required. This would exceed local needs and would result in an unsustainable pattern of development. For this reason, it is submitted that the larger, more sustainable, settlements ought to be the focus for new housing development to meet their own needs and those arising in their rural catchment areas.

If the present and future housing needs of the rural population are to be met in a sustainable manner, a wider consideration of the suitability of settlements to meet such needs is required. One key element in this respect is the availability of local employment. Where employment is not available, a good public transport service is required to link the settlement to employment areas. Alternatively, significant housing growth should only be allowed when balanced with new local employment growth.

A further consideration must be the service centre function fulfilled by the settlement. Whereas, Meir Heath and Rough Close, and Blythe Bridge score highly on the assessment, these settlements are effectively suburbs of Stoke-on-Trent. They do not provide any

	<p>important service centre function for the rural area in the north of the Borough.</p> <p>Eccleshall acts a service centre for the north-west of the Borough, Gnosall for the west, and Great and Little Haywood for the east. It is therefore submitted that these settlements are properly identified as being within the highest (most sustainable) group.</p> <p>In addition, the suitability and desirability of directing additional housing development to particular settlements should be considered. Barlaston, although a high scoring settlement, occupies a sensitive location with limited separation from Stoke-on-Trent. In addition, parts of the settlement are of high historic and environmental value. It is submitted that the need to maintain the Green Belt in this location renders the settlement unsuitable to accommodate any significant level of new housing development.</p> <p>Finally, the ability of settlements to absorb additional housing development in social and physical infrastructure terms should be considered. The assessment considers the range of facilities available in settlements, not their quality or ability to expand to serve additional development.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p>	<p>Accepted. The appropriate scale of settlement development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. All available evidence will be considered when preparing the strategic approach in the Core Strategy document, not just the Principles for Settlement Development methodology.</p>
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Lord Stafford's Estates</b></p>	<p>Do You Agree?</p> <p>No</p> <p>It is recognised that any assessment methodology used will be imperfect. The broad principles of examining settlement size (which should relate potential future local housing demand) and facilities are considered to provide a useful snapshot of the relative sustainability of settlements. However, this assessment alone is considered inadequate to act as a determinant of planning policy in respect of the formulation of Principles for Settlement Development.</p> <p>The purpose of providing additional housing primarily to meet local needs is supported.</p> <p>It is recognised that development ought properly to be directed to the larger, more sustainable, settlements, which benefit from the</p>

necessary range of services and facilities to support additional housing.

It is accepted that the sustainability of many of the smaller settlements would be improved if additional housing were to be provided to support new rural facilities and services. However, in order to support the provision of the range of services and facilities, which would be required to make many of the smaller settlements more sustainable, significant levels of additional housing would be required. This would exceed local needs and would result in an unsustainable pattern of development. For this reason, it is submitted that the larger, more sustainable, settlements ought to be the focus for new housing development to meet their own needs and those arising in their rural catchment areas.

If the present and future housing needs of the rural population are to be met in a sustainable manner, a wider consideration of the suitability of settlements to meet such needs is required.

One key element in this respect is the availability of local employment. Where employment is not available, a good public transport service is required to link the settlement to employment areas. Alternatively, significant housing growth should only be allowed when balanced with new local employment growth.

One settlement, which both provides employment and is proximate to another significant employment area (Cold Meece), is Yarnfield. Hixon is also a settlement with significant employment areas.

A further consideration must be the service centre function fulfilled by the settlement. Whereas, Meir Heath and Rough Close, and Blythe Bridge score highly on the assessment, these settlements are effectively suburbs of Stoke-on-Trent. They do not provide any important service centre function for the rural area in the north of the Borough.

Eccleshall acts a service centre for the north-west of the Borough, Gnosall for the west, and Great and Little Haywood for the east. It is therefore submitted that these settlements are properly identified as being within the highest (most sustainable) group. In addition, the suitability and desirability of directing additional housing development to particular settlements should be considered. Barlaston, although a high scoring settlement, occupies a sensitive location with limited separation from Stoke-on-Trent. In addition, parts of the settlement are of high historic and environmental value. It is submitted that the need to maintain the Green Belt in this location renders the settlement unsuitable to accommodate any significant level of new housing development.



	<p>Finally, the ability of settlements to absorb additional housing development in social and physical infrastructure terms should be considered. The assessment considers the range of facilities available in settlements, not their quality or ability to expand to serve additional development.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  Accepted. The appropriate scale of settlement development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. All available evidence will be considered when preparing the strategic approach in the Core Strategy document, not just the Principles for Settlement Development methodology.</p>	
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Staffordshire Police</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>It is recognised that any assessment methodology used will be imperfect. The broad principles of examining settlement size (which should relate potential future local housing demand) and facilities are considered to provide a useful snapshot of the relative sustainability of settlements. However, this assessment alone is considered inadequate to act as a determinant of planning policy in respect of the formulation of Principles for Settlement Development.</p> <p>The purpose of providing additional housing primarily to meet local needs is supported.</p> <p>It is recognised that development ought properly to be directed to the larger, more sustainable, settlements, which benefit from the necessary range of services and facilities to support additional housing.</p> <p>It is accepted that the sustainability of many of the smaller settlements would be improved if additional housing were to be provided to support new rural facilities and services. However, in order to support the provision of the range of services and facilities, which would be required to make many of the smaller settlements more sustainable, significant levels of additional housing would be required. This would exceed local needs and would result in an unsustainable pattern of development. For this reason, it is submitted that the larger, more sustainable, settlements ought to be the focus for new housing development to meet their own needs and those arising in their rural catchment areas.</p>

If the present and future housing needs of the rural population are to be met in a sustainable manner, a wider consideration of the suitability of settlements to meet such needs is required.

One key element in this respect is the availability of local employment. Where employment is not available, a good public transport service is required to link the settlement to employment areas. Alternatively, significant housing growth should only be allowed when balanced with new local employment growth.

One settlement, which both provides employment and is proximate to another significant employment area (Cold Meece), is Yarnfield. Hixon is also a settlement with significant employment areas.

A further consideration must be the service centre function fulfilled by the settlement. Whereas, Meir Heath and Rough Close, and Blythe Bridge score highly on the assessment, these settlements are effectively suburbs of Stoke-on-Trent. They do not provide any important service centre function for the rural area in the north of the Borough.

Eccleshall acts a service centre for the north-west of the Borough, Gnosall for the west, and Great and Little Haywood for the east. It is therefore submitted that these settlements are properly identified as being within the highest (most sustainable) group.

In addition, the suitability and desirability of directing additional housing development to particular settlements should be considered. Barlaston, although a high scoring settlement, occupies a sensitive location with limited separation from Stoke-on-Trent. In addition, parts of the settlement are of high historic and environmental value. It is submitted that the need to maintain the Green Belt in this location renders the settlement unsuitable to accommodate any significant level of new housing development.

Finally, the ability of settlements to absorb additional housing development in social and physical infrastructure terms should be considered. The assessment considers the range of facilities available in settlements, not their quality or ability to expand to serve additional development.

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Accepted. The appropriate scale of settlement development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. All available evidence will be considered when preparing the strategic approach in the Core Strategy document, not just the Principles for Settlement Development methodology.	
<b>National Trust</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Although services and facilities are important, there is a need to have regard to the other issues such as local employment opportunities and from our point of view, more importantly, the sensitivity of the environment within and surrounding the settlement. Environmental issues that might indicate that a settlement is less suitable for peripheral expansion could include, by way of example, floodplains and nationally or internationally designated heritage assets, landscapes and habitats.</p> <p>We welcome the references to conservation areas, the Cannock Chase AONB and listed buildings in the Revised Settlement Assessment. These appear to be part of a general widening of its scope from the consultation draft Assessment of Services and Facilities and it is disappointing that this more-rounded approach has not been carried forward into the principles. In addition, we are concerned that there is no reference to the grade I registered historic park of Shugborough. The boundary of the registered park immediately abuts the built-up areas of the villages of Great Haywood, Little Haywood and Milford.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Environmental constraints and the implications for the scale of development to particular settlements will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Mr P Bourne</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>However housing needs for each settlement should be a factor.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
In April 2008 the Strategic Housing Market Assessment was published providing housing needs for the Stafford Borough area. However the housing needs for individual settlements is not provided in this report.	
<b>Mr J Wood</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes  However housing needs for each settlement should also be a factor.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
In April 2008 the Strategic Housing Market Assessment was published providing housing needs for the Stafford Borough area. However the housing needs for individual settlements is not provided in this report.	
<b>Mr R Bell</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes  However housing needs for each settlement should also be a factor.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
In April 2008 the Strategic Housing Market Assessment was published providing housing needs for the Stafford Borough area. However the housing needs for individual settlements is not provided in this report.	
<b>Mr A Barnes on behalf of Stone Rural Parish Council</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Mr A Pym on behalf of Mr J Lloyd</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> No

PPS1 is referred to in paragraph 2.1 of the Council's document as the overarching guidance for sustainable development. It is made clear in the fifth bullet point of paragraph 5 in PPS1 that good access to jobs is as important as good access to services.

This is endorsed further in PPS1 (para 27) where reducing the need to travel by car between home and work is a key element of planning for sustainable communities. Indeed this paragraph states that it may be more difficult to achieve such a reduction in rural areas, but where the opportunity exists it should be pursued.

The statistical analysis of settlements does not make any allowance for jobs but this is one of the most important, and most regular series of trips which many people will make. In trying to achieve more balanced communities, special emphasis should be given to reducing the distances travelled to work.

Paragraph 9.26 sets out the aim to achieve balanced communities with appropriate levels of housing, jobs and services. This was also a key part of Guiding Principle B adopted as part of the West Midlands RPG Review process.

The absence of an assessment of jobs puts the proposed settlement hierarchy at odds with the RSS.

The Council's own Employment Land Review of December 2007 noted that Hixon is a sustainable location for further commercial development, resolving to retain the allocation of land on the Hixon Airfield Industrial Estate for commercial development. Jobs and homes should be developed in parallel.

**Officer Response**

Accepted that the relationship between employment and housing is relevant, which will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.

<p><b>Mr S Beck on behalf of Fulford Parish Council</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b> Yes</p>
<p><b>Mrs J Hill on behalf of Ranton Parish Council</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b> Yes</p>
<p><b>Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o King Sturge</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b> Yes</p> <p>King Sturge acts on behalf of Akzo Nobel and are instructed to submit representations to the Plan For Stafford: Principles for Settlement Development Document and to seek a residential led and mixed use allocation for its land holding at Beaconside to the north of the County Town of Stafford. Akzo Nobel submitted parallel representations to the Core Strategy Issues and Options Report in February 2008. We broadly agree with the methodology, which is based on a scoring system of services and facilities.</p> <p>Stafford Town is the largest and most accessible settlement in the Borough and one which we consider is capable of self sufficient and managed growth. We consider that significant new development should be accommodated both within and on the periphery of Stafford Town to meet Borough and County wide requirements. This approach would help to protect the distinctive character of Stafford as a free standing town and help to relieve pressure for development elsewhere in less sustainable locations. We consider that the methodology should acknowledge that services and facilities can sometimes be provided as part of a sustainable comprehensive, mixed use development on a larger scale site on the edge of Stafford, Stone and the main urban areas.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b> Accepted. The scale and location of new development in and around Stafford will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. In July 2008 Stafford was announced as a 'New Growth Point'.</p>	

<p><b>Dr Malcolm Bell Ltd</b></p>	<p>We broadly agree with the methodology. However we find the expression “...significant Greenfield sites...” in the description of the First Group too restrictive. We feel that restricting boundary adjustments to only Greenfield developments is unexplained and contrary to Regional and National aims which seek to prioritise Brownfield sites. ( For example, paragraph 63 of PPS3) . In the RSS the aim is for 76% of new housing to come from Brownfield sites and states “in locating development priority should be given to using previously developed land in suitable locations” (page 34). Hence the present wording is too restrictive and should include reference to suitable existing brownfield sites, particularly where they are close to existing settlements. In its present form the Policy appears unsound. This will also assist the Borough Council in reaching its own targets for new houses on brownfield sites.</p> <p>We feel there are such sites around Eccleshall that could usefully be considered.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The Council will consider the availability of both greenfield and brownfield land through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Whilst there is no objection to some form of objective approach to this issue, villages are more than a mere collection of “services” and “facilities”. The scoring system is a rating system for “services and facilities” not a ranking system for villages. The choice of villages to accept development must be a subjective political and democratic decision. This is not “a system” or “principle” for settlement development. It is only a first stage approach to new housing distribution. “Settlement development” is altogether a different activity.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Agree. The Principles for Settlement Development is part of a process to establish new future development distribution in Stafford Borough.	
<b>Mr G Fergus</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If policies are not founded on a comprehensive and up to date evidence base it will be impossible to demonstrate they are the most appropriate in all the circumstances. You will recall that this was a key failing of the Lichfield LDF CS.</p> <p>This document contains an important set of information however the key determinant for a locally distinctive sub area structure for the Borough as a whole including Stafford and Stone, are what are the key issues identified through consultation e.g. issues that pass over administrative boundaries i.e AONB, housing in the area south east of Stafford partly within Stafford partly within South Staffordshire, the Eastern Distributor and improved access to the hospital, community priorities as confirmed in the Community Plan e.g. affordable housing, market town regeneration, rural regeneration, protection of the environment and rural accessibility.</p> <p>Have you identified and are you intending to evaluate all reasonable options appropriate to the Borough - Not just variations on the same approach that led to RDB's and settlement strategy for the Local Plan.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
A range of spatial options relating to the scale and location of development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The purpose of the Principles of Settlement Development is to aid the identification of reasonable options.	
<b>Mrs C Westwood</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b>                      Yes</p> <p>I do think you should some how add in a score which reflects the national planning regulations, which may exclude development in certain villages due to Green belt legislation</p>



<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> In preparing the new Development Plan for Stafford Borough factors such as the Green Belt will be taken into account alongside other local, regional, National and European designations.	
<b>Mr M Lunn</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Mr Boughey for Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Cannock Chase District Council</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes  Agree with principle of concentrating new development on larger settlements (e.g. Stafford and Stone) with existing services, except where there is a need for affordable housing in line with national planning policies. The only problem with the scoring system in Appendix 1 is that if a settlement loses services (e.g. Post Office) or people move out and it moves lower down the scoring list the reduced score could result in less scope for new service provision funded by new developments (e.g. Section 106 Agreements) when they need to attract new provision. We strongly support the higher scores for public transport provision, access to retail facilities and open spaces.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> The Principles for Settlement Development and the specific scores for each settlement have been prepared as a guide for establishing the scale and location of new development. It is accepted that this document is a snapshot in time and other factors will also be considered when the identification of development options are being considered.	

<b>Messrs P and D Ricketts</b>	The system used based on scoring points is the best method for elimination of land which is to be set aside (unusable). The higher the points the identity of establishing land for development can be proved.
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Noted.</p>	
<b>Mrs A Crane on behalf Sustainability Matters in Stafford Borough</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Paragraph 3.5</b></p>	
<b>Cllr A Bevington</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.5?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>If the scoring system was representative and provided an accurate representation of the facilities &amp; resources of the settlements, then it may be fair, it does not.</p> <p>The results seem skewed, I base this on the comparison between settlements in group 1 specifically.</p> <p>How can Gnosall a large village without any 24hour banking facilities let alone cash point machines rank higher than Eccleshall?</p>

	<p>There are larger, better &amp; more numerous shopping facilities, residents of Gnosall have to travel to one of the larger retail centres as do all the settlements other than Eccleshall. So I believe as a town with excellent facilities it should be grouped with Stone &amp; Stafford and be higher than group 1!</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  In producing the Principles for Settlement Development document access to banking facilities has been included under 'other facilities' and the settlements scored accordingly.</p>	
<p><b>Councillor Mrs J E Tabernor</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.5?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>I don't think Little Haywood should be in the first group as it hasn't got the facilities a lot of other larger villages have and there isn't a bus service between Little Haywood and Great Haywood to enable the residents of Little Haywood, who don't drive and can't walk the distance between the two villages to use the facilities in Great Haywood.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to show Great Haywood and Little Haywood &amp; Colwich separately. Both Great Haywood and Little Haywood &amp; Colwich have sufficient services and facilities to warrant their grouping.</p>	
<p><b>Councillor Mrs J E Tabernor</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.5?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I agree providing infrastructure is carefully considered before a decision is made.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  Accepted.</p>	

<p><b>Councillor Mrs J E Tabernor</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.5?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Local employment has not been considered. If there isn't a lot of local employment then there is a greater need for the use of the car and travelling distances to and from work.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>It is accepted that the relationship between employment and housing is relevant to the development strategy, which will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.5?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>With regard to “Greenfield development”, the use of the capital letter for “Greenfield” highlights (one can only assume pejoratively) the term “Greenfield”. We would suggest instead the use of the term “not previously developed” as this does not carry the stigma associated with greenfield development.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>No change</p>	
<p><b>Mr D Pimble</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.5?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The comments of Paul Sharpe Associates are almost as if they did not understand the meaning of the term Greenfield. The boundaries of certain towns outside Stafford and Stone should be expanded to include additional land for development. The Governments targets may be ambitious but at least identifying the land may reduce the current difficulties in finding new sites for additional houses.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
No change	
<b>Mrs C Heelis on behalf of Eccleshall Parish Council</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.5?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Eccleshall Parish Council agrees Stafford and Stone should be considered to be principal and secondary settlements within Stafford Borough but accepts that some development in Eccleshall would be beneficial for the maintenance of the established services and facilities in the town.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Noted	
<b>Cllr. J A Russell</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Particularly as there is no intention to alter greenbelt boundaries.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Issues concerning the Green Belt will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Mr A Preece</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.5?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Mrs M Green</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.5?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>

### Paragraph 3.6

**McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings Ltd**

Please see the response to 2.4 above. The release of previously developed (brownfield) land in Green Belt on the edge of the settlement should be considered for new development/redevelopment. The Bassett Group Holdings Ltd site at Tittensor is an example.

#### Officer Response

Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.

**Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates**

**Do you agree with Paragraph 3.6?**

No

Comments regarding the use of the term “Greenfield” – as in para 3.5 above. Exclusion of settlements in Green Belt is not appropriate. Minor adjustments to Green Belt boundaries is appropriate and creating a settlement hierarchy including minor adjustments to Green Belt boundaries would not be in conflict with the RSS.

For Oulton, currently, this settlement is “washed over” by Green Belt designation. The scale of the settlement (and its services and facilities score) warrants the “insetting” of the village within the Green Belt in order to facilitate limited development for local needs. The LDF is the appropriate mechanism for effecting this minor change to Green Belt and, if required, the potential for additional housing can be incorporated in this process.

#### Officer Response

Amendments to the Green Belt will be considered in the context of national and regional planning policy. The scale and location of new development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.

<p><b>Mr M Lunn</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.6?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I agree that Green Belt must be protected at all cost. However, a further definition of "less significant" is required.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Amendments to the Green Belt will be considered in the context of national and regional planning policy. The scale and location of new development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Mrs A Vaughan</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.6?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>I am unhappy that Derrington is in group 2. It should be in group 3.</p> <p>The supporting document also states that Derrington has a post office and convenience store but they are now closed.</p> <p>We need to retain our small villages as they are part of our heritage.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The Settlement Assessment of Services and Facilities document, together with the Principles for Settlement Development scoring has been amended accordingly. Derrington is now classed as a Group 3 settlement.</p>	

<b>Paragraph 3.7</b>	
<b>Mr J Perks</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.7?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Settlements where boundaries will be retained to provide for development in the future but it is not envisaged that expansion would be appropriate other than for Rural Exception Sites to deliver affordable housing.</p> <p>Developing affordable housing in the smaller settlements is a good thing, but not out of proportion with the development of affordable housing across the whole Borough.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>No change</p>	
<b>Mrs S Starr</b>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.7?</b></p> <p>Yes. Our group seems satisfactory at present and feel that 'to leave well alone' is appropriate.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>No change</p>	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of J F Bostock Settlemnt</b>	<p>There appears to be something of an anomaly here in that retention of village boundaries would discourage rather than provide for development in the future. We think it is important that there should be some flexibility for greenfield housing release on the edge of village settlements, even in Group 3.</p>



**Officer Response**

The scale and location of development, alongside settlement boundaries, will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.

**Mr D Pimble**

**Do you agree with Paragraph 3.7?**

Yes

These hamlets are inappropriate for extra development either because of the Green Belt or the difficulties of access along narrow country lanes. With regard to the latter, Adbaston, Ranton and Norbury are good examples as they are only served by very narrow lanes.

**Officer Response**

Access and transport issues will be considered alongside other infrastructure requirements in the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.

**Cllr. J A Russell**

**Do you agree with Paragraph 3.7?**

No

I cannot understand why Tittensor and Yarnfield do not have a \* showing them in greenbelt.

**Officer Response**

Accepted. References to Tittensor and Yarnfield within the Principles for Settlement Development to be amended to identify their relationship to the Green Belt.

## Question 2 Do you agree with the three broad groups of settlements?

**Cllr R Greatrex,  
Gnosall Parish  
Council**

No. Group One should be withdrawn from the equation completely. Groups 2 and 3 should become Groups 1 and 2. Group 3 should then take smaller hamlets and villages that are not represented so as to develop these areas, leaving the large areas in the original group 1 to have minor infill development.

### **Officer Response**

The scale and location of new development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.

**Mr J Perks**

### **Do you agree?**

Yes

If this is going to be the policy then you will have to be able to dynamically add and take away new areas as facilities are added and close down.

This also needs to be captured - for example the new Child's Play Area in Croxton, which opened in March 2008.

This give Croxton a score of 10, I think, rather than 9 points.

And you may want to review its inclusion in Group 3 too.

### **Officer Response**

The Principles for Settlement Development document scoring for Croxton has been amended. The scale and location of new development will consider the scores within the Principles for Settlement Development document together with other matters through the Core Strategy.

**Mr Stubbs**

### **Do you agree?**

Yes

	<p>The settlements listed within group 3 are suitable for small scale development. However it is considered that the settlement of Salt, having an irregular development boundary line, would benefit from an extension to its boundary in order to provide a cohesive village where sustainable development can be best accommodated.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  The scale and location of development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Mr &amp; Mrs Swinnerton</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b>  Yes</p> <p>The settlements in Group 2 are suitable for housing development both within and adjacent to the development boundary and that the service provision within these settlements is adequate to provide sustainable development for the future.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  The scale and location of development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Aragon Land and Planning</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b>  No</p> <p>Stafford and Stone need to be identified in the hierarchy.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  Stafford and Stone are referenced in the Principles for Settlement Development document as being principal and secondary settlements within the Borough area. The scale and location of development in and around Stafford and Stone will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	

<p><b>Mr P Cope</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary to the west of Yarnfield is illogical and requires some redrawing to make a more appropriate perimeter to the village, as was the case prior to Green Belt changes made in the 1960/70s.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Green Belt issues will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide clarification in terms of Yarnfield's relationship to the Green Belt.</p>	
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The broad groupings, in policy terms, are supported. However, the categorisation of settlements into these groups is subject to objections (see responses to Questions 1, 3, 4 and 5).</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Noted</p>	
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Lord Stafford's Estates</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The broad groupings, in policy terms, are supported. However, the categorisation of settlements into these groups is subject to objections (see responses to Questions 1, 3, 4 and 5).</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Noted	
<b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Staffordshire Police</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The broad groupings, in policy terms, are supported. However, the categorisation of settlements into these groups is subject to objections (see responses to Questions 1, 3, 4 and 5).</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Noted	
<b>National Trust</b>	<p>It is difficult to comment on this without an indication of the scale of growth that would be considered significant – is it doubling the size of the village, 5-10% growth or something in between?</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The scale and location of development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Mr A Barnes, Stone Rural Parish Council</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Mrs L Bricknell</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>

<b>Moore Family Trust</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Agree with the three broad groups of settlements.</p>
<b>Mr R Bell</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Mr P Bourne</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Mr J Wood</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Mr S Beck, Fulford Parish Council</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Cllr A Bevington</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No.</p> <p>As in the previous question, the nature of the survey is not representative. Access facilities are critical particularly where a greener approach is required. As bus facilities are poor throughout the rural area, at peak times buses are unable to collect all of the potential travellers, so rail &amp; proximity to rail should be a factor measured. Each settlement may want to expand in order to stimulate improved amenities. Villages who have worked hard to provide the funding &amp; build public amenities appear to have been penalised for doing so</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> No change	
<b>Mr A Pym on behalf of Mr J Lloyd</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The principle of categorisation is fine but it should take full account of employment opportunities and this will require a reappraisal of the individual settlements. I comment on Hixon below as a settlement which should be moved to Group 1.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> Accepted that the relationship between employment and housing should be considered when preparing the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended, with Hixon now falling within Group 1.	
<b>Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o King Sturge</b>	<p>Whilst we acknowledge that sites in particular those around Stafford and Stone are to be considered separately from the Principles of Settlement Development document, we note that Stafford will be included in the First Group when considered in the LDF Core Strategy. We maintain that we would like to see Stafford Borough meet its emerging housing, economic and social needs in a balanced and sustainable way with the primary focus for development within and around Stafford and Stone.</p> <p>We acknowledge that there will be capacity for smaller scale development in settlements elsewhere within the Borough (as set out in the proposed settlement groupings) to maintain or improve their socio economic vitality. However, development in these areas should not undermine the potential for maximising the use of land within and on the periphery of Stafford to enable the most sustainable pattern of development.</p> <p>We maintain our view that there is potential to develop a sustainable urban extension on Akzo Nobel's land at Beaconside, to the north of Stafford Town, close to the existing employment areas at Prologis Park and Primepoint and the Parkside residential area. The Akzo Nobel site lends itself to a mix of uses with housing (including affordable housing) commercial and community uses such as public realm, improved linkages and open space. This mix will contribute to the sustainable development of the site and provide a wider community benefit for Stafford and the surrounding areas.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The scale and location of development at Stafford and across the Borough's settlement will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b>  Yes, but we do not agree with the effective exclusion of villages located within the Green Belt.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Amendments to the Green Belt will be considered in the context of national and regional planning policy. The scale and location of development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide greater clarification with regards to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Mr G Fergus</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b>  No  The focus for the Core Strategy should be the town of Stafford where the vast majority of development and linked infrastructure improvements will be focused. Stone has issues and opportunities and it is logical for this market town to be a second tier urban settlement.  There then needs to be a very focused approach taken to the rural area. Therefore we suggest that there should be only 1 group of rural settlements comprising Eccleshall, Gnosall, Great Haywood, Hixon and Brocton and Brocton A34. These would retain their RDB with any adjustments required to accommodate specific allocations and proposals. The remainder of the rural settlements would only be appropriate for exception affordable housing. This would involve removing all existing RDB for these settlements which would then be covered by open countryside policies. Specific policies could apply to such settlements to address local issues or priorities identified through consultation.



<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The scale and location of new development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Mrs C Westwood</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>I think there should be 4 groups the fourth being one for villages currently identified with an *, this would make it easier for a lay person to understand whether their village is to be earmarked for future development. My understanding at the moment which has taken me several times of reading to understand is that villages with an * are not likely to be included in future plans.....but have I understood the technical jargon? If so, why put them in a category which initially suggests they will be considered for development, I thought local government was meant to offer plain English explanations.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The settlement scores set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document are based on the existing services and facilities rather than infrastructure requirements or national policy. The scale and location of new development will be considered in the context of a wide range of factors through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide greater clarification with regards to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Mr M Lunn</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Mr Boughey for Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>

<b>Cannock Chase District Council</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Agree with broad groups of settlements to provide a hierarchy of suitability for different concentrations of development in accordance with predicted needs.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b> No change</p>	
<b>C T Planning on behalf of Messrs Rawthorne</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>This representation is made in respect of Derrington only and should not be taken as supporting or objecting to the inclusion of any other settlement in the proposed hierarchy. We support the inclusion of Derrington as a Group 2 settlement. The village supports a range of community services and facilities. Greenfield release for housing adjacent to the village would allow growth in the village which would further support local services. The settlement is within 5km of Stafford, the regional strategic centre, and the local national cycle network route 5 provides a direct and sustainable option for travel from the village to Stafford town centre.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b> The score for Derrington has been amended as a result of the Principles for Settlement Development consultation and Derrington is now positioned in Group 3. The scale and location of new development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<b>Messrs P and D Ricketts</b>	<p>To provide 3 broad groups of settlement is fine, but there could have been four.</p>

<b>Officer Response</b> No change	
<b>Mrs A Crane on behalf of Sustainability Matters in Stafford Borough</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>It would be good if rural exception sites were also allowed if they are carbon neutral homes with telephone and water connection if necessary, but no gas or drainage connection, and with enough land to allow for self-sufficiency. These should also be allowed in or near any smaller settlements which haven't been mentioned, within or outside the green belt. Additional advantage would be that they would help to maintain or make viable public transport links to local doctor, shop and school. Allowing smallholdings such as these will also encourage local food growing.</p>
<b>Officer Response</b> No change	
<b>Mr A Preece</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Paragraph 3.8</b>	
<b>McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings Ltd</b>	<p>The release of previously developed (brownfield) land in Green Belt on the edge of the settlement should be considered for new development/redevelopment. The Bassett Group Holdings Ltd site at Tittensor is an example. However, where there are significant areas which are currently inappropriately located in Green Belt then their potential to provide for new development should be considered. An example is the Bassett Group Holdings Ltd Transport Site at Stone Road, Tittensor, details of which we submitted on</p>

	<p>behalf of the Bassett Group in January of this year in response to the Borough-Wide Development Strategy. Half of this built up transport depot site lies within Green Belt. The Principles for Settlement Development should also recognise the scope for redevelopment of "major developed sites" in the Green Belt in accordance with the advice in Annex C of PPG2 (Green Belts).</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.8?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>The statement in the second sentence of para 3.8 is incorrect. The LDF provides the vehicle for adjusting Green Belt boundaries. National policy for Green Belt is capable of adjustment via this LDF process without conflict with RSS and must not be prevented or excluded at this stage of the plan preparation process.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Green Belt issues will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide greater clarification with regards to settlements affected by the Green Belt.</p>	
<p><b>Mrs C Westwood</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree with Paragraph 3.8?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>But why don't you just put them in a group on their own rather than complicate matters for the lay person?</p>

**Officer Response**

Green Belt issues will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide greater clarification with regards to settlements affected by the Green Belt.

**Question 3 - Are there any settlements which you consider should / should not be included in any of the 3 groups? If so please state the settlement and give reasons.**

**Cllr R Greatrex,  
Gnosall Parish  
Council**

Yes. We feel that Eccleshall should be excluded from the list, the reason being that it is classed as a town, not a village. It has more resources than all the settlements on the current list. Forton, Sutton, Croxton, Norton Bridge, Oulton, Salt, Sandon should all be included.

**Officer Response**

It is accepted that not all settlement in the Borough have been identified through the Principles for Settlement Development document. The rationale for settlements included is contained in paragraph 3.9. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to include Croxton, Hilderstone, Fulford and Hopton in Group 3.

**Mrs L Bricknell**

**Do you agree?**

No

**Mr J Perks**

**Do you agree?**

Yes

There are three of the current settlements with RDBs - Fulford, Croxton and Hilderstone - which are not targeted for development under Groups 1 - 3.

	<p>For Croxton not to be considered for development at all will reduce its ability to keep the community and existing local facilities vibrant and healthy. I believe that this decision should be reviewed on a 'fact based assessment' rather than believed circumstances for example on water treatment. Other area surveys do not seem to have suggested such a big problem and equally water discharge does not have to be exclusively 'to ground'.</p> <p>Croxton offers good access to other local areas via a 'B' road which is better than most 'A' roads in the County and access to facilities outside of the village is closer than places like Yarnfield, Great Bridgeford etc..</p> <p>Therefore I believe that it could quite easily accept greater development possibly between the two current RDBs, along the main road or as infill.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to include Croxton in Group 3.</p>	
<p><b>Mr Stubbs</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The settlements in the Green Belt should be removed from the groups given that there are other settlements capable of accommodating development. There are no exceptional reasons for moving the Green Belt boundaries.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Green Belt issues will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide greater clarification with regards to settlements affected by the Green Belt.</p>	
<p><b>Mr &amp; Mrs Swinnerton</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>

	<p>The settlements in the Green Belt should be removed from the groups given that there are other settlements capable of accommodating development. There are no exceptional reasons for moving the Green Belt boundaries.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Green Belt issues will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide greater clarification with regards to settlements affected by the Green Belt.</p>	
<p><b>Aragon Land &amp; Planning</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Stafford and Stone need to be identified in the hierarchy.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Stafford and Stone are referenced in the Principles for Settlement Development document as being principal and secondary settlements within the Borough area. The scale and location of development in and around Stafford and Stone will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Oulton is a village ‘washed over’ by Green Belt. As such, development should properly be strictly controlled both within and adjacent to the village. It makes it an unsuitable village for greenfield development. Furthermore, it is considered that it should not benefit from a Residential Development Boundary and should be removed from the Settlement groupings altogether.</p> <p>Trentham/Dairyfields occupies a sensitive location on the edge of Stoke-on-Trent. Any expansion of the present built area would have an adverse impact on the Green Belt in that it would extend the built-up area of Stoke-on-Trent into the adjacent countryside. This could undermine the regeneration of Stoke. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, any extension would have an adverse impact on the character of the historic Trentham Gardens Estate. It is submitted that Trentham/Dairyfields should be excluded from the</p>

	<p>Settlement classification.</p> <p>Adbaston is a small settlement in a reasonably remote area. It does not act as a service centre for any rural hinterland, due to its lack of facilities. As such it is considered inappropriate to allow for any additional housing development other than rural exceptions policy affordable housing. It is submitted that its Residential Development Boundary should be removed and the settlement deleted from the groupings.</p> <p>It is noted that Adbaston scored 9 points on the settlement evaluation. As a general principle it is submitted that all settlements which scored less than 10 points must, on this evaluation, be unsustainable and therefore are not locations where further housing development should properly be considered. The Residential Development Boundaries of the settlements concerned should be deleted and the settlements excluded from the grouping.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Accepted that consideration needs to be given to Residential Development Boundaries when preparing the new development strategy. The settlement scores set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document are based on the existing services and facilities rather than infrastructure requirements. The scale and location of new development will be considered in the context of a wide range of factors such as infrastructure, employment and environment and physical constraints through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009, not just existing services and facilities.</p>	
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Lord Staffords Estates</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Oulton is a village 'washed over' by Green Belt. As such, development should properly be strictly controlled both within and adjacent to the village. It makes it an unsuitable village for greenfield development. Furthermore, it is considered that it should not benefit from a Residential Development Boundary and should be removed from the Settlement groupings altogether.</p> <p>Trentham/Dairyfields occupies a sensitive location on the edge of Stoke-on-Trent. Any expansion of the present built area would have an adverse impact on the Green Belt in that it would extend the built-up area of Stoke-on-Trent into the adjacent countryside. This could undermine the regeneration of Stoke. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, any extension would have an adverse impact on the character of the historic Trentham Gardens Estate. It is submitted that Trentham/Dairyfields should be excluded from the</p>



	<p>Settlement classification.</p> <p>Adbaston is a small settlement in a reasonably remote area. It does not act as a service centre for any rural hinterland, due to its lack of facilities. As such it is considered inappropriate to allow for any additional housing development other than rural exceptions policy affordable housing. It is submitted that its Residential Development Boundary should be removed and the settlement deleted from the groupings.</p> <p>It is noted that Adbaston scored 9 points on the settlement evaluation. As a general principle it is submitted that all settlements which scored less than 10 points must, on this evaluation, be unsustainable and therefore are not locations where further housing development should properly be considered. The Residential Development Boundaries of the settlements concerned should be deleted and the settlements excluded from the grouping.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Accepted that consideration needs to be given to Residential Development Boundaries when preparing the new development strategy. The settlement scores set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document are based on the existing services and facilities rather than infrastructure requirements. The scale and location of new development will be considered in the context of a wide range of factors such as infrastructure, employment and environment and physical constraints through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009, not just existing services and facilities.</p>	
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Staffordshire Police</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Oulton is a village 'washed over' by Green Belt. As such, development should properly be strictly controlled both within and adjacent to the village. It makes it an unsuitable village for greenfield development. Furthermore, it is considered that it should not benefit from a Residential Development Boundary and should be removed from the Settlement groupings altogether.</p> <p>Trentham/Dairyfields occupies a sensitive location on the edge of Stoke-on-Trent. Any expansion of the present built area would have an adverse impact on the Green Belt in that it would extend the built-up area of Stoke-on-Trent into the adjacent countryside. This could undermine the regeneration of Stoke. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, any extension would have an adverse impact</p>

	<p>on the character of the historic Trentham Gardens Estate. It is submitted that Trentham/Dairyfields should be excluded from the Settlement classification.</p> <p>Adbaston is a small settlement in a reasonably remote area. It does not act as a service centre for any rural hinterland, due to its lack of facilities. As such it is considered inappropriate to allow for any additional housing development other than rural exceptions policy affordable housing. It is submitted that its Residential Development Boundary should be removed and the settlement deleted from the groupings.</p> <p>It is noted that Adbaston scored 9 points on the settlement evaluation. As a general principle it is submitted that all settlements which scored less than 10 points must, on this evaluation, be unsustainable and therefore are not locations where further housing development should properly be considered. The Residential Development Boundaries of the settlements concerned should be deleted and the settlements excluded from the grouping.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  Accepted that consideration needs to be given to Residential Development Boundaries when preparing the new development strategy. The settlement scores set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document are based on the existing services and facilities rather than infrastructure requirements. The scale and location of new development will be considered in the context of a wide range of factors such as infrastructure, employment and environment and physical constraints through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009, not just existing services and facilities.</p>	
<p><b>Mr A Barnes for Stone Rural Parish Council</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b> Yes</p>
<p><b>Mrs S Starr</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b> No</p>

<p><b>Cllr A Bevington</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>As previously, Eccleshall is a town &amp; should be treated as such. Villages capacity for housing does not appear to be measured, ie the ability of existing water &amp; waste water treatment, the ability to attract Employment &amp; local industry etc</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The settlement scores set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document are based on the existing services and facilities rather than infrastructure requirements. The scale and location of new development will be considered in the context of a wide range of factors such as infrastructure, employment and environment and physical constraints through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009, not just existing services and facilities.</p>	
<p><b>Mr D Pimble</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I believe that villages are just the sort of small settlements that should be allowed to retain a development boundary to maintain the services that presently exist. Another such example could be Norton Bridge where a small number of additional dwellings would be an advantage.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The scale and location of new development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Mr P Bourne</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p>

<p><b>Mr J Wood</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p>
<p><b>Mr R Bell</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p>
<p><b>Mr S Beck, Fulford Parish Council</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Fulford Parish council believe Fulford village should be included in Group 3.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended with Fulford now included in Group 3.</p>	
<p><b>Cllr. J A Russell</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Listing is illogical and implies that if government directives about Greenbelts changes then these may become acceptable.</p> <p>Sadly I hear that the Government is changing designations in the South East due to massive pressures but there should not be changes here. New CPRE comments emphasise the danger of designating land for 'affordable' housing that will be 'cherry-picked' by developers.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues will be considered in the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide greater clarification with regards to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o King Sturge</b>	We acknowledge that there will be capacity for smaller scale development in settlements elsewhere within the Borough (as set out in the proposed settlement groupings) to maintain or improve their socio economic vitality. However, development in these areas should not undermine the potential for maximising the use of land within and on the periphery of Stafford to enable the most sustainable pattern of development.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Accepted. The scale and location of new development in and around Stafford will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. In July 2008 Stafford was announced as a 'New Growth Point'.	
<b>Mrs C Heelis on behalf of Eccleshall Parish Council</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b>  Yes  Eccleshall Parish Council believes that some minor development would be appropriate in Croxton to maintain the existing amenities and services in the village, as this village serves a large hinterland between Eccleshall and Loggerheads. Appropriate foul drainage would obviously be necessary. This would add Croxton to Group 3.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to include Croxton in Group 3.	
<b>Mr Boughey for Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b>  No

<p><b>Cannock Chase District Council</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Support designation of Brocton on the A34 in Group 2 for limited Greenfield development but not in Green Belt. It is reasonably close to our boundary but peripheral development would be controlled effectively by the Green Belt and AONB status of the Chase.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>No change</p>	
<p><b>Messrs P and D Ricketts</b></p>	<p>The settlements listed here should not be included because they have problems with utility services:</p> <p>CROXTON, sewerage treatment, bus service is only hourly</p> <p>OULTON, Severn Trent stage sewerage would have to drain to Brancote which is 9 miles away as far as crow flies, Environment Agency state no development until improvements</p> <p>COTES HEATH, Flood problems, Environment Agency state 1/2 settlement discharges to septic tank which when distributed on local farm ground could permeate into water course and pollute Meece Brook and water supply, no mains gas in some settlements.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Environmental constraints and infrastructure issues will be considered in preparing the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. Information concerning the water resources and infrastructure for individual settlements to be raised with the Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water.</p>	
<p><b>Mrs A Crane, Sustainability Matters in</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>

<b>Stafford Borough</b>	
<b>Mr A Preece</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> No
<b>Mr A Preece</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Question 4 Do you agree that settlements located within or adjacent to the Green Belt should not be considered for peripheral expansion?</b>	
<b>Cllr R Greatrex, Gnosall Parish Council</b>	We do not agree with this statement, all areas should be included for peripheral expansion, whether adjacent to Green Belt or not.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b> Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.	
<b>Mrs L Bricknell</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> No  Certain SYMPATHETIC forms of development should be allowed (e.g. community facilities)

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
National planning policy in Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts sets out what is considered acceptable development in the Green Belt.	
<b>Moore Family Trust</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Do not agree. There may be occasions where settlements adjacent to Green Belt may be suitable for expansion.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues including amendments will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Mr Stubbs</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Developments within the Green Belt should not be considered. There are no exceptional reasons for moving the Green Belt boundaries.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Mr &amp; Mrs Swinnerton</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes Developments within the Green Belt should not be considered. There are no exceptional reasons for moving the Green Belt boundaries.</p>



<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt	
<b>Aragon Land and Planning</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>The small settlements that have the green belt drawn tightly around them should not be considered for development</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt	
<b>Mr P Cope</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Land for small developments providing a better defined boundary to a village could be released with no detrimental effect to the countryside.. For example, the Green Belt to the west of Yarnfield is irregular and includes part of a garden. Interestingly, this unusual boundary was formed to exclude land which had previously been granted Planning Permission in the 1960s</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues, including Major Developed Sites, will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt	

Mrs S Starr	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p>
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>As a general principle, it is considered that Green Belt villages should not be considered for peripheral expansion. However, it is also recognised that some villages in the Green Belt are the more sustainable and provide services for the wider rural area and employment. Consequently, it is submitted that appropriate villages in less sensitive locations in the Green Belt may be appropriate for peripheral expansion.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.</p>	
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Lord Stafford's Estates</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>As a general principle, it is considered that Green Belt villages should not be considered for peripheral expansion. However, it is also recognised that some villages in the Green Belt are the more sustainable and provide services for the wider rural area and employment. Consequently, it is submitted that appropriate villages in less sensitive locations in the Green Belt may be appropriate for peripheral expansion.</p> <p>For the reasons stated in response to Questions 3 and 5, it is submitted that the only settlement in the Green Belt where peripheral expansion would be appropriate is Yarnfield.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues, including Major Developed Sites, will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Staffordshire Police</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>As a general principle, it is considered that Green Belt villages should not be considered for peripheral expansion. However, it is also recognised that some villages in the Green Belt are the more sustainable and provide services for the wider rural area and employment. Consequently, it is submitted that appropriate villages in less sensitive locations in the Green Belt may be appropriate for peripheral expansion.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>National Trust</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Mr A Barnes for Stone Rural Parish Council</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Cllr A Bevington</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No - In some cases this may be appropriate &amp; should be considered.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Councillor Mrs J E Tabernor</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Mr P Bourne</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> No  Where appropriate peripheral expansion should be considered - widening of the RDB's is an option where land is immediately available and where the settlement services, facilities and infrastructure can support it. Growth to all settlements will be required at sometime and therefore peripheral expansion is a necessity to meet the Governments requirements for new housing developments.
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Mr J Wood</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> No  Where appropriate peripheral expansion should be considered - widening of the RDB's is an option where land is immediately available and where the settlement services, facilities and infrastructure can support it. Growth to all settlements will be required at sometime and therefore peripheral expansion is a necessity to meet the Governments requirements for new housing development.

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Mr R Bell</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Where appropriate peripheral expansion should be considered - widening of the RDB's is an option where land is immediately available and where the settlement services, facilities and infrastructure can support it. Growth to all settlements will be required at sometime and therefore peripheral expansion is a necessity to meet the Governments requirements for new housing developments.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Mr S Beck on behalf of Fulford Parish Council</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Development should be possible in exceptional circumstances and where any development would enhance the settlement.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	

<p><b>Cllr. J A Russell</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Many of the settlements are already in very narrow greenbelts. Any development will be harmful. It is accepted that there could be more intensive use of land within the rdb.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt</p>	
<p><b>Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o King Sturge</b></p>	<p>We acknowledge that there will be capacity for smaller scale development in settlements elsewhere within the Borough (as set out in the proposed settlement groupings) to maintain or improve their socio economic vitality. However, development in these areas should not undermine the potential for maximising the use of land within and on the periphery of Stafford to enable the most sustainable pattern of development.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Accepted. The scale and location of development across the Borough and at Stafford will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. In July 2008 Stafford was announced as a 'New Growth Point'.</p>	
<p><b>Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>See response to para 3.8 and Q2 and para 3.6.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.	
<b>Mrs C Westwood</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Mr M Lunn</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Mr Boughey for Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Cannock Chase District Council</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes  Agree that settlements located within or adjacent to the Green Belt should not be expanded, except for affordable housing exception sites. This includes most of the area north of the Cannock Chase boundary that also has Area of Natural Beauty status including Brocton and land near Colwich. Only the area north of Rugeley is not protected by this policy. Any development that would damage areas with environmental protection designations including the Cannock Chase SAC should be avoided:  <u>Cannock Chase SAC Appropriate Assessment</u> Stafford Borough Council and Cannock Chase Council have prepared jointly a screening report, June 2007, to help determine whether an Appropriate Assessment of our Local Development Frameworks in relation to the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation, is

	<p>required under the European Directive 92/43/EEC (The Habitats Directive). A Habitats Regulations Assessment is the requirement that Local Authorities and Regional Planning Bodies (RPBs) should consider whether projects or plans, as part of land use planning documents, will have adverse affects on Natura 2000 Sites (also known as European Sites), which includes SAC sites.</p> <p>Cannock Chase SAC lies both within Stafford Borough Council and Cannock Chase District. The purpose of the Habitats Regulations Assessment is to assess the impacts of land-use plans and projects against the conservation objections of a Natura 2000 site and to ascertain whether there will be an adverse affect on the integrity of the site. If significant effects are identified by the assessment, alternative plan options need to be examined. In October 2007, the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Phase Two Revision of the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy was published. This indicated that due to particular pressure on the Cannock Chase SAC in the context of additional housing being likely to increase local traffic and air pollution, further studies may be required.</p> <p>A working group has been formed involving Stafford Borough, Cannock Chase District, Lichfield District, South Staffordshire District and Staffordshire County Councils, together with Natural England to progress this matter and discussions are currently being held with the West Midlands Regional Assembly.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b>  The settlement scores set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document are based on the existing services and facilities. The scale and location of new development will be considered in the context of a wide range of factors such as infrastructure, employment and environment and physical constraints through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009, not just existing services and facilities.</p>	
<p><b>Messrs P and D Ricketts</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>I do not agree with this question. Settlements located within or adjacent to Green Belt should be considered for development if they meet the essential conditions ie non flooding etc</p>



**Officer Response**

Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.

**Question 5 Do you agree that the settlements are identified in the appropriate group? If not please identify the settlement and give reasons**

**Clr R Greatrex,  
Gnosall Parish  
Council**

This question is totally flawed. We are being asked to judge other areas, villages and hamlets that are out of area area and we have no knowledge thereof

**Officer Response**

No change

**Mr Stubbs**

**Do you agree?**

Yes

Save for those settlements in the Green Belt which should be removed from the groups given that there are other settlements capable of accommodating development. There are no exceptional reasons for moving the Green Belt boundaries.

**Officer Response**

Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt

<p><b>Mr &amp; Mrs Swinnerton</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Save for those settlements in the Green Belt which should be removed from the groups given that there are other settlements capable of accommodating development. There are no exceptional reasons for moving the Green Belt boundaries.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt.</p>	
<p><b>Aragon Land and Planning</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>The small settlements that have the green belt drawn tightly around them should not be considered for development.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Green Belt issues will be considered in relation to the scale and location of new development and the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide further clarification in relation to settlements affected by the Green Belt</p>	
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>It is considered that the settlements of Barlaston, Blythe Bridge, Meir Heath and Rough Close should not be included in Group 1. These settlements are all located immediately adjacent to or near the Stoke-on-Trent urban area. In such locations the Green Belt fulfils a</p>

	<p>number of important functions, including preventing the unrestricted sprawl of the urban area and preventing its coalescence with neighbouring settlements. In the case of Barlaston, the Green Belt also protects and safeguards its historic character and setting. None of the settlements fulfils any significant service centre function for the rural area in the north of the Borough.</p> <p>It is therefore submitted that these settlements should not be allowed to expand into the present Green Belt. Consequently, as there will be no opportunities for significant greenfield development, these settlements should not be included either in Group 1 or Group 2. They should properly be included in Group 3.</p> <p>Brocton is not only within the Green Belt, it is also within the AONB. Any significant level of development in this location would have an impact on the AONB and ought therefore, not to be allowed. Consequently, Brocton should, be made a Group 3 village.</p> <p>Tittensor is within the Green Belt in a highly accessible location to Stoke-on-Trent. It is considered that the Green Belt in this area should be protected in order to support the regeneration of Stoke-on-Trent. Tittensor should be made a Group 3 settlement.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The settlement scores set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document are based on the existing services and facilities. The scale and location of new development will be considered in the context of a wide range of factors such as infrastructure, employment and environment and physical constraints through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009, not just existing services and facilities. Categorisation alone will not mean settlements are suitable for development.</p>	
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Lord Stafford's Estates</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>It is considered that the settlements of Barlaston, Blythe Bridge, Meir Heath and Rough Close should not be included in Group 1. These settlements are all located immediately adjacent to or near the Stoke-on-Trent urban area. In such locations the Green Belt fulfils a number of important functions, including preventing the unrestricted sprawl of the urban area and preventing its coalescence with neighbouring settlements. In the case of Barlaston, the Green Belt also protects and safeguards its historic character and setting. None of the settlements fulfils any significant service centre function for the rural area in the north of the Borough.</p>

It is therefore submitted that these settlements should not be allowed to expand into the present Green Belt. Consequently, as there will be no opportunities for significant greenfield development, these settlements should not be included either in Group 1 or Group 2. They should properly be included in Group 3.

Yarnfield and Hixon, although presently benefiting from a more limited range of local services and facilities than the settlements included in Group 1, do have the advantage of significant areas of local employment. Yarnfield is within the Green Belt area but an alteration of the Green Belt boundary would not lead to any coalescence with other settlements or appreciable diminishment of the surrounding open countryside.

It is submitted that these settlements are suitable to accommodate significant greenfield development and should therefore be included in Group 1.

Brocton is not only within the Green Belt, it is also within the AONB. Any significant level of development in this location would have an impact on the AONB and ought therefore, not to be allowed. Consequently, Brocton should, be made a Group 3 village.

Tittensor is within the Green Belt in a highly accessible location to Stoke-on-Trent. It is considered that the Green Belt in this area should be protected in order to support the regeneration of Stoke-on-Trent. Tittensor should be made a Group 3 settlement.

As a result of these considerations, and the responses to Question 3, the settlements should be assigned to the Groups in the following manner:-

Group 1:-

Eccleshall; Gnosall; Great and Little Haywood; Hixon; Yarnfield.

Group 2:-

Derrington; Great Bridgeford; Haughton; Swynnerton; Weston; Woodseaves.

	<p>Group 3:-</p> <p>Aston by Stone; Barlaston; Blythe Bridge; Brocton and Brocton A34; Church Eaton; Clayton; Cotes Heath; Meir Heath and Rough Close; Milford; Tittensor.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The settlement scores set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document are based on the existing services and facilities. The scale and location of new development will be considered in the context of a wide range of factors such as infrastructure, employment and environment and physical constraints through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009, not just existing services and facilities. Categorisation alone will not mean settlements are suitable for development.</p>	
<p><b>Mr R Gough on behalf of Staffordshire Police</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>It is considered that the settlements of Barlaston, Blythe Bridge, Meir Heath and Rough Close should not be included in Group 1. These settlements are all located immediately adjacent to or near the Stoke-on-Trent urban area. In such locations the Green Belt fulfils a number of important functions, including preventing the unrestricted sprawl of the urban area and preventing its coalescence with neighbouring settlements. In the case of Barlaston, the Green Belt also protects and safeguards its historic character and setting. None of the settlements fulfils any significant service centre function for the rural area in the north of the Borough.</p> <p>It is therefore submitted that these settlements should not be allowed to expand into the present Green Belt. Consequently, as there will be no opportunities for significant greenfield development, these settlements should not be included either in Group 1 or Group 2. They should properly be included in Group 3.</p> <p>Yarnfield and Hixon, although presently benefiting from a more limited range of local services and facilities than the settlements included in Group 1, do have the advantage of significant areas of local employment. Yarnfield is within the Green Belt area but an alteration of the Green Belt boundary would not lead to any coalescence with other settlements or appreciable diminishment of the</p>

surrounding open countryside.

It is submitted that these settlements are suitable to accommodate significant greenfield development and should therefore be included in Group 1.

Brocton is not only within the Green Belt, it is also within the AONB. Any significant level of development in this location would have an impact on the AONB and ought therefore, not to be allowed. Consequently, Brocton should, be made a Group 3 village.

Tittensor is within the Green Belt in a highly accessible location to Stoke-on-Trent. It is considered that the Green Belt in this area should be protected in order to support the regeneration of Stoke-on-Trent. Tittensor should be made a Group 3 settlement.

As a result of these considerations, and the responses to Question 3, the settlements should be assigned to the Groups in the following manner:-

Group 1:-

Eccleshall; Gnosall; Great and Little Haywood; Hixon; Yarnfield.

Group 2:-

Derrington; Great Bridgeford; Haughton; Swynnerton; Weston; Woodseaves.

Group 3:-

Aston by Stone; Barlaston; Blythe Bridge; Brocton and Brocton A34; Church Eaton; Clayton; Cotes Heath; Meir Heath and Rough Close; Milford; Tittensor.

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
<p>The settlement scores set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document are based on the existing services and facilities. The scale and location of new development will be considered in the context of a wide range of factors such as infrastructure, employment and environment and physical constraints through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009, not just existing services and facilities. Categorisation alone will not mean settlements are suitable for development.</p>	
<b>National Trust</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>Given the one-dimensional approach to the assessment, we cannot be confident that any settlement is in the right group. We have specific concerns at the potential for significant peripheral expansion of Great Haywood and Little Haywood to harm the setting of the grade I registered historic park of Shugborough which is in the Trust's protective ownership.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
<p>The settlement scores set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document are based on the existing services and facilities. The scale and location of new development will be considered in the context of a wide range of factors such as infrastructure, employment and environment and physical constraints through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009, not just existing services and facilities. Categorisation alone will not mean settlements are suitable for development.</p>	
<b>Mrs L Bricknell</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Mrs J Hill for Ranton Parish Council</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>

<p><b>Mr A Barnes for Stone Rural Parish Council</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b> Yes</p>
<p><b>Cllr A Bevington</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b> No</p> <p>Two points again, Eccleshall as a self sufficient town should be outside of the village groupings completely.</p> <p>Some smaller settlements may be ripe for expansion ie Yarnfield where the planned development of the old BT facility will change things fundamentally.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b> The settlement scores set out in the Principles for Settlement Development document are based on the existing services and facilities. The scale and location of new development will be considered in the context of a wide range of factors such as infrastructure, employment and environment and physical constraints through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009, not just existing services and facilities. Green Belt issues, including Major Developed Sites, will be considered in the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide greater clarification with regards to settlements affected by the Green Belt.</p>	
<p><b>McDyre and Co on behalf of J F Bostock Settlement</b></p>	<p>J F Bostock Settlement Ltd consider that Hyde Lea should be moved from Group 3 to Group 2. The point score for the village is 7, but we calculate this as 13, which would put it into the Group 2 category. The Council's assessment of services and facilities understates the education facility, the bus service and the recreational areas for the village.</p> <p>Burton Manor Grammar School should be awarded 3 points, not 1. With regard to bus services, beside the no. 77 listed in the Principles for Settlement Development Document, Travel Line advises us that there is a no. 8 service from Burton Manor which provides a service to Stafford every 8 minutes. The point score therefore should be 4 points for this service, not 1. With regard to</p>



informal recreational area, the Burton Manor site provides tennis courts, bowling green and pitch for Burton Manor Sports Association on land purchased from J F Bostock Settlement Ltd. The point score here should be at least 2.

In summary, the point score should be 13 not 7 as follows:-

General Store - 1

Pub - 1

Education Facility - 3

Bus Service - 4

Village Hall - 1

Mobile Library - 1

Informal Recreation - 2

Total - 13

13 points would place the village in Group 2 where it rightfully belongs. In any event Hyde Lea should be promoted to Group 2 because of its close proximity to Stafford Urban Area. Within comfortable cycling and walking distance as well as by bus, there are several facilities in the Rising Brook area of Stafford just on the other side of M6 motorway from

Hyde Lea, including:-

Primary School

Large Post Office

Co-op Store

Food Takeaway

Newsagents

Chemists (2)

Butcher

Launderette

In summary, Hyde Lea is an extremely sustainable settlement and inappropriate for designation in Group 3. J F Bostock Settlement Ltd request that Hyde Lea be moved into the Group 2 category of villages.

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
No change is proposed to the categorisation of Hyde Lea.	
<b>Mr P Bourne</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Mr J Wood</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Mr R Bell</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Mr S Beck on behalf of Fulford Parish Council</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b> Yes
<b>Mr A Pym on behalf of Mr J Lloyd</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b>  No  Hixon. The assessment of settlements identifies all the services available in Hixon and they are substantial, but no credit is given for the benefit of the employment opportunities on the various industrial estates. This should be amended and the settlement should be reclassified in Group 1. It should be identified for additional housing development in preference to other centres where jobs are not available locally.  To the extent that better services should be provided, the presence of both homes and workplaces should encourage greater provision; where settlements have only homes and rely on travel away for work and for some services, it is less likely that new

	<p>facilities will be provided.</p> <p>Hixon has a population similar to Barlaston and Great Haywood, and is larger than Blythe Bridge. In all respects the planning policy for Stafford Borough should aim to achieve a sustainable community at Hixon, with increased development.</p> <p>The score for Hixon is set at 19, but it seems that it should be 20 (or 21):</p> <p>2 general stores, 1 non-food shop and a post office = 2 (or 3); 3 educational facilities = 4; hourly bus service = 3; village hall = 1; church = 1; 2 pubs = 2; mobile library service = 1; 4 recreational facilities = 2; population of 1713 = 4.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Accepted that the balance of housing and employment should be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended with regards to the score for Hixon, which now lies in Group 1.</p>	
<p><b>Dr Malcolm Bell Ltd</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Those in Group 1 appear appropriate at this time</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>No change</p>	
<p><b>Moore Family Trust</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Mr M Lunn</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>

<b>Mr Boughey for Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council</b>	<b>Do you agree?</b>  Yes
<b>Cannock Chase District Council</b>	<p>The designation of Great and Little Haywood on the A51 in Group 1 allowing settlement boundary changes to accommodate significant Greenfield development (except in the Green Belt) could potentially be of concern to us as they are the nearest named settlements in this grouping to our district. They would be far enough away from Rugeley not to cause concern if development was controlled and potentially take development pressure off the Greenbelt/AONB area of Rugeley. Controlled expansion together with the proposals in the Lichfield Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment could support development to the eastern side of Rugeley in a positive way. The main concerns would be if Stafford and Stone as principle settlements could not absorb enough development resulting in too greater expansion of the next tier (Group 1) settlements. We would also request a more detailed definition of what significant development might mean in respect of housing numbers/development area/etc.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The location and scale of new development will be considered through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009.</p>	
<b>Messrs P and D Ricketts</b>	<p>Some settlements could have been selected into a different group. Brocton should not be considered with Derrington, Woodseaves, Yarnfield, Great Bridgeford, Hixon, Oulton, Weston, Swynnerton, Haughton because they are quite a distance from Stafford Town Centre. Brocton is not it is only 1 mile from Stafford. Brocton should be considered with settlements Milford, Hyde Lea, Hopton. This will then create a (nucleus) an essential part around the centre of Stafford which is meant to receive additions of development. The eastern bypass can then be determined.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended in terms of settlement scoring and groupings.</p>	

<p><b>Mrs A Crane, Sustainability Matters in Stafford Borough</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Paragraph 3.9</b></p>	
<p><b>Aragon Land and Planning</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>The small settlements that have the green belt drawn tightly around them should not be considered for development.</p>
<p><b><u>Officer Response</u></b></p> <p>Green Belt issues, including Major Developed Sites, will be considered in the context of national and regional planning policy through the Core Strategy, scheduled for consultation in Spring 2009. The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to provide greater clarification with regards to settlements affected by the Green Belt.</p>	
<p><b>Councillor Mrs J E Tabernor</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No. I don't agree with Great Haywood and Little Haywood should be in the first group because Little Haywood hasn't enough facilities and there are sewage problems in all the villages.</p>

<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
The Principles for Settlement Development document has been amended to show Great Haywood and Little Haywood & Colwich separately. Both Great Haywood and Little Haywood & Colwich have sufficient services and facilities to warrant their grouping. Information regarding water resources and infrastructure is being sought from the Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water.	
<b>Cllr. J A Russell</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>It was a pity the compilers did not consult Barlaston residents about separating Barlaston Park from the main Barlaston area. Councillors have always tried to unite the communities - not separate them.</p> <p>In the case of Meir Heath and Rough Close the assessment does not take account of the dependence of residents on facilities in the City. There is no Health Centre or chemist at Meir Heath and access by car is essential. These are not sustainable communities.</p>
<b><u>Officer Response</u></b>	
No change	
<b>Mr A Preece</b>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Section 4- next steps</b>	
<b>ACORUS Wolverhampton</b>	<p>I would like the Council to consider the recently published content of The Taylor Review as part of the review of the Principles for Settlement Development.</p> <p>Identifying smaller settlements as non-sustainable merely lock the inhabitants in to an unsustainable location and could prevent the opportunity arising for communities to become economically and socially diverse and vibrant.</p>

The Prime Minister asked Matthew Taylor, MP for Truro and St Austell, to conduct a review on how land use and planning can better support rural business and deliver affordable housing.

This Review was presented to Government on 23 July 2008.

As part of the Review a Call for Evidence was launched seeking the views from a wide range of stakeholders, and ran for 12 weeks from 17 December 2007 to 7 March 2008. This generated a total of 278 submissions from organisations and individuals across the country.

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/livingworkingcountryside>

**Officer Response**

Any change in Government policy will be reflected in the Core Strategy or related Local Development Document.

**Appendix 1: Principles for Settlement Development – Scoring**

<p><b>Sport England</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>With regard to sport etc. what will be the score if a settlement has 4 facilities? It seems to fall between two stools in the scoring system.</p>
-----------------------------	--

**Officer Response**

Accepted. The scoring in relation to sport facilities has been amended. This amendment does not alter any of the settlement scores.

APPENDIX 4 – SUMMARY OF RESPONSES & OFFICER RESPONSES (ACTION)  
DELIVERING THE PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH – ISSUES & OPTIONS

**CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION**

---

1. Introduction

1 response (Simpson) – Objection to Stone options for development SN-1 due to traffic, flooding, local character, housing needed & green areas

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stone development locations discussion.

1.1 1 response (Jones) – Objection to Little & Great Haywood options for development due to lack of services & facilities, lack of public transport, impact on local character and biodiversity

ACTION: Noted & refer to Little & Great Haywood development locations discussion.

1.2 1 response (Mrs P MacDonald) – Objection to Gnosall options for development due to traffic congestion & impact on local roads, limited facilities and flooding issues

ACTION: Noted & refer to Gnosall development locations discussion.

1.3 No responses

1.4 4 responses

Mr Larkin – Objection to Little Haywood options for development due to medical facilities, flooding, traffic & local character

ACTION: Noted & refer to Little Haywood development locations discussion.

Staffordshire Badger Conservation Group – planning system to continue to support protected species

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Chapter 9 Environment / Nature Conservation policy, supporting sections and national policy context.

Mr R Miller – Wish to see Haywood objections and supports grouped together

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 8 – Great & Little Haywood.

Mr & Mrs Turner – Objection to Little Haywood options for development due to flooding, access, lack of services & facilities, local character

ACTION: Noted & refer to Little Haywood development locations discussion.

1.5 1 response (First City for Evans, Stott & Boote families) – Support delivery of new development to the east of Stafford on client's land north of Tixall Road. Requirement to amend references to SF-3 as not highly sensitive to landscape, flood or biodiversity. SF-4 & SF-10 in floodplain whilst SF-8 impact on setting of Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Evaluation and review land use delivery elements of the Sustainable Community Strategies for quality of life and new services



/ facilities. Vision and key objectives to be locally distinctive by focussing on positive managed change and certainty with 8 objectives suggested covering local character and identity, the environment, high quality development, housing delivery, employment provision, services and facilities, town centre vitality and viability, and sustainable modes of transport to manage future travel demands. Measures including choice for local transport networks. Support for positive development-led Vision and urban extension east of Stafford. Query scale of development to rural areas beyond local need through Option C being contrary to RSS thus supporting Option A in sustainable locations, using existing infrastructure, mixed use areas and Greenfield locations. Core strategy to identify edge of Stafford new development to broad locations and strategic sites. SF-3 is a strategic, comprehensive and sustainable location for housing, eastern distributor road and open space supported by access to sustainable transport modes, existing infrastructure, services and facilities, and limited impact on open countryside and landscape. Object to identification of land south of Stafford with lack of cross-border support, loss of countryside, lack of services and facilities. Focus on land east of Stafford to support growth with minima figures applied from the RSS.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stafford development locations discussion.

## **CHAPTER 2 – SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGIES**

---

### 2. Sustainable Community Strategies

1 response (Mr J Francis) – Comment about less engaging Police Force, loss of historic environment and lack of new road provision

ACTION: Noted & refer comments to the Policy & Improvement Team

#### 2.1 No response received

#### 2.2 4 responses received

1 response (Jones) – question increased house-building in context of climate change. Question rural development at the Haywoods with no rail link and loss of green assets undermining climate change.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development location discussion

1 response (Mrs Greenhalgh) – Stating climate change requires a proactive response and question increased house-building prior to other solutions (i.e. use existing stock). Link new housing to sustainable transport solutions and lower carbon emissions.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 – Climate Change policy and background context.

1 response (Hine) – reference to reducing greenhouse gas emissions is required through new infrastructure and development

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 – Climate Change policy and background context.

1 response (J Smith) – criticism of jargon wording and lack of plain English which reduces credibility

ACTION: Noted & refer comments to Policy & Improvement Team.

### 2.3 8 responses received

1 response (Mr D'Arcy) – All new build housing should be equipped with sustainability and renewable energy technologies to address climate change

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 – Renewable Energy / Design policy and background context.

1 response (Mr R Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – The vision statements set out neglect to include the important and fundamental objective of ensuring that all households are provided with an adequate standard of housing to meet their needs. It is submitted that this aim should be included in the vision.

ACTION: Noted & refer comments to Policy & Improvement Team

1 response (Jones) – Objection to development at the Haywoods due to increased car use, lack of public transport links, lack of employment and loss of greenfields.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion

1 response (Sport England) – Support ambition for healthier lifestyles.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Allen) – Lack of bus services from Eccleshall to transport hubs in Stafford including proposed Park & Ride prevents use. ACTION: Noted & refer to Eccleshall development locations discussion and associated infrastructure

1 response (Mr Baldwin) – Objection to further development at Stone due to traffic pressures, empty homes and loss of community character

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stone development locations discussion

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Lack of commitment to low carbon future / climate change. Support protection of open spaces as opposed to increased economic growth and urbanisation.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 – Climate Change / Environment policy and background context.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Public transport provision from / to Stone should be increased. Provide for greater waste collection capacity.

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Stone development locations discussion and provide comments to Environment & Health Services

#### 2.4 9 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Questions environment with new development. Questions green tourism to dormer towns. Oppose development at Haywoods on lack of bus service, waste disposal and flooding.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (National Trust) – Welcome support for historic environment and action on climate change but question lack of reference to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 – Climate Change / Environment policy and background context.

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – Support Stafford vision.

ACTION: Noted

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Support the vision.

ACTION: Noted

1 response (Messrs Hartley) – Support for Vision and new development proposed by Trent Vision Trust for Stone. Question the 15 year timescale for the Plan to 2031 rather than 2026.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stone development locations discussion in the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy Plan period.

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Support visions but too much economic emphasis and lack of environmental considerations. New housing development through the LDF will be in conflict with the Sustainable Community Strategies, currently being achieved at Eccleshall.

ACTION: Refer comments to Policy & Improvement Team & consider through Eccleshall development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr R Gough for Lord Stafford) – The vision statements set out neglect to include the important and fundamental objective of ensuring that all households are provided with an adequate standard of housing to meet their needs. It is submitted that this aim should be included in the vision.

ACTION: Noted & refer comments to Policy & Improvement Team

1 response (Mr R Gough for Staffordshire Police) – The vision statements set out neglect to include the important and fundamental objective of ensuring that all households are provided with an adequate standard of housing to meet their needs. It is submitted that this aim should be included in the vision.

ACTION: Noted & refer comments to Policy & Improvement Team

1 response (Stafford SDVS Mr Allen) – LDF should support improved accommodation for the Third Sector to deliver better services to citizens. LDF to acknowledge Third Sector as partner within LSP.

ACTION: Noted.

### **CHAPTER 3 – SPATIAL VISION & KEY OBJECTIVES**

---

#### **3. The Plan for Stafford Borough – Spatial Vision & Key Objectives**

1 response (Mr J Francis) – Object to scale of central Government intervention in the local Development Plan.

ACTION: Noted

#### **3.1 1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – A comprehensive assessment of need is required to differentiate between rural areas, led by local people.**

ACTION: Noted

#### **3.2 3 responses received**

1 response (Jones) – Focus new development on Stafford and Stone due to level of services and facilities. Other areas will increase car use.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy discussion.

1 response (Mr Allen) – Make reference to increased sporting areas (i.e. Gnosall)

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Norton) – Historic environment to be protected, focus on brownfield rather than Greenfield, provide employment but monitor new development deliverables.

ACTION: Noted.

### 3.3 3 responses received

1 response (Mr D'Arcy) – Focus development on urban areas rather than medium & small scale villages.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Baldwin) – Stone to retain character and not increase in size which may lead to crime and increased diversity.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stone development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Objection to new development in Stone due to lack of social infrastructure provision and market town character.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stone development locations discussion.

### 3.4 4 responses received

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Choice of rural life for countryside and community with less services. Avoid villages reverting to suburbs

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Jones) – Rural locations already have adequate housing mix. Where is the new demand for additional housing? No demographic change in population.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Miss Currivan) – Objection to increased development at Little Haywood due to loss of rural character, lack of services & facilities, transport implications.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Little Haywood development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Increase public transport to rural areas

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 – Transport policy and background context.

### 3.5 17 responses

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Make reference to Barlaston for new housing development due to level of services & facilities, major employment at Meaford.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Amend final bullet point to make reference to infill development of smaller villages to support services & facilities.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (National Trust) – End of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph add words “and contributing to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions”.

ACTION: Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of Vision to reflect wording given.

1 response (British Waterways – Wales & Border Counties) – Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point to read “preserve or enhance the local character of the town with its canal side vistas...” Also the final paragraph to be reworded to support tourism related development “The... Green Belt... will not have had any significant development negatively affecting their local character or openness”

ACTION: Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point to read “preserve and enhance the local character of the town with its canal side vistas...” No change to final paragraph

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – Support for Stafford vision.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support for vision.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Messrs Hartley) – Support for vision but greater emphasis on improved provision of tourism related, leisure & recreational development.

ACTION: Amend 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph to include the words “... making Stafford attractive to local residents and tourists.” Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph to include the words “... and tourists to visit through improved tourist related developments.”

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Lack of logic in terms of Eccleshall services and facilities meeting rural hinterland needs but would need expansion if new development took place.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Jones) – Vision statement does not fit with lack of employment. Objection to the Haywoods increased housing development.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Support new services & facilities in the Haywoods, protection of the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), Stafford providing for unmet need of Cannock Chase District, biodiversity enhancement, service provision & affordable housing. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England) – Support for vision particularly Cannock Chase AONB, climate change initiatives & green infrastructure assets.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Kirby) – Object to new Greenfield development in larger villages but support small scale affordable housing for local need

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Dale) – Object to increased housing development at Hixon due to lack of infrastructure and previous developments.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Hixon development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Dale) – Question the provision of services and facilities for increased use of Ministry of Defence land.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Miss Simpson) – Object to loss of village character for the Haywoods and Hixon.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Object to housing and employment development in the villages due to loss of character and environment.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Object to increased housing and employment at Stone. Existing services and facilities should be improved

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stone development locations discussion.

#### Key Objectives – 2 responses

1 response (Mr Francis) – New employment land and an improved road / public transport network should be delivered alongside new housing development.

ACTION: Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of vision with words "... an improved road and public transport network ...".

1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel) – Support scale of development at Stafford town with significant housing accessible to high quality employment but not necessarily research & development.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stafford development locations discussion.

### 3.6 5 responses

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – Greater level of housing development should be directed to Stafford town due to Growth Point.

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Development Strategy approach in the context of RSS figures for Stafford town.

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Will Stafford Borough Council dispute higher growth scenario and support citizens.

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Development Strategy approach in the context of RSS figures with the Council engaging in the process to oppose higher growth numbers.

1 response (Jones) – Question housing figures in light of economic downturn, numbers of empty homes, justification of need. Focus development on urban areas with transport links and employment.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Francis) – Concern about level of infrastructure required and question immigration approach with no inward investment

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Francis) – Question need for housing, quality of local economy, support University links and protection of Cannock Chase AONB + Green Belt. Transport problems to south of Stafford town.

ACTION: Noted.

### 3.7 14 responses

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Support Vision and main focus of development to Stafford.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (National Trust) – One of the objectives for development at Stone should be safeguarding the landscape setting of the town. Also the objectives for development in the villages should include protecting their character and settings. Increased environmental performance should occur on strategic sites and greenhouse gas emissions reduced. Reference is needed to affordable housing on larger sites.

ACTION: Amend objectives to include the following “safeguard and enhance the landscape setting”. Chapter 9 to include policy on strategic site delivery and Housing preferred policy as well as background context.

1 response (Mr Clegg) – Object to Stone new development to support North Staffordshire conurbation. Question how major infrastructure will be delivered through developer contribution and new health centre.



ACTION: Noted & refer to Stone development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support with flexibility for increased RSS development requirements. Hierarchy / phasing approach to employment development with focus on Stafford and Stone rather than less sustainable / accessible rural industrial estates. Affordable housing to be focused on higher order settlements rather than small villages due to location of services and facilities.

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Development Strategy approach & Chapter 9 – Affordable Housing preferred policy.

1 response (Messrs Hartley) – Support vision and reference to Stone with potential development proposals for Trent Valley area.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stone development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford) - Support with flexibility for increased RSS development requirements. Hierarchy / phasing approach to employment development with focus on Stafford and Stone rather than less sustainable / accessible rural industrial estates. Affordable housing to be focused on higher order settlements rather than small villages due to location of services and facilities.

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Development Strategy approach & Chapter 9 – Affordable Housing preferred policy.

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Support with flexibility for increased RSS development requirements. Hierarchy / phasing approach to employment development with focus on Stafford and Stone rather than less sustainable / accessible rural industrial estates. Affordable housing to be focused on higher order settlements rather than small villages due to location of services and facilities.

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Development Strategy approach & Chapter 9 – Affordable Housing preferred policy.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Support green infrastructure links between Stafford and Cannock Chase AONB. Support new infrastructure and improved services for rural housing development as well as specific employment uses. Biodiversity and environment supported. Affordable housing to meet rural local needs.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England) – Strong support for Stafford & Stone new green infrastructure (30-40% of new developable areas). Support Trent Valley multi-functional space and suggest same for Penk Valley in Stafford. Support Biodiversity Enhancement Zones & new habitats.

ACTION: Amend to include new objective for Stone reflecting the existing objective for Stafford related to River Sow & Penk.

1 response (McDyre for Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd) – Support objective for increased rural employment via renewable energy but expand to new housing development at Raleigh Hall, link to Eccleshall.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Raleigh Hall development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Kirby) – Question regarding existing commitments and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) sites to be taken into account, need for additional rural employment land and scale of housing to smaller villages.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Sport England) – Significant new housing development at Stafford to be supported by new sport infrastructure which is not mentioned in the document despite PPG17 Assessment and draft Staffordshire Sport Strategy.

ACTION: Amend 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point objectives for Stafford to make reference to new sport & recreation infrastructure. Chapter 9 to include a preferred policy – Open Space, Sport & Recreation.

1 response (Mr Smith) – Question the protected demand and need for new housing in context of current economic climate and demographic changes. Support new services & facilities in Stone and larger villages but not new housing development. Suggest new development on edge of Stoke-on-Trent and role / future link between Ministry of Defence land at Stafford with specialist industries.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Support for new marina development near Stone as well as tourism employment development and new facilities but not new housing which will exacerbate traffic problems .

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stone development locations discussion and Chapter 9 – Tourism preferred policy and background context.

## **CHAPTER 4 – SPATIAL PORTRAIT FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH**

---

### **4. Spatial Portrait for Stafford Borough – Stafford Borough area**

2 responses

1 response (Mr Francis) – The ageing population and its increasing needs must be planned for through appropriate development and supporting communities with associated services and facilities.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 Housing and Community Facilities preferred policies.

1 response (Mr Francis) – Car useage is significant in Stafford Borough’s rural area which needs to be considered in the new Plan.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 Transport preferred policy and background context.

4.1 2 responses

1 response (Jones) – There is a poor public transport network outside of Stafford and Stone in relation to the significant development proposed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach although influence is limited to liaison regarding the Staffordshire County Council Local Transport Plan.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Reference should be made to cross boundary working on the Cannock Chase AONB, housing provision & Habitat Regulations Assessment.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Development Strategy approach and Chapter 9 – Environment preferred policy and background context.

4.2 No responses received

4.3 1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Disagree that all hamlets & villages are linked economically to Stafford. Reference should be made to links with larger villages such as Gnosall & Eccleshall as well, with impact on capacity of services and facilities.

ACTION: Amend end of paragraph to include the words “... to other larger centres.”

4.4 1 response (Jones) – Questions the population growth when based on Census 2001 information and evenly spread out.

ACTION: Noted.

4.5 - 4.6 No responses received

4.7 1 response (McCarthy & Stone (Dev) Ltd) – National planning policy advice in PPS3 and the ‘Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods - A National Strategy for Housing in an Ageing Society’ in February 2008 sets the context for local planning policies to deliver specific accommodation and quality housing for older people. This should be based on robust evidence.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 Housing preferred policy and background context.

4.10 2 responses

1 response (Jones) – 2001 Census data to be revised in light of economic climate.

ACTION: Noted. A range of information informs Plan preparations.

1 response (Mr Norton) – Update the unemployment figures for Stafford Borough in the document due to the recession and economic climate.

ACTION: Noted. A range of data informs Plan preparations with the most up-to-date information sought for the document.

4.11 1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Note reference to Cannock Chase AONB, Green Belt and shared boundary.

ACTION: Noted.

4.12 3 responses

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Since 2001 the figure for home working in the County are likely to have increased which should be included.

ACTION: Noted. A range of data informs Plan preparations with the most up-to-date information sought for the document.

1 response (Jones) – Poor levels of public transport usage to be reflected in development locations. The Haywoods are mainly accessible by car and a limited bus service. Lack of employment will lead to greater car journeys if housing development takes place.

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Development Strategy approach and the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Allen) – Additional traffic would be generated and impact on Eccleshall with new development. Discount EC3, EC4 & EC5.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Eccleshall development locations discussion.

4.13 – 4.15 No responses received

Figure 4.1 – House prices

1 response (Jones) – Data needs to be updated in light of Bank of England & Government predictions.

ACTION: A range of data informs Plan preparations with the most up-to-date information sought for the document.

4.16 1 response (Mr Norton) – Update unemployment figures for Stafford Borough due to current economic climate.

ACTION: A range of data informs Plan preparations with the most up-to-date information sought for the document.

4.17 2 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Protect the farmland with brownfield land used first for new development.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach taking account of completions and commitments. Chapter 9 – Environment policy to support brownfield land development in context.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Protect local food production by avoiding Greenfield development to avoid security and climate change problems.

ACTION: Noted.

4.18 No responses received

4.19 1 response (Dr Oliver) – Avoid adverse development affecting biodiversity and important nature conservation sites.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach and Chapter 9 – Environment preferred policy.

4.20 1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Suggest the following change "... although some parts of Cannock Chase SAC extend into the Cannock Chase Council local authority area...".

ACTION: Amend paragraph to reflect this change.

4.21 1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – The planning approach to include compulsory mitigation strategies to support biodiversity and avoid surface landfill.

ACTION: Noted. Chapter 9 – Environment preferred policy and background context as well as Chapter 10 – Planning Obligations preferred policy approach.

4.22 – 4.23 No responses received

4.24 1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Agree to protect the historic environment but question how this is achieved with new housing development.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Historic Environment evidence base.

4.25 – 4.27 No responses received

4.28 2 responses received

1 response (Jones) – No widespread development at the Haywoods Conservation Areas.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Concern about new development affecting Haywoods Conservation Areas.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

4.29 No responses received.

4.30 2 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Concern about flooding issues being exacerbated in the Haywoods and impact on local roads so new housing development should not take place.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Concern about flooding issues and capacity of fields between the Haywoods absorbing rainfall and reducing run off speed into the river system.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

4.31 No responses received

4.32 1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Consideration of environmental significance between Stafford and Cop Mere in the new Plan.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 – Environment preferred policy and Water Resources / Flooding preferred policy approach.

4.33 1 response (Mr Clegg) – No new development should occur on flood plains or areas producing run off (i.e. SN-1 at Stone).

ACTION: Noted & refer to Stone development locations discussion.

4.34 1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – New development at Eccleshall will increase traffic problems through school children travel movements to Stafford and Stone as well as increasing rural inequality.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Eccleshall development locations discussion.

4.35 2 responses received

1 response (Jones) – The Haywoods have no sports facilities to support young people through the scale of new housing development.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion and Chapter 9 Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach.

1 response (Mr Allen) – Lack of sport facilities in Eccleshall which encourages greater car use.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Eccleshall development locations discussion and Chapter 9 Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach.

4.36 1 response (Mr D'Arcy) – Sports facilities will be inadequate if new housing development occurs.

ACTION: Refer to Chapter 9 – Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach.

4.37 – 4.38 No responses received

4.39 1 response (Sport England) – Issues of sport and recreation should be addressed by the Core Strategy, based on the finalised PPG17 Assessment and Strategies for the Borough area and Sub-Regional Sports Strategy as well as the implications of proposed new housing growth (see Excel spreadsheet).

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Development Strategy approach and Chapter 9 – Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach.

4.40 – 4.46 No responses received

4.47 1 response (British Waterways Wales & Border Counties) – Greater consideration given to moving freight using the canal network.

ACTION: Noted.

### **The County Town of Stafford**

4.48 No response received

4.49 2 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Population increases focused on sustainable centres.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Francis) – Better links between Stafford & rural areas. Stafford town needs a central bus station and Park & Ride system.

ACTION: Noted but limited influence & refer to Chapter 9 – Transport preferred policy approach.

4.50 1 response (Jones) – Stafford & Stone have good transport links. Development in other areas will increase car usage.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

4.51 – 4.54 No responses received

4.55 1 response (Jones) – Questions use of MOD land at Stafford for new development to avoid greenfield development

ACTION: Suggestion is not supported by Defence Estates.

4.56 No responses received

4.57 2 responses received

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Concern that Stafford District Hospital will be unable to deal with increased population and new housing development.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Dr Revell) – Disagree with previous comment. Stafford District Hospital is able to cope with increased population levels and support this medium-sized secondary health care trust with additional funding.

ACTION: Noted.

4.58 1 response (Sport England) – Culture and leisure have a significant role to play in improving physical and mental health. Clearly increasing levels of physical activity through sport and recreation has a major impact on improving health and sports facilities and green space, as well as green travel (walking and cycling) can help to deliver the plans vision.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach.



4.59 2 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Protect allotment sites.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach.

1 response (Sport England) – New provision on school sites to include community sports access.

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Chapter 9 – Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach as well as Chapter 10 – Planning Obligations. Relevant to strategic development locations in settlements

4.60 No responses received

### **The Market Town of Stone**

1 response (Mr Francis) – Object to new housing development at Stone due to implications for Stoke and creation of ribbon urbanisation.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

4.61 – 4.62 No responses received

### **Areas outside of Stafford & Stone**

4.63 – 4.64 No responses received

## **CHAPTER 5 – NATIONAL & REGIONAL POLICY**

---

5.1 2 responses

1 response (Jones) – Object to the Haywoods development due to lack of employment, increased car use and lack of national policy support.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Lunn) – Concern about the level of housing mix to deliver smaller housing units especially in smaller settlements to date which must be addressed by the new Plan. Object to significant new development at Woodseaves due to traffic pressures and access to services and facilities

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Development Strategy approach including Residential Development Boundaries, Woodseaves development locations discussion and Chapter 9 – Housing preferred policy approach.

- 5.2 1 response (Jones) – Strongly object to new development in the Haywoods due to lack of employment opportunities, increased car usage / traffic movements and lack of public transport. Question the delivery of a section of the Vision.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

- 5.3 6 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Question why the Borough Council has agreed to take the housing requirements, how is this justified on Census 2001 figures of fall in population levels, does it take account of the current economic climate and level of vacant properties?

ACTION: Noted. The new Plan must comply with the Regional Spatial Strategy and provide the local approach through the Development Strategy.

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – LDF to meet 12,100 new homes as a minimum to meet flexibility requirement of new planning system and avoid unsoundness.

ACTION: Noted. The new Plan must comply with the Regional Spatial Strategy and provide the local approach through the Development Strategy including phased delivery of new housing.

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – LDF to meet 12,100 new homes as a minimum to meet flexibility requirement of new planning system and avoid unsoundness.

ACTION: Noted. The new Plan must comply with the Regional Spatial Strategy and provide the local approach through the Development Strategy including phased delivery of new housing.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Mr Edwards) – Support scale of development for the Borough and Stafford town, although figures to be taken as a minima due to potential increase in housing numbers.

ACTION: Noted. The new Plan must comply with the Regional Spatial Strategy and provide the local approach through the Development Strategy including phased delivery of new housing.

1 response (Mr Lameris) – Future development should be focussed on sustainable locations with access to services and facilities supporting a critical population mass for economic viability, this being Stafford town as set out in the RSS. New

employment development supported at Stafford due to motorway links. Limited housing and employment development should be directed to Hixon as this is a less sustainable location.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Hixon development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Farmer) – Do not agree with the large numbers proposed with infrastructure not in place to cope leading to impacts on bin collections, traffic, sewerage etc... Support small number of affordable houses for younger couples. Oppose growth in the Haywoods which will take away village character and cause a long period of disruption. 500 new houses in the Haywoods will lead to an increase in population and loss of greenfields.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

#### 5.4 3 responses received

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Stafford to be focus for new housing with increased densities not likely to undermine local character and maximise land use.

ACTION: Noted and refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Jones) – Development to be focussed on areas with the ability to support it. The Haywoods is not such an area.

ACTION: Noted and refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Stafford to be the main focus for new development to avoid other settlements suffering a loss of character. Hixon is an exception due to its despoiled character.

ACTION: Noted and refer to Development Strategy approach.

#### 5.5 2 responses received

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Stafford Borough Council to support minimum growth scenario and challenge Government housing numbers. Growth Point bid will have a negative impact on smaller rural areas.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Jones) – Why was the increase accepted by the Borough?

ACTION: Noted. The new Plan must comply with the Regional Spatial Strategy and provide the local approach through the Development Strategy.

#### 5.6 No responses received

5.7 1 response (Jones) – Questions the level of need based on the population despite longer life expectancy.

ACTION: Noted. Amend to reflect the most up-to-date information regarding local need.

5.8 – 5.9 No responses received

5.10 2 responses

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Provision of housing to meet Cannock Chase unmet need to be at Stafford Growth Point, supported by Government.

ACTION: Noted. The new Plan must comply with the Regional Spatial Strategy and provide the local approach through the Development Strategy.

1 response (Mr Dale) – Questions the benefit of Growth Point to actual planning & delivery of growth.

ACTION: Noted.

## CHAPTER 6 – PREPARING THE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

---

3 responses

1 response (Jones) – The Haywoods maps not to scale or accurate with locations.

ACTION: Greater explanation at Preferred Approach consultations concerning use of maps.

1 response (Strawson Property) – Support Stafford as the main focus for new development.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Dale) – Hixon Ordnance Survey map was out of date.

ACTION: Greater explanation at Preferred Approach consultations concerning use of maps.

6.1 No responses received

6.2 2 responses

1 response (Jones) – Focus development on brownfield land rather than Greenfield cheaper alternatives.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach to phasing and Chapter 9 – Housing preferred policy in context of PPS3.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Oppose Green Belt development.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

6.3 3 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Support development at Stafford and Stone rather than in any other larger settlements proposed in the document.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Support development at Stafford, Stone and smaller sites to meet local need in other settlements not undermining local character and environment.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Object to new development in Stone due to impact on local character, education and health provision with current lack of public transport and retail facilities.

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Development Strategy approach and Stone development locations discussion.

6.4 - 6.5 No responses received

6.6 2 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Support use of brownfield rather than Greenfield sites so question why the Haywoods are proposed for new development.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Agree with using brownfield rather than Greenfield and protection of nature conservation assets.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

6.7 1 response (Jones) – Strongly object to the Haywoods development and coalescence of settlements with associated loss of character.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

6.8 – 6.9 No responses received

6.10 1 response (Jones) – Support focus of new development at Stafford due to sustainability aspects but scale of housing proposed elsewhere to be reviewed.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

6.11 1 response (Jones) – Support focus of new development at Stafford and Stone but scale of housing proposed elsewhere is too high.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

6.12 2 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Object to the Haywoods proposed development due to poor public transport and no employment opportunities, loss of green space, loss of character, unsuitability of access lanes for both construction and increased traffic

levels, lack of amenities to support a large population increase, and the risk to the villages and towns and villages downstream as flood risk increased.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Disagree that Eccleshall has good access to employment, traffic problems, lack of public transport and limited education provision to support community activities.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Eccleshall development locations discussion.

#### 6.13 2 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Focus new development at Stafford and Stone but housing numbers are excessive elsewhere.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Clegg) – Support option D with no new development at Stone due to impact on the North Staffordshire conurbation.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

#### 6.14 1 response (Jones) – Oppose option E due to poor public transport.

ACTION: Noted.

#### 6.15 3 responses received

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Support option C as the preferred option for Stafford Borough. New development for Rugeley is provided within Cannock Chase District and cross-border in Lichfield District.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Jones) – Little Haywood and Great Haywood are not suited to the large scale housing proposed due to poor access, poor public transport, risk of flooding, loss of green space, loss of character, lack of amenities to support population increase, environmental damage.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Dale) – Object to Hixon new development due to limited access roads, 1 full primary school, no garage, large housing estates and access roads without footpaths, no medical and dental surgery and limited public transport.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Hixon development locations discussion.

- 6.16 1 response (Jones) – Increased business space / vacancies in Stafford so update predictions & data required due to current economic climate.
- ACTION: Noted with the new Plan to comply with requirements set in the Regional Spatial Strategy.
- 6.17 1 response (Jones) – Question the sustainability of Option C due to increased car usage.
- ACTION: Noted, considered through the Sustainability Appraisal.
- 6.18 1 response (McDyre & Co for J F Bostock Settlement) – Support option C but wish Hyde Lea in higher settlement group from Group 3 to Group 2. Would support expansion of Hyde Lea, not just for a Rural Exception site which poorly delivers affordable housing when compared with market housing sites & a percentage of affordable homes. Hyde Lea settlement boundaries should be revised to provide for new development.
- ACTION: Noted but no change for Development Strategy settlements.
- 6.19 1 response (Jones) – Object to the Haywood new development due to no employment opportunities, environmental impact, lack of infrastructure, joining of Little & Great Haywood, and landscape destruction on the edge of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.
- 6.20 2 responses received
- 1 response (Jones) – New development at the Haywoods will increase flooding downstream such as Rugeley.
- ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion as well as Chapter 9 – Water preferred policy approach.
- 1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Support significant development at Group 1 settlements but consider implications on Rugeley, the Green Belt and the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty particularly at the Haywoods.
- ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.
- 6.21 1 response (McDyre & Co for Bassett Group Holdings Ltd) – Support Residential Development Boundary adjustments to accommodate new housing development particularly at Tittensor but the Major Developed Site to be replaced with a boundary adjustment.



ACTION: Noted but no change to Green Belt boundary.

#### 6.22 3 responses received

1 response (Mr Pert) – Support new development at Group 2 and 3 settlements through Residential Development Boundary adjustments to reduce impact of new development on larger settlements. This approach would support existing services and be sympathetic to character.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach concerning future of Residential Development Boundaries.

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Support small scale infill development at smaller settlements to support services & facilities.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach concerning future of Residential Development Boundaries.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – No significant development at Brocton away from the Green Belt and AONB is supported.

ACTION: Noted.

Table 6.1 1 response (Mr Lunn) – Question the approach to settlement inclusion in Groups 2 and 3, particularly proposed development options at Woodseaves and rationale at Derrington, Great Bridgeford and Cotes Heath based on sustainability and viability issues. Suggested that the criteria should be reviewed

ACTION: No change. Consider through Woodseaves development locations discussion and Development Strategy approach.

#### 6.23 5 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Agree with issues raised by Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) consultation in particular for the Haywoods so why are development options being considered to undermine character, lack of employment and leading to increased car use.

ACTION: Noted & refer to the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Agree with issues and wish LDF to take strong consideration.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Support the findings that major development could have a negative impact on the character of villages, the surrounding environment, traffic congestion and inadequate infrastructure capacity.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Lunn) – Support issues raised in previous consultation and question why development options put forward on large scale Greenfield sites rather than smaller areas, particularly loss of character, lack of facilities traffic and transport problems at Woodseaves and Cotes Heath.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Strongly support the summary.

ACTION: Noted.

6.24 – 6.25 No responses received

6.26 1 response (Jones) – Why is the SHLAA not taken into account?.

ACTION: Refer to Development Strategy approach concerning existing completions, commitments and SHLAA sites delivery.

6.27 No responses received

6.28 3 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Avoid Greenfield development in preference for brownfield land and use of empty homes.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 – Housing preferred policy in context of PPS3: Housing for national planning policy advice.

1 response (Jones) – Avoid Greenfield development in preference for brownfield land and use of empty homes.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Chapter 9 – Housing preferred policy in context of PPS3: Housing for national planning policy advice.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Support no significant Green Belt development and no new settlement.

ACTION: Noted.

6.29 5 responses received

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Broad support option C with appropriate distribution of development to larger settlements based on sustainable development principles, local opportunities and constraints.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Mr Edwards) – Support option C with particular focus on Stafford due to its sustainability credentials.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford) - Broad support option C with appropriate distribution of development to larger settlements based on sustainable development principles, local opportunities and constraints.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Broad support option C with appropriate distribution of development to larger settlements based on sustainable development principles, local opportunities and constraints.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates) – Support option C with exclusion of Stone placing undue pressure on smaller settlements to meet development requirements. Oppose option D.

ACTION: Noted.

6.30 No responses received

6.31 10 responses received

1 response (Mr Pert) – Support the continued use of Residential Development Boundaries to define where new development can occur. Greater local community engagement is required to avoid poor local design characteristics on new developments

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach concerning Residential Development Boundaries and Chapter 9 – Design preferred policy approach.

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – Support review of Residential Development Boundaries with brownfield sites on edge of Stafford prioritised over Greenfield sites.

ACTION: Noted. Refer to Development Strategy approach and Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (British Waterways Wales and Border Counties) – Housing and employment development to be focussed on larger settlements but tourism and leisure developments enabled elsewhere, whilst preserving visual amenity, to support canal network

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach as well as Chapter 9 – Tourism preferred policy approach.

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Agree with review of Residential Development Boundaries to support sustainable development.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support review of Residential Development Boundaries to reflect current and future planned development including employment areas to reflect potential re-use for housing in line with national planning

policy. Many small settlements should not have Residential Development Boundaries.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach including future application of Residential Development Boundaries.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Mr Edwards) – Support review of Residential Development Boundaries in order to meet scale of new development proposed for Stafford Borough.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford) – Support review of Residential Development Boundaries to reflect current and future planned development including employment areas to reflect potential re-use for housing in line with national planning policy. Many small settlements should not have Residential Development Boundaries.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach including future application of Residential Development Boundaries.

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Support review of Residential Development Boundaries to reflect current and future planned development including employment areas to reflect potential re-use for housing in line with national planning policy. Many small settlements should not have Residential Development Boundaries.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach including future application of Residential Development Boundaries.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Bassett Group Holdings Ltd) – Support review of Residential Development Boundaries in order to meet scale of new development proposed for Stafford Borough.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Robust evidence base to prove review of Residential Development Boundaries. Boundaries only moved to accommodate appropriate new development for the character and size of the existing settlement.

ACTION: Noted.

### 7. Development Strategy Scenarios & Spatial Options

42 responses

1 response (E M Hazeldine) – The residential development boundary for Ranton to include land at Butt Lane.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the review of Residential Development Boundaries

1 response (Residents of Great Bridgeford & Creswell) – Concern about speed and volume of traffic affecting Creswell and Great Bridgeford with need for reduced speed limits, volumes of traffic and junction improvements. Object to new housing at Eccleshall, Gnosall and Woodseaves as well as employment development of warehousing at Ladfordfields due to local traffic implications, particularly from Heavy Goods Vehicles, and limited job opportunities. Infrastructure must be delivered in advance of new housing including walking / cycle path, electricity and gas. More affordable housing should be delivered. Housing mix to create local community cohesion and be environmentally efficient. Object to traveller sites in the area with focus on brownfield sites in urban locations and strict conditions.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered in preparing the Preferred strategy approach.

1 response (Milwich & Fradswell Parish Council) – Character of rural villages to be maintained with access to services sustaining local communities. Small scale development in villages to meet local needs. Site specific affordable housing thresholds to be integrated in accessible locations. Support for rural economy and diversification minimising landscape impacts including high speed telecommunication. Support knowledge economy and limited extension of existing buildings for live / work units. Avoid loss of existing facilities and seek viability. Greater emphasis is needed on reducing commuting, climate change, support for agricultural development and protecting services & facilities. Issues concerning Milwich RDB and further infrastructure at Stone.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered in preparing the Preferred strategy approach.

1 response (Mrs Taylor) – Object to new housing development in the Haywoods within current economic climate due to impact on rural character and community life, flooding and sewage disposal, limited local shops, schools and medical services, parking problems, impact on local road network and lack of employment opportunities leading to increased commuting. **ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Cooke) – Object to new housing development in the Haywoods within current economic recession due to impact on rural character and community life, flooding and sewage disposal, limited local shops, and medical services, parking problems, impact on local road network including density and loss of open space.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Whiston) – Object to new housing development at Stone, question the numbers and impact of Government change, extra provision of leisure facilities and open space, level of regard given to local resident opposition.  
ACTION: Noted.

1 response (A Broster) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (R Clapham) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (T Forrester) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (K Clarke) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr Knight) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr Tippett) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mrs Kilkenny) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr Kilkenny) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Kinson) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mrs Maelem) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Miss Macham) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr Macham) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr Rhead) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr Everson) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.



1 response (G Grimes) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr F Forrester) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mrs Forrester) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (J Forrester) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr L Forrester) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (J M Humphreys) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (I J Forrester) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr Humphreys) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (D & N Raine) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (M Oakley) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr Oakley) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr Scott) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mrs Quarrie) – Hopton's development boundary should be eased to enable development to support new community services and facilities. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the review of Residential Development Boundaries.

1 response (P Shale) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr Bentley) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (K Maratta) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are

set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr Maratta) – There is no change to the plan for Cold Meece despite an increased number of houses and residents over the last ten years which should be reflected. Cold Meece is identified as an employment redevelopment site despite the residential area. All residents should be consulted about the existing and future plan. Current MOT test centre not to be replaced by industrial development. No plans are set out to address Cold Meece's issues and no investment included. Local consultation on the ten year plan is needed.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred developments.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Mountford) – The residential development boundary for Aston by Stone to be amended to include grassland / orchard to deliver a new house.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the review of Residential Development Boundaries.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Mr G Edwards) – The plan should be flexible to deliver up to 9,000 new homes in Stafford, possibly more due to RSS scenarios. Stafford is the most sustainable location for new homes regarding services, facilities and infrastructure.

ACTION: Noted to be considered as part of the preferred approach for the Borough and Stafford town.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Bassett Group Holdings Ltd) – The level of housing provision for Yarnfield and Tittensor should be increased from 250 – 300 to 350 – 400 in both the minimum and higher growth scenarios reflecting a significant increase in the capacity of land at Tittensor to deliver extra new homes within the Green Belt. Further information is provided in detailed response.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Chapter 8 response.

1 response (Mr Flower) – Object to new housing development at SN-1. Questions the level of housing development with objection to Government, increase tax on second homes, restrict rent to buy, support marriage rather than single occupancy and stop immigration.

ACTION: Noted.

#### 7.1 5 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Broad support the key principles.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford) – Broad support the key principles.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Broad support the key principles.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Use brownfield land at Yarnfield and Tittensor before Greenfield land.

ACTION: Agree to include Yarnfield & Tittensor, refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Make reference to Stafford Borough meeting unmet housing needs of Cannock Chase District, achieved through a higher growth scenario at Stafford.

ACTION: Not accepted.

7.2 No responses received

7.3 10 responses received

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – Minimum provision should be made in line with the higher growth scenario of 12,100 to ensure the Plan's flexibility to change regarding the Regional Spatial Strategy and avoid unsoundness.

ACTION: Development Strategy approach to provide flexibility.

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Minimum provision should be made in line with the higher growth scenario of 12,100 to ensure the Plan's flexibility to change regarding the Regional Spatial Strategy and avoid unsoundness.

ACTION: Development Strategy approach to provide flexibility

1 response (McDyre & Co for Mr Edwards) – Support the Plan being flexible to accommodate higher growth scenario of 12,100 but should increase to 13,100 to avoid unsoundness and sufficient flexibility included.

ACTION: Development Strategy approach to provide flexibility.

1 response (Strawson Property) – Support the higher growth scenario for economic development and accommodating need.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Jones) – The lower growth scenario should be a maxima and this is questioned in light of current economic climate and demand.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – No evidence of Stafford Borough Council attempting to negotiate the housing figures down, having listened to public opinion.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Bassett Group Holdings Ltd) – Support the Plan being flexible to accommodate higher growth scenario of 12,100 but should increase to 13,100 to avoid unsoundness and sufficient flexibility included.

ACTION: Development Strategy approach to provide flexibility.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Note the need to provide for higher growth scenario to accommodate RSS review including use of Greenfield sites and land south of Stafford.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – The smaller development option is too much, especially for Stone.

ACTION: Development Strategy will provide for development at Stone in a western direction.

1 response (Mrs Vaughan) – Higher growth scenarios should not be considered as even the lower growth scenario is too much.

ACTION: Development Strategy must meet RSS requirements.

#### 7.4 6 responses received

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Object to Barlaston not being identified for new housing development due to level of services & facilities, access to employment at Meaford and transport accessibility.

ACTION: No change as Barlaston is surrounded by Green Belt.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd ) – Remove reference to Stafford and Stone in paragraph 7.4 'Settlements outside of Stafford & Stone'. Support identification of larger villages as suitable locations for new housing and employment development

ACTION: Delete the heading 'Settlements outside of Stafford & Stone.'

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford) – Remove reference to Stafford and Stone in paragraph 7.4 'Settlements outside of Stafford & Stone'. Support identification of larger villages as suitable locations for new housing and employment development

ACTION: Delete the heading 'Settlements outside of Stafford & Stone.'

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – . Remove reference to Stafford and Stone in paragraph 7.4 'Settlements outside of Stafford & Stone'. Support

identification of larger villages as suitable locations for new housing and employment development

ACTION: Delete the heading 'Settlements outside of Stafford & Stone.

1 response (Jones) – Object to development at the Haywoods due to infrastructure, inadequate facilities, no proposed employment, no reasonable access to sites in Little Haywood, loss of habitat, increased flood risk amongst others.

ACTION: The Haywoods to have development in a northern direction but discuss with infrastructure stakeholders the issues raised.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Object to increased development at Stone affecting current residents as it is unrealistic.

ACTION: Development Strategy will provide for new development at Stone in a western direction.

#### 7.5 4 responses received

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Haughton & Woodseaves should only be considered in the higher growth scenario for development due to lack of services & facilities, and locality of larger settlements with better provision.

ACTION: Agree and reflect through the Development Strategy.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford) – Haughton & Woodseaves should only be considered in the higher growth scenario for development due to lack of services & facilities, and locality of larger settlements with better provision.

ACTION: Agree and reflect through the Development Strategy

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Haughton & Woodseaves should only be considered in the higher growth scenario for development due to lack of services & facilities, and locality of larger settlements with better provision.

ACTION: Agree and reflect through the Development Strategy

1 response (Mr Dale) – Disappointed by poor quality of schematics and displays at the public exhibition for Hixon. Object to new development at Hixon due to recent increased housing growth, comparison of services and facilities with better served settlements (i.e. Eccleshall and Great Haywood). Pressure on the existing highway network and traffic problems already exist at Hixon. Existing industry at Hixon would appear to lead to increased housing growth although only 6% of residents work locally and this approach of housing with employment is not reflected in other settlements. The primary school is at capacity with new development requiring road re-routing and a new secondary school. Hixon has a lack of infrastructure to support more housing whilst having had significant development in the recent past.

ACTION: Development Strategy will provide for new development at Hixon in a northern direction (HI-1 & HI-6).

## 7.6 4 responses received

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support the use of brownfield land at Yarnfield for new housing leading to a sustainable community but oppose Green Belt development at Meaford and Tittensor due to implications on the North Staffordshire conurbation.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy will provide for new development at Yarnfield, discuss the inclusion of Tittensor but Meaford already has planning permission for employment development.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford) – Support the use of brownfield land at Yarnfield for new housing leading to a sustainable community but oppose Green Belt new housing development at Meaford and Tittensor due to implications on the North Staffordshire conurbation. At Yarnfield Green Belt release should not be restricted to brownfield land but limited release between Yarnfield Lane and the former BT centre should be accommodated for integration.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy will provide for new development at the former BT centre north of Yarnfield only, discuss the inclusion of Tittensor but Meaford already has planning permission for employment development.

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Support the use of brownfield land at Yarnfield for new housing leading to a sustainable community but oppose Green Belt development at Meaford and Tittensor due to implications on the North Staffordshire conurbation.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy will provide for new development at Yarnfield, discuss the inclusion of Tittensor but Meaford already has planning permission for employment development.

1 response (Councillor R M Smith) – Support limited new housing development at Woodseaves to support the primary school and shop.

**ACTION:** Noted.

## 7.7 4 responses received

1 response (Mr Rawsthorne) – Derrington to be included in list of remaining villages suitable for growth with a minor amendment to a retained Residential Development Boundary to accommodate Greenfield development. Derrington is a sustainable location with good transport links to Stafford, with existing services and facilities which could be consolidated and expanded alongside new housing development. A site map and details are suggested.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy to provide some provision to remaining villages but unlikely to require RDB amendment to Derrington.

1 response (McDyre & Co for J F Bostock Settlement) – Support the higher growth scenario and suggest Hyde Lea should have Residential Development Boundary



adjustment to meet housing requirements outside of Stafford town due to lack of brownfield land and poor delivery of affordable housing on Rural Exception Sites.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy to provide some provision to remaining villages but unlikely to require RDB amendment to Hyde Lea. Chapter 9 to include a Draft Policy on Rural Exception Sites.

1 response (P Clarke) – Land put forward at Hopton for consideration as development potential in the new Plan.

**ACTION:** Noted & include in SHLAA review.

1 response (Mrs Vaughan) – Object to new development at Derrington due to water resource infrastructure requirements and local community opposition. Current boundaries should be retained.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy to provide some provision to remaining villages but unlikely to require RDB amendment to Derrington.

#### 7.8 2 responses received

1 response (Councillor R M Smith) – The current system of residential development boundaries is too restrictive. Some villages cannot accommodate any more within current boundaries and that encourages people to build in their gardens which can sometimes damage the village character. Therefore there should be at least some expansion of existing boundaries. However I also think there are some villages with no boundaries which could also benefit from further modest building. In addition I think some houses should be permitted in what are termed 'isolated' rural locations. The planners often refer to such applications as incongruous in the rural scene. My counter argument is that the rural scene is exactly that, isolated houses which have been there for a century or more and are never described as incongruous. At present houses are allowed for farm workers if need is demonstrated, however there are increasing businesses in rural areas which may also justify someone living there.

**ACTION:** Noted. Discuss appropriate response with team.

1 response (Mr Lee) – Object to Brocton being described as two communities (i.e. Brocton and Brocton A34).

**ACTION:** No change due to geographical split.

#### 7.9 2 responses received

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Object to no recognition that minor review of Green Belt can lead to sustainable development relative to settlement size and avoiding impact on purposes of the Green Belt, such as at Barlaston where a village extension could allow for local affordable housing needs.

**ACTION:** No change to Development Strategy due to Barlaston being surrounded by Green Belt and no change to boundary.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Buzzard) – Retain the Residential Development Boundary at Brocton to enable infill development due to services and facilities available.

**ACTION:** Brocton to continue with identified existing RDB.

7.10 – 7.12 No responses received

7.13 9 responses received

1 response (Jones) – Object to new housing development at Great and Little Haywood due to merging of settlements, loss of green space, poor access, lack of employment leading to increased car usage, flooding implications, lack of services & facilities and loss of local character.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy will provide for new development at Great Haywood in a northern direction (GH-1).

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Disagree with proportionate approach to higher growth scenarios with the main focus being Stafford and less development to larger villages such as the Haywoods. Barlaston should be considered for new housing development.

**ACTION:** No change as Barlaston is surrounded by Green Belt.

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – Provision should be made for the higher growth scenario figure to ensure the Plan is flexible and takes account of the Regional Spatial Strategy process.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy to provide for flexibility in terms of new development requirements.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Disagree with the proportionate split for the higher growth scenario leading to increased development in larger villages. The increased provision should be provided to Stafford and Stone taking into account physical, environmental and infrastructure constraints, national and regional planning policy impacts (such as undermining the regeneration of the North Staffordshire conurbation) and market factors.

**ACTION:** Noted & Development Strategy to consider this approach.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford) – Disagree with the proportionate split for the higher growth scenario leading to increased development in larger villages. The increased provision should be provided to Stafford and Stone taking into account physical, environmental and infrastructure constraints, national and regional planning policy impacts (such as undermining the regeneration of the North Staffordshire conurbation) and market factors.

ACTION: Noted & Development Strategy to consider this approach.

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Additional houses should be directed to Stafford through a higher growth scenario due to Growth Point status and level of services and facilities.

ACTION: Noted & Development Strategy to consider this approach.

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Disagree with the proportionate split for the higher growth scenario leading to increased development in larger villages. The increased provision should be provided to Stafford and Stone taking into account physical, environmental and infrastructure constraints, national and regional planning policy impacts (such as undermining the regeneration of the North Staffordshire conurbation) and market factors.

ACTION: Noted & Development Strategy to consider this approach.

1 response (Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates) – The distribution of new housing should be at sustainable locations such as Stone. Remaining villages should not have housing allocations and any provision is effectively windfall which is no longer acceptable by national policy in PPS3. This provision should be re-directed to Stone. In addition the provision to the larger villages should be reduced due to local character and re-directed to Stone. This approach should be followed through the proportionate distribution of any higher growth scenario with a focus on Stone.

ACTION: Development Strategy to direct higher growth to Stafford.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – The Haywoods has limited capacity to take new housing development due to a high quality natural environment, lack of services & facilities including education and health, traffic problems, out commuting, flooding issues, loss of countryside and access. If housing development occurs this should take place on vacant land within the settlement of high quality and siting. Any more housing development should be accommodated at GN-1 north of Great Haywood due to access for A51. Object to a new village centre for the Haywoods.

ACTION: Development Strategy will provide for new development at Great Haywood in a northern direction (GH-1).

## Scenario Options 1

13 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford) – The options should identify as much development to Stafford as is reasonable with no new development in remaining villages apart from existing completions & commitments, the balance being at Stone and lower levels to the larger villages. Haughton, & Woodseaves should only be used through the higher growth scenario. A similar distribution should be reflected for employment provision.

ACTION: Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Pert) – Distribution of development could have serious implications for style and character of an area. Existing commitments and completions should be taken into account. Outside of Stafford and Stone distribution should be based on percentage of total housing in the settlements and:

1. a notional uplift on the existing settlement
2. an uplift based on existing spare capacity within the local infrastructure. This would stop development without the necessary infrastructure capacity. There should be a natural 'head-room' allowed as well for natural expansion.
3. Applying an investment strategy for infrastructure based on per new house developed in each area, so those areas taking greater levels of housing gained by having greater levels of infrastructure committed and built.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy to be prepared on basis of existing completions and commitments with infrastructure implications.

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – Greatest housing provision should be identified to Stafford, up to 10,000, due to its sustainable location of education, transport infrastructure and recreation / retail facilities. Larger villages would be unable to sustain increased growth due to physical limitations.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy to direct increased development to Stafford town.

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – The higher growth scenario should have the main focus being Stafford and less development to larger villages and infill areas due to physical and sustainability capacities such as the Haywoods. Barlaston should be considered for new housing development.

**ACTION:** No change as Barlaston is surrounded by Green Belt.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – The options should identify as much development to Stafford as is reasonable with no new development in remaining villages apart from existing completions & commitments, the balance being at Stone and lower levels to the larger villages. Haughton, & Woodseaves should only be used through the higher growth scenario. A similar distribution should be reflected for employment provision.

**ACTION:** Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – The options should identify as much development to Stafford as is reasonable with no new development in remaining villages apart from existing completions & commitments, the balance being at Stone and lower levels to the larger villages. Haughton, & Woodseaves should only be used through the higher growth scenario. A similar distribution should be reflected for employment provision.

**ACTION:** Noted & refer to Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Concern regarding over development at the Haywoods and Hixon due to environmental impacts and costly infrastructure provision. Brocton to be categorised in ‘Remaining Villages’.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) – The higher growth scenario should direct new development to Stafford due to sustainability credentials and ability to manage such growth, as highlighted in the Regional Spatial Strategy. Based on existing completions and commitments this growth is achievable provided is accompanied by the required infrastructure, employment and community facilities to create a sustainable, balanced town

ACTION: Development Strategy will focus development at Stafford.

1 response (Mr M S) – New development should be directed to Stafford and Stone rather than larger villages due to accessibility and levels of services and facilities. A proposed distribution is set out.

ACTION: Development Strategy approach to be discussed.

1 response (Mr Kirby) – New development should be directed to Stafford and Stone to reduce infrastructure investment, protect rural character and maximise access to employment areas.

ACTION: Development Strategy to focus development on Stafford and Stone taking into account the North Staffordshire conurbation.

1 response (Mr Dale) – Question the scale of new development to Hixon when the other villages outweigh current housing by such a massive number?

ACTION: Refer to the Development Strategy approach & Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Previous housing provision in Stone should be better provided for and should limit future development.

ACTION: Development Strategy will provide for new development at Stone in a westerly direction.

1 response (Councillor G I Sunley) – Growth at Haughton, Weston and Woodseaves in the options is too high proportionately to the existing settlement. A lower level of provision should be made.

ACTION: Refer to the Development Strategy approach with limited provision to these settlements, if any.

#### 7.14 3 responses received

1 response (Strawson Property) – Supports the higher growth scenario with greater proportion of employment development at Stafford and less attributed to Stone and other Recognised Industrial Estates.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy to provide for employment development reflecting scale of housing development by settlement.

1 response (Mr Pert) – Querying whether other additional potential development land will be put forward and questions future consultation.

**ACTION:** Further explanation of consultation process required.

1 response (Messrs Hartley) – Proportionate split of new development through the higher growth scenario is supported, particularly in Stone close to the town centre on the edge of the settlement boundary. There is an upward trend in housing need shown through the RSS process.

**ACTION:** Development Strategy to provide for flexibility of higher growth scenario and proportionate split to be finalised.

## **CHAPTER 8 – IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL LOCATIONS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT**

---

### **8. Identifying Potential Locations for New Development**

3 responses

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Disagree with the approach of using circles. Core Strategy to identify directions of growth or site specific details.

**ACTION:** Agree with strategic sites & directions of growth approach

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – Disagree with the approach of using circles. Core Strategy to identify directions of growth or site specific details.

**ACTION:** Agree with strategic sites & directions of growth approach

1 response (McDyre & Co for Mr Edwards) – Regarding Stafford town it is considered that development to the north would impact on the North Staffordshire RENEW area, development to the west is constrained by market conditions whilst development to the east and south would help to deliver the eastern and southern distributor road through developer contributions. Client's land is location SF-7 which could deliver 540 homes rather than 300. SF-7 is in a highly sustainable and accessible location with excellent local services and facilities nearby which is available for development whilst SF-8 is considered a medium to long term location due to cross authority liaison required. SF-10 at Rickerscote is allocated in the adopted Stafford Borough Local Plan but constrained by multiple landowners.

**ACTION:** Note the client's willingness to deliver SF-7.

8.1 1 response (Jones) – Object to new housing development at the Haywoods which would merge the villages.

ACTION: Development Strategy will include new development in a northerly direction for Great Haywood.

8.2 1 response (Jones) – Object to new housing development at the Haywoods due to downstream flooding implications and floodwaters blocking access roads.

ACTION: Development Strategy will include new development in a northerly direction for Great Haywood.

8.3 2 responses received

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Agree that settlements affected by the Green Belt and Cannock Chase AONB should not have development.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Sport England) – Playing fields to be excluded from development as protected by national policy.

ACTION: Chapter 9 to include Draft Policy on Open Space, Sport & Recreation.

8.4 No responses received

8.5 1 response (Mr Dale) – Consider that housing completions and commitments from the last 15 years rather than 2 years should be taken into consideration.

ACTION: Amend paragraph to explain figures start at 2006 due to the Regional Spatial Strategy plan period from 2006-2026.

8.6 – 8.7 No responses received

8.8 4 responses received

1 response (Mr Pert) – Appreciate the reason for identifying significantly more housing development options than required due to Government policy statements but has lead to General Public opposition without a mature debate about the best sites. Other development options have been ignored (i.e. employment and retail). Level of development is only marginally more than achieved in recent years.

ACTION: Noted and agree.

1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel Ltd) – Support a northern direction of growth for Stafford town which is less constrained by major new transport infrastructure requirements, would not impact on the North Staffordshire RENEW area although Stone's development should be constrained in the early Plan period, has limited flooding problems and could solve downstream flooding issues through green infrastructure and sustainable drainage solutions.

**ACTION:** Note the client's willingness to bring forward this location.

1 response (Mr Bowen and Mr & Mrs Madders) – Support the Regional Spatial Strategy focus on Stafford town and an eastern direction of growth including land south of Tixall Road and SF-4 which is a sustainable location with access to services and facilities, employment areas nearby and has limited flooding issues with evidence provided to show delivery. The site would support green infrastructure, the eastern distributor road and a mix of housing types and tenures.

**ACTION:** Note the client's willingness to bring forward this location.

1 response (Natural England) – Development of Stafford town in an easterly direction must take account of the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and welcome commissioning of an Appropriate Assessment to inform decision-making. Sites of high environmental value must be avoided and spatial locations consider such issues as well as legally protected species, UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) habitats and species. Staffordshire Wildlife Trust's work last year was incomplete and should be updated / re-surveyed regarding protected species and UK BAP habitats and species which can lead to significant land take if present.

**ACTION:** Discuss actions required with team.

## **Stafford (SF) – Housing and Employment Location Options**

17 responses received including 9 PDF files

1 response (Parkside residents petition) - Object to SF1 and SF2 for the following reasons; impinge of Greenfield land, create disproportionate level of development north of the town, increase traffic volumes and increase demand for infrastructure combined with impact of potential new MOD properties.

1 response (Berkswich Parish Council) – Object to development at SF-6 and SF-7 due to impact on local services & facilities, vicinity of the Cannock Chase AONB and high visual landscape impact. Traffic problems would be exacerbated and object to the eastern distributor road which crosses a floodplain, impacts on the AONB and has been reject at public inquiry already.

**ACTION:** Note objections to SF-6 and SF-7.



1 response (Mr Pert) – A fully joined up approach in terms of delivering new infrastructure associated with new development is required. The plans of different service providers must be co-ordinated. Object to the words “Approximate position of possible new road”.

ACTION: Greater clarification required in the Preferred Approach.

1 response (Mr D Tomlinson) – Development at SF-8 should take account of increased traffic flows on already congested local roads, use of brownfield land before open countryside is allocated, part of the area is previously a landfill site with methane levels so a thorough ground condition and geological survey is required to investigate contamination and pollution hazards, wildlife species – animal & birds / woodlands / habitats to be maintained for landscape and biodiversity, impact on the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The southern distributor road should be listed as a significant barrier to development at SF-8. Prefer development north of Stafford and question the impact on North Staffordshire conurbation.

ACTION: Noted objection to SF-8 land south of Stafford and preference for land north of Stafford.

1 response (D Stocking – double entry of representation) – Object to new development south of Stafford impacting on the Cannock Chase AONB and SAC, particularly SF-6, SF-7 and SF-8 as well as the eastern and southern distributor roads which conflicts with Government policy on climate change and increase traffic / HGV movements undermining quality of life through severe visual and environmental impacts. New housing development south of Stafford would undermine cultural heritage, biodiversity & the open countryside. Question the location and value of a country park south of Stafford reducing impacts on the Cannock Chase AONB and SAC.

ACTION: Note objections to SF-6, SF-7 & SF-8.

1 response (AG & M Taylor – double entry of representation) – Object to new development at SF-4, SF-6, SF-7 and SF-8. SF-4 requires clarification and is misleading. SF-6 is on high ground and impact on the Cannock Chase AONB, congest the local highway network, there is limited public transport, services & facilities in the nearby area making it unsustainable, delivery of the Eastern distributor road is misleading due to previous public inquiry rejection, combined impacts with SF-7 and SF-8. SF-7 is on high ground and impact on the Cannock Chase AONB, congest the local highway network, there is limited public transport, services & facilities in the nearby area making it unsustainable, delivery of the Eastern distributor road is misleading due to previous public inquiry rejection, combined impacts with SF-6 and SF-8. SF-8 is visible from the Cannock Chase AONB and South Staffordshire District, will have a major impact on local highway, public transport, educational, retail and medical services many of which are already overloaded, at or near capacity, delivery of the Eastern distributor road is misleading due to previous public inquiry rejection, combined impacts with SF-6 and SF-7.

ACTION: Note objections to SF-6, SF-7 and SF-8.

1 response (Manor Ward Councillors – Cllr Mrs Loughan, Cllr Rowland & Cllr Mrs Rowland) - Need to determine the route and commence construction of the Eastern Distributor Route before further development in Stafford to support the local road network. Infill housing development in Manor ward needs to be for family occupancy and gardens due to current high volume of flats resulting in a need for family homes and parking issues. Concern about loss of garages proposed to housing. Location SF-9 is only accessible from A449 via small local roads and there is lack of space for junction improvements leading to need for major infrastructure disproportionate to scale of development. Closer cross border working required due to implications of housing developments at Coppenhall on local services and facilities. Car parking is a problem in the ward at Burton Square, particularly around the local services centre. There is a need for increased play space particularly if housing development increases.

**ACTION:** Noted comments regarding Stafford preferred development locations and access issues for SF-9.

1 response (Mr Cantrill) – Confirming deliverability of land north of Stafford in his ownership either individually or in combination with neighbouring land for housing or employment development.

**ACTION:** Noted support for development of owned land north of Stafford.

1 response (N D Finlay – Walton High School) – Support a new relief road if this delivers a new build school to meet increasing demand from new housing development and safeguard sports facilities in the area. Would welcome re-location of Walton High School as part of SF-7 and releasing the current school land for housing development.

**ACTION;** Noted support for a new school related to the new relief road and significant housing development south of Stafford at SF-7.

1 response (Ms Sharman) – Object to new development at SF-7 and SF-8 due to impact on the local highway network and distributor roads increasing M6 traffic leading to more accidents. Support development north of Stafford at SF-1 and SF-2 with better M6 access and no requirement to build distributor roads. Concern about SF-8 including a completed landfill site, impact of housing on the Cannock Chase AONB, wildlife and increasing incidents of anti-social behaviour.

**ACTION:** Note support for SF-1 and SF-2 with objections to SF-7 and SF-8.

1 response (Mr Plumb) – Development of SF-8 will need agreement with South Staffordshire Council who have no proposals for this area of open countryside. The following factors should be taken into account: development is dependant on constructing the southern distributor road to reduce traffic problems in Stafford town centre, the area has high wildlife, woodland and biodiversity value whilst being close to the Staffordshire & Worcestershire canal, the area could be wholly designated as a country park due to landscape characteristics / value to safeguard the nearby Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, open space requirements within new development due to proximity of Acton Trussell, land could be contaminated following tipping in the 1950's and 60's. Support use of brownfield

before Greenfield development. Consideration to be given for a lake feature in the River Penk floodplain area as a new open space feature.

ACTION: Noted comments regarding SF-8 to be considered as part of Stafford preferred development locations.

1 response (Mr Prior) – New dual carriageway required to link M6 Jct 13 and Jct 14 as existing road network is inadequate with Park & Ride not a solution. Existing road network needs significant improvement

ACTION: Incorporate Stafford town transport model into decision-making on the Preferred Approach.

1 response (Mrs Smithson) - Object to any development affecting Tixall Road due to flooding of farmland during heavy rainfall with implications for new housing developments, increase in traffic with detrimental impact on the local road network and impact on wildlife.

ACTION: Noted objections regarding sites east of Stafford to be considered as part of Stafford preferred development locations.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Mitchell) – Concern about Stafford's grid locked state, lack of public transport infrastructure and other services & facilities.

ACTION: Further information on infrastructure strategy incorporated into decision-making on the Preferred Approach.

1 response (O'Rourke) – Concern about the local road network with increased development and activity. Concern about new gypsy sites impacting the local countryside

ACTION: Noted.

#### 8.9 5 responses received

1 response (Inland Waterways Association) – Concern about SF-8. New development would have a devastating impact on the Staffordshire & Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area, its setting, the river valley and the countryside and is totally unacceptable. The canal is a historic waterway and a valuable amenity and recreational corridor. It also lies entirely outside the Borough boundary and is not identified in the South Staffordshire Core Strategy Preferred Option as a possible site. It should be removed from any further consideration. Object to Stafford Borough accepting increased housing numbers no deliverable within its boundary and identification of land south of Stafford in the Regional Spatial Strategy. Question the deliverability of the eastern and southern distributor roads.

ACTION: Note the objections to SF-8.

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – Object to scale of Greenfield development options identified for Stafford without consideration for brownfield edge of town sites, such as client's land at The Crescent, Doxey which should be identified.

**ACTION:** Consider deliverability and viability of site for allocation.

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Consideration should be given to housing development within the existing urban area of Stafford such as client's former Police playing fields at Silkmore Lane before urban Greenfield extensions. Alternative provision could be made for existing club users through the new Sport Strategy for the Borough.

**ACTION:** Consider deliverability and viability of site including level of allowance for commitments and SHLAA sites in Preferred approach.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Dugmore) – Support new employment and housing development north and south of Stafford town rather than to the east (i.e. SF-3 & SF-c) due to poor transport links, existing congestion problems and overloading. Existing employment at Beaconside Business Park & the Technology Park cause light and noise pollution. To avoid loss of nature conservation interests brownfield land should be used in preference to Greenfield sites.

**ACTION:** Note support for north & south development whilst opposing development to east of Stafford.

1 response (Mr Kerr) – Concern about current capacity of Newport Road with a new link road required to reduce pressure near Stafford railway station, facilitated by SF-11 and SF-12. Support SF-f but must avoid exacerbating traffic / rat run problems in the town centre.

**ACTION:** Noted and make reference to issues through Preferred Approach and identification of strategic sites.

## **Spatial Options 1**

8 responses received including 1 PDF file

1 response (Kier Regeneration) - Support for western direction of growth at Stafford and support for development of land off Kingsway to accommodate 150 – 200 new houses and assist delivery of the western access road and local centre thus delivering the higher growth scenario.

**ACTION:** Noted and consider land as part of the Stafford preferred development locations.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – New development to the west of Stafford at SF-11 & SF-12 is the most sustainable location and is a priority, delivering housing, recreation provision, services & facilities. Employment development should

take place north of Stafford due to existing sites and accessible locations from the town.

**ACTION:** Note the client's willingness to bring forward the western location and comments concerning land north of Stafford.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford) – New development to the west of Stafford at SF-11 & SF-12 is the most sustainable location and is a priority, delivering housing, recreation provision, services & facilities. Employment development should take place north of Stafford due to existing sites and accessible locations from the town.

**ACTION:** Note the client's willingness to bring forward the western location and comments concerning land north of Stafford.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Suggests a balanced level of growth in several directions for Stafford including the western area but concern about scale of development to the south due to impact on the Cannock Chase AONB, traffic congestion and floodplain implications.

**ACTION:** Noted.

3 responses combined into 1 response (Cllr C Simpson) – Question the value of the consultation on addressing planning issues through conflicting interests. Supports affordable housing in rural areas to meet needs and use of land south of Stafford to provide the eastern distributor road. Support housing north of Parkside and employment north of Tollgate Farm

**ACTION:** Note suggested approach for northern and southern directions of growth for Stafford.

1 response (Dr Burns) – Concern about flooding issues and new road infrastructure on eastern direction of growth for Stafford.

**ACTION:** Noted.

8.10 No responses received

8.11 1 response (Mr Clegg) – Understand the M6 motorway widening scheme has been rejected for an active management system. Support use of SF-11 and SF-g to safeguard landscape in other areas together with SF-1 and SF-i.

**ACTION:** Note support for development at locations identified.

Table 8.1 2 responses received

1 response (Mr D'Arcy) – Object to disproportionate level of development to north of Stafford and concerns about impact on the local highway network from increased traffic generation.

ACTION: Note the objection to use of land north of Stafford.

1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) – Support the use of client's land north of Stafford to accommodate housing and employment development as already identified in the adopted Stafford Borough Local Plan, with later development on adjacent land. The development would also provide community and green infrastructure, whilst being least constrained in terms of highway infrastructure.

ACTION: Note support for development north of Stafford.

#### 8.12 No responses received

#### Table 8.1 2 responses received

1 response (Strawson Property) – Support use of client's land at SF-g which is highly accessible and not requiring major transport infrastructure. Wishes land to be identified for mixed use development rather than strictly employment land.

ACTION: Note support for client's land at SF-g.

1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) – Support the use of land north of Stafford at SF-h and SF-I for major employment including research & development alongside housing to facilitate a sustainable urban extension taking advantage of existing highway infrastructure and avoiding undue pressure on existing services and facilities through relevant expansion.

ACTION: Note support for employment development north of Stafford.

#### 8.13 2 responses received

1 response (Mr D'Arcy) – Oppose employment land at SF-I north of Stafford due to conflict with new housing development proposed, based on existing issues with housing and employment on Primepoint 14. Suggest employment restricted to SF-h.

ACTION: Noted. Ensure sensitive employment development / offices north of SF-1 on SF-I location.

1 response (Mr Clegg) – Support development at Stafford as the most sustainable location for growth with existing infrastructure and employment. Development at Stone would impact on the North Staffordshire conurbation.

ACTION: Noted and to be considered through Development Strategy approach.

8.14 4 responses received

3 responses combined into 1 response (Mr D'Arcy) – Development north of Stafford will require construction of eastern and southern distributor roads due to level of north / south traffic to access new employment land for new and existing housing areas. New transport infrastructure will be needed with Beaconside being a dual carriageway due to increase in local and cross-country traffic. Ribbon development north of Stafford along the A34 to be avoided, thus avoiding Stafford and Stone being joined.

ACTION: Noted and consider Stafford transport study implications as part of the development strategy for Stafford.

1 response (Batchelor) – Question the development of southern distributor road in light of Government's climate change guidance and public transport initiatives.

ACTION: Noted.

8.15 1 response (Batchelor) – Question the development of the eastern distributor road in light of impact on Cannock Chase AONB, Government's climate change guidance and public transport initiatives.

ACTION: Noted.

8.16 4 responses received

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company) – Sequential approach to site selection needed with use of land within Stafford urban area to be considered.

ACTION: Noted and refer to Development Strategy approach with existing completions and commitments.

1 response (National Trust) – Concern about eastern proposals for Stafford with new housing and employment impacting on the visual and landscape context of Shugborough.

ACTION: Noted and refer to Stafford preferred development approach with rationale for location selection.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support the western expansion of Stafford including client's land to provide housing, recreation and other associated services & facilities. Support use of land north of Stafford for employment based on accessible location.

ACTION: Note support for western and northern expansion including client's land.

1 response (Natural England) – Support western and northern expansion of Stafford to avoid impact on the Cannock Chase AONB and SAC of development to the south and east. However Biodiversity Alert Site on Burleyfields must be protected together with its population of protected species.

ACTION: Noted and include in Stafford preferred development.

## **Stone (SN) – Housing and Employment Location Options**

102 responses received

1 response (H Chadwick) – Objects to development at Location SN-1 on the grounds of loss of town character, traffic / transport / access problems, pressure on Stafford hospital, car parking, policing, lack of jobs, depreciation of existing housing, sewage, lack of activities especially for youth, limited shops, flooding issues, education, food production and loss of agricultural land.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Residents of Aston Lodge) – Petition objecting to Location SN-1 north of Pingle Lane for housing development and Location SN-2 north of Lichfield Road due to population pressure, traffic, strain on local resources, loss of rural area and lack of brownfield site development alternatives.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 and SN-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Lockwood) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 on the grounds of loss of accessible natural areas trees and landscape, impact on biodiversity, impacts on the local road network and St Michael's school, drainage and flooding impacting the Lichfield Road area.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Plant) – Object to proposed development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 on the grounds of impacts on existing congested road network including Walton roundabout, limited school and doctors capacity, loss of high quality agricultural land and protected species, flooding, existing use of the Common for leisure and recreation area. A planning application at SN3 has been turned down in the past due to impact on local residents.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.



1 response (Mr Chadwick) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 on the grounds of lack of demonstrated need for housing in this area, over provision in the current housing market, impact on natural environment and landscape, access along Pingle Lane is unsuitable, increase in traffic and associated impacts, impact on education, dentist, doctors provision, pressure on existing infrastructure, including sewerage and utilities as well as flood risk. There would be financial and legal cost implications for the Council to proceed with this scheme.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Johnson) – Object to proposed new housing development at SN-1 on the grounds of scale and impact of development on the landscape, noise and light pollution, traffic pressures, access is restricted using Pingle Lane, loss of Tree Preservation Orders, flooding problems increasing especially as the Flood Alleviation Scheme is only based on existing, not new development, loss of habitats and wildlife, especially protected species listed in the Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan, loss of greenfield land when sufficient housing exists.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Barlow) – Object to proposed new development at Location SN-5 on the grounds of traffic impacts for A34 and flooding.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (P J Bromley) – Object to proposed new development at SN-5 due to the existing level of housing within Stone, loss of Greenfield undermining the market town character, development on floodplain and loss of elderly care provision increasing development pressures. The Council has a duty to preserve the rural environment.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Reeves) – Object to proposed new development at SN-5 on the grounds that this is Greenfield land close to the town centre.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Heeley) – Object to proposed new housing development at SN-5 as this Greenfield land is in the flood plain. The level of housing for Stone is too high, placing pressure on existing services and facilities and would not benefit the community.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Acraman) – Object to proposed new housing development at SN-5 as this Greenfield land is in the flood plain. The level of housing for Stone is too high, placing pressure on existing services and facilities and would not benefit the community.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone

1 response (Mr Alder) – Object to proposed new development at Location SN-1 on the grounds that the area is designated as Special Landscape Area, impact and scale of development, increased noise and light pollution, traffic impacts on the local road network and on the A51 compounded by the marina development, water drainage and flooding issues, lack of consideration / mention about security issues arising from increased access including on public footpaths. The consultation with adjacent residents has not been widely communicated.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (E Woodstock) – Object to proposed new development at Location SN-5 on the grounds that it is in the flood plain, would cause loss of views and the scale of new houses proposed is excessive.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Lee) – Object to proposed new development at Location SN-5 (Comment SHLAA 526 - representation made by Hulme Upright Manning regarding land at Filleybrooks) due to loss of Greenfield land and flooding.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Tallent) – Object to proposed new development at Location SN-5 due to the existing over supply of housing, in particular apartments in Stone, loss of views and landscape impacts as well as traffic congestion on the A34.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (E A Marsh) – Object to proposed new development at SN-5 due to the substantial increase in flood risk.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Wiles) – Object to development at Fillybrooks, Location SN-5 for the following reasons; flooding problems, loss of greenfield land, increase in traffic and loss of town character. Alternatives development sites would be more appropriate rather than undermine the beautiful area for future generations. Suggests a new public footbridge across the meadow area.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr W & P McGovern & Adams) – Stone has been over developed with existing properties unused, incomplete, unaffordable etc... Stone's character has been undermined by the development causing problems of congestion and lack of car parks.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Miss Segota) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-5 due to problems of access onto A34, traffic and loss of greenfield land.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Hood) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-5 (Fillybrooks) for the following reasons. Increased traffic / congestion on A34, loss of views for existing residents with resulting drop in property values, building on flood plains, loss of Greenfield site, impact on sewer system, impact on wildlife including otters in the River Trent.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Berrys Mr Locke for Mr Stone) – Supporting land to be used for new housing development at Location SN-2 on behalf of the landowner due to the extensive services and facilities in Stone, good transport links, a sustainable employment location, improve highway matters, limited flooding issues, lack of Greenbelt use, supportive to existing local community infrastructure and services including the relief road easing traffic flows and affordable housing for the local economy. A number of paragraphs are referenced in the document to support further housing development in Stone alongside new services.

**ACTION:** Note support for Location SN-2 by the landowner to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (J Winstanley) – Support proposed new housing development at Locations SN-1 and SN-2 due to the proximity to Stone town centre, proposed new roads would benefit existing congested roads, proximity to local employment areas with the possibility to improve public transport and existing local infrastructure is in place. Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 due to insufficient infrastructure to support development, lack of services and facilities in the Walton area and increased traffic congestion on the A34 road.

**ACTION:** Note support for Locations SN-1 and SN-2 with objection to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (J Peak) – Support proposed new housing development at Locations SN-1 and SN-2 in Stone with new road provision to the area, suitable infrastructure in place and within walking distance to the town centre. Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 due to a new road required through the Green Belt and agricultural land, is excessive in scale for Stone's housing needs creating a larger Walton area separate from Stone.

**ACTION:** Note support for Locations SN-1 and SN-2 with objection to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (AG & H Barnett) – Support proposed new housing development at Locations SN-1 and SN-2 as the most suitable areas for growth in Stone. A Consortium Agreement between local landowners would improve and satisfy the needs of existing homeowners & provide for new inhabitants including a new tunnel & link road from Aston Lodge to A51, the level crossing at Little Stoke could be closed to reduce the risk of a major incident & to permit Network Rail to improve its services, flood defences are already planning and local road infrastructure is in place at Aston Lodge, St Michael's school could be relocated to further relieve congestion. Object to new development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 due to use of Greenbelt and the amount of land involved. Stone town would become isolated and major road infrastructure would be required.

**ACTION:** Note support for Locations SN-1 and SN-2 with objection to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (K P Brakeman) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 on the grounds of loss to biodiversity, landscape and wildlife, as well as the negative impact of new road provision with increased traffic congestion.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Kelly) – Object to the proposed scale of new housing development, resembling a huge residential estate, at Stone as being completely disproportionate to its current size. The present infrastructure is totally inadequate particularly in respect of local roads, schools, health services and drainage. Concerned about the percentage of properties being affordable social housing and how this may affect property prices and the image of Stone as a market town.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Gratton, Hulme Upright Manning for landowners west of Walton, Stone) – Support the use of landowners land west of Stone for proposed new housing development as more deliverable than other areas in Stafford Borough with the main settlements being the focus for development. A number of potential allocations in Stafford have constraints to delivery with significant detail provided of meetings and infrastructure issues to be considered. Development west of Stone could be planned and phased to support new local infrastructure alongside existing services and facilities whilst not leading to a loss of Special Landscape Area. There are willing landowners, no flooding problems and infrastructure capacity for

development. Reference is made to various paragraphs in the consultation document to support this use of land west of Stone.

**ACTION:** Note support for locations west of Stone by the current landowners to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Heath MBD Architecture for Stone, Barnett & Watson) Support the proposed new housing development at SN-1 and SN-2 with access to all the main services and facilities, landowners are in agreement to bring forward the land and the necessary local road infrastructure. Improvements to highways links and access points would occur easing traffic congestion on the Lichfield Road, volumes of traffic reduced, provision of a flood alleviation scheme and areas of open space provided.

**ACTION:** Note support for locations east of Stone including Locations SN-1 and SN-2 by the current landowners to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (K Cope) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-1 due to loss of Greenfield land, in particular open countryside that is designated Special Landscape Area, and pressure on the existing road network. Other preferable sites exist for new housing development across the Borough.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Lloyd) – Object to proposed new housing development at Stone and particularly Location SN-1. Stone's infrastructure will not be upgraded to support development and the population increase, there is pressure on existing services and facilities including education and health provision, some new town centre development is on existing car parks, new housing is proposed on greenfield land whilst brownfield land would be more beneficial as well as using existing empty properties. Recent new developments have been left unsold in Stone. With regards to Location SN-1 traffic problems have been alleviated by new signals, there is an increased risk of surface water run off and flooding.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Amison) – Concern stated about the scale of new development in Stone for residential and employment uses due to the impact on the town's character and local infrastructure particularly education, local services, drainage and highway capacity. Employment development in the past has been of 'low employment density' nature leading to high levels of commuting. The population increase for Stone would be almost 50% and question the level of demand for housing in this market town with limited employment capacity. A number of issues raised about the inability of the current highway and road network to cope with existing traffic volumes let alone new provision requiring major road infrastructure with no capital resources available.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (E Colley) – Concern about the proposed new road access along Pingle Lane together with the scale of new housing creating significant noise and traffic levels.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 and SNPR-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (D Finch) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 to due the population increase, pressure on existing services and facilities, strain on the existing road network including Lichfield Road for significant new developments recently, loss of greenfield land and the Special Landscape Area, loss of Tree Preservation Orders, flooding issues and increasing the dormitory effect on the town. Object to the proposed new road at Pingle Lane due to the loss of green open space. Other brownfield site alternatives should be considered first and keep the Special Landscape Area.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 and SNPR-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Wain) – Concerned about the scale of development at Location SN-1 with lack of education infrastructure, over congested local roads and car parks, lack of health facilities for an ageing population, limited local employment opportunities, loss of high value landscape, increased pollution and loss of town character and sense of community. Concern that new development will be reminiscent of council estates of the 1970's and recommends considering brownfield sites and employment opportunities elsewhere.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Warrilow) – Concerned about the proposed new development at Location SN-1 with no reinforcements of sewage and storm drainage systems in the Lichfield Road area for many years causing flooding problems. Further development will exacerbate this problem without improvements to the system for sewage and surface water run off. Concerns also raised about the landscape impact and the natural contours around Stone, increased traffic and congestion.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Bull) – Object to proposed new development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 with inadequate plans at the public exhibition. The housing development will lead to traffic congestion with no mention of infrastructure improvements, surface water run off problems and sewerage issues, and a change of character for Walton area of Stone. High level densities will cause problems for residents.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (A O Jones) – Concerning proposed new housing development at Location SN-2 a new access road would provide access to Aston Lodge estate, relieve traffic on Lichfield Road and improve safety by avoiding the railway crossing. Concern about the traffic congestion and lack of pedestrian crossing areas on Lichfield Road, flooding problems in the area, landscape impacts and the need for new drainage systems. Concern about new development on the old coal yard as Abbey Street is narrow and congested due to existing uses in the area.

**ACTION:** Note concerns and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Bull) – Object to proposed new development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 with inadequate plans at the public exhibition. The housing development will lead to traffic congestion with no mention of infrastructure improvements required for new school provision and sewerage upgrading, surface water run off problems and lack of local employment, and a change of character for the Walton.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Chadwick) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing and employment development based on population change, a existing busy local road network requiring road improvements before any development takes place, expansion of local infrastructure. The development does not reflect local democracy but Government imposed housing numbers as a done deal. Questions are asked concerning the marina at Aston and the Crown Street store related to the impact of development. Development expansion will require issues for education, medical services, car parking and impact quality of life.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Byrne) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 because most of Stone's residents work elsewhere, there will be an increase in traffic including to local schools and what provision has been made for car parking, education and health services?

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Brundrett) – Object to the rationale for the scale of development across the Borough and particularly for Stone with significant greenfield development and no consideration for residents. Greenfield development will require new services and facilities as existing provision will be inadequate due to the scale. Smaller brownfield sites should be used as an alternative. Options to the east and west of the town will increase traffic congestion on inadequate local transport infrastructure. Further information is required concerning the infrastructure delivery to support development. The consultation exercise has not been widely publicised and events difficult to attend.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (P N Pennell Planning Consultant for Castle Homes & Properties Ltd) – Support proposed new housing development together with open space provision for Stone at Location SN-3 due to housing need, its sustainable location including employment provision, reduced commuting and lack of major highway infrastructure requirements.

**ACTION:** Note landowners support for Location SN-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Harrison) – Oppose new housing development at Locations SN-1 and SN-2 due increased traffic and pollution leading to Pingle Lane becoming a significant new road.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-1 and SN-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Baldwin) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 and the proposed new road SNPR-1. Brownfield sites should be used before greenfields, concerned about surface water run off from higher agricultural land, lack of consultation considering the scale of development. Stone is a small canal town which suffers already from congestion and when waters rise there are flooding problems.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Stone Town Council) – No encroachment on the Green Belt between Stone and Barlaston, all services and facilities should be in place before development occurs, concern about landscape impacts, brownfield sites should be used before Greenfield, local employment should be supported, garden land should be avoided, more affordable homes are required but less shared ownership, lifetime homes are required, support green infrastructure and protected open space at Tilling Drive, Walton Heath, Westbridge Park, the Common Plot, north and south Meadows as well as opposing telecommunications apparatus. Object to new housing development in Stone due to adequate housing stock and existing unoccupied properties, small scale development is preferred, green areas should be provided, lack of road infrastructure, no employment at Location SN-a and SN-b to be west of the A34. Better health care facilities are required and floodplain areas protected, improvements to green infrastructure and leisure provision but oppose commercial development at Westbridge Park. Encourage sustainable drainage systems and local employment. Stone town centre should be expanded if required to Christchurch Way, Stonefield Square and a new link road from Margaret Street to Radford Street extending the pedestrianised area. No objection to the proposed retail development.

**ACTION:** Note general comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Cllr Carey) – Oppose any new housing development at Walton for the following reasons: increased traffic on A34 and Eccleshall Road, requirement to enlarge school premises impacting on local roads, any houses built at Common Lane would cause serious flooding problems to Foxwood Close, further deterioration of existing problems, increased accidents and loss of Greenfield land. The small piece of land by the Fire Station on A34 should be zoned for recreation purposes only and not housing because of flood risks. The Market Street to Radford Street road link should be reintroduced to enable pedestrianisation of Granville Square as part of Radford Street and Station Road.

**ACTION:** Note general comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Rees) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 due to loss of greenfield sites, lack of brownfield land being used and greatly increased population pressure in the immediate area and on Stone's facilities.



**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Stone Residents – 73 & 44 years) – Relating to the existing Local Plan Housing Allocation: Land North West of Trent Road, Stone (HP17), this area has gained outline and detailed extant resolutions to grant planning permission subject to a section 106 agreement and appears as both a Housing Allocation and Commitment in the 2001 Stafford Borough Local Plan and the latest Housing Monitor. In view of the 10,000 new homes the Borough has to accommodate this site should be used especially after the rigorous public scrutiny by both the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector and the Borough Council's own planning process. HP17 re-allocation will make a valuable contribution to the housing requirement whilst strongly object to more houses being built on the higher ground (at Aston Lodge Park and Eccleshall Road) around Stone.

**ACTION:** Note support for re-allocation of HP17 and objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Heath MBD Architecture for Messrs Bowers) – Support the employment development proposed at SN-a and act as agent to the owners of the land, Messrs Bowers. There is clarity and certainty of the landowner's willingness, commitment and enthusiasm for use of the land which is located adjacent to an existing employment use site, has good highway access from the A51 Stone / Rugeley and the usable land is relatively flat and well drained and is clear of the land shown to be subject to flooding on the Environment Agency flood mapping. All mains services are available adjacent the site.

**ACTION:** Note support for Location SN-a to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (H Ball) – There has been significant housing development in Stone over the last 40 years. Every available brownfield site has been utilised without ruining the town and it's setting. However the proposed additional housing at Stonepark Farm and Little Stoke will completely ruin views from the Town to the rolling hills and destroy the existing valley setting. The proposal to build houses on the higher land at Walton Heath and Walton Hill will destroy the rural nature of the Common Land at Walton Heath whilst there have already been three extensions to the housing estates in this area. The proposed site at Stonepark farm will also be visible from the Green Belt area around Oulton as well as the conservation valley of the Oulton and Moddershall grinding mills totally spoiling the views and nature of these scenic places. The industrial estate at Walton is an eyesore and any expansion would only make matters worse. The infrastructure is barely coping under current volumes. There are vacant units on the Industrial Estates which could be utilised without the need to build additional accommodation.

**ACTION:** Note general comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Sparrow) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 for the following reasons. Stone is a market town but is not able to sustain further housing development for the existing infrastructure, services and facilities,

problems of local traffic congestion on Uttoxetter Road and Lichfield Road, the loss of greenfield land and countryside as well as increased flooding problems

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Sparrow) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 for the following reasons. Stone is a market town but is not able to sustain further housing development for the existing infrastructure, services and facilities, problems of local traffic congestion on Uttoxetter Road and Lichfield Road, the loss of greenfield land and countryside as well as increased flooding problems

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (D & M Lock) – Object to the proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 and the proposed new road at SNPR-1 for the following reasons: increased population and pressure on local resources, loss of greenfield land and land in Special Landscape Area designation, loss of accessible public green space at Pingle Lane to a proposed new road when SNPR-2 is preferred as a route, development exacerbating the dormitory effect and local traffic congestion on existing road infrastructure. Brownfield land should be utilised before greenfield land is developed. Question why land above Pingle Lane is not Green Belt designated.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 and SNPR-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (V Kading) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 for the following reasons; existing heavy traffic on Lichfield Road with increased pollution and narrow access to the town centre, the land is designated as a Special Landscape Area, future development would cause a dormitory effect for Stone with limited services and facilities to support an increased population and loss of town character. Brownfield land should be utilised rather than using Greenfield land.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Ball) – Object to any further housing development in Stone for the following reasons; impact on the town's character and character of the surrounding countryside with the existing infrastructure unable to cope with such a scale of development. Development should not occur either to the east or the west of Stone due to open countryside impacts as well as employment to the south. Questions whether there is any need for further development in Stone due to the following factors: current economic climate, demand for new housing has fallen significantly, little likelihood of businesses being willing or able to provide further employment opportunities. Existing housing stock should be better utilised rather than loss of countryside. Overall the strategy needs to reflect population trends, particularly an ageing population rather than new housing and employment on Greenfield land around Stone.

**ACTION:** Note general comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Baggaley) – Stone should remain a small market town and no new development should detract from this. Efforts should be made to attract businesses to empty town centre properties. Concerns are raised about the scale of development with impacts on landscape character particularly SN-1, SN-3 and SN-4, the Green Belt, increased carbon footprint arising from commuting elsewhere for employment, lack of medical provision, limited parking and school provision, impacts on local roads and traffic, drainage and flooding problems. Further employment land should be directed to the Stone Business Park or Whitebridge Industrial estate. Stone does require affordable homes for young people to support a mixed and balanced community rather than a town for the elderly. Support for new infrastructure, services and facilities but new housing and employment should not occur in Stone.

**ACTION:** Note general comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (A Plant) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 due to loss of Greenfield land, impact on countryside and landscape. There is sufficient land coming forward for residential development on allocated sites and previously developed sites within Stafford Borough without the need for these sites which will impact on the local road network, which is already heavily congested at peak times. Existing education, medical and community health facilities are barely adequate to meet local resident's needs. There are a number of protected species on the site as well as its definition by Defra as being "best and most versatile agricultural land".

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Turley Associates for Trent Vision Trust) – Support proposed new housing development at Locations SN-1 and SN-2 with support for the Vision and focus on Stone town regarding future growth on greenfield land in a sustainable and suitable location linked to services and facilities. The land is available, suitable and achievable with links to community facilities, closely connected to Stone town centre including walking and cycling, adds to habitat and flood alleviation provision whilst not undermining landscape character. Access will be improved by proposed new roads reducing the accident risks at the Uttoxetter Road level crossing whilst major infrastructure would be required on alternative sites in Stone. There is insufficient brownfield land to meet housing requirements with affordable housing to be well designed on single site areas and phasing for major infrastructure requirements so planned development early in the Plan.

**ACTION:** Note support for Locations SN-1 and SN-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (A Searle) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-5 as it is a Greenfield site, the visual impact of housing along the River Trent valley impinging on the Crown Meadows Nature Reserve and the site is not easily accessible by public transport.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (R & J Smith) – Object to the scale of development for Stone and Location SN-1 with the proposed new housing and employment development impacting on the town's character, lead to increased congestion on the existing local roads, increase pressure on local schools, nurseries and health services. The scale of development will reduce the land available for agriculture and increase the likelihood of flooding. Location SN-1 will affect traffic movement on Lichfield Road and access to the town centre. Recommendations - small-scale developments for a relatively small town context, need for social housing and first-time buyers, and plan for effective traffic systems to minimise congestion.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Cllr Leason) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 due to concerns regarding the loss of Greenfield land, impact on landscape, traffic congestion on Lichfield Road and access problems for Pingle Lane. Object to Location SN-2 due to concerns on the size of development and traffic congestion for Lichfield Road. Object to SN-3 & SN-4 due to concern that these locations would have access off the Eccleshall Road and A34 which has major traffic problems at peak times. Support development at Location SN-5 providing access is directly onto the A34. The site is considered an appropriate infill site. Object to Location SN-a due to the site being an existing former farm and open land with development for employment restricted to SN-b with access directly on to the A34. Object to SN TC T3 and SN TC 15 in the town centre as development of these car parks would have a detrimental effect on the town's night time economy. Any major future development must have local infrastructure improved beforehand.

**ACTION:** Note general comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Kelly) – Development on the scale proposed has potential to worsen conditions in Stone in terms of traffic movements, impacts on local services and facilities, loss of amenity and high landscape value. New roads and railway bridges are associated with the development of some of the areas and new water storage and electricity capacity to serve the enlarged community could be required. Choice of areas to develop is crucial to the future functioning of the town and to the quality of life of the residents. Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 as this area is cut off from the existing settlement by the West Coast railway line and new access road from Lichfield Road and a new bridge over the railway would be required. Building on this land would mean the loss of an important landscape. Traffic conditions on Lichfield Road would be worse. Object to Location SN-2 as development would straddle the railway and require a new railway bridge and road link from Uttoxeter Road to the A51. Support SN-3 & SN-4 as these areas fit within the existing road and rail pattern, and would link with the existing housing estates on either side of the Eccleshall Road. There are no apparent obstacles to development on these sites. In summary the least challenging and least costly areas to develop to produce the least impact would be SN3, SN4 and SN5. Developing at SN1 is the most challenging, most expensive and disruptive option and should not be considered.

**ACTION:** Note general comments and objections to Locations SN-1 and SN-2 whilst support for SN-3, SN-4 & SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (P Kelly) – Development on the scale proposed has potential to worsen conditions in Stone regarding traffic movements, impact on local services and facilities, loss of amenity and impact on high landscape value. New roads and railway bridges are associated with the development of some of the areas and new water storage and electricity capacity to serve the enlarged community could be required. Choice of areas to develop is crucial to the future functioning of the town and to the quality of life for the residents. Object to Location SN-1 as this area is cut off from the existing settlement by the West Coast railway line and therefore a new access road from Lichfield Road and a new bridge over the railway would be required to make this development feasible. Building on this land would mean loss of an important landscape, Special Landscape Area and the only green public space on this area of Stone. Traffic conditions on Lichfield Road would be much worse. Object to Location SN-2 as this development will require a new railway bridge and road link from Uttoxeter Road to the A51 at significant cost. Support development at locations SN-3 & SN-4 as these areas fit within the existing road and rail pattern with development linking with the existing housing estates on either side of the Eccleshall Road. There are no apparent obstacles to development. In summary the least challenging and least costly areas to develop to produce the least impact would be SN3, SN4 and SN5. Developing at SN1 is the most challenging, most expensive and disruptive option and should not be considered. The Borough Council should investigate alternative sites, including brown field site development.

**ACTION:** Note general comments and objections to Locations SN-1 and SN-2 whilst support for SN-3, SN-4 & SN-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Warrilow) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-1 and SN-2 as well as the proposed new road at SNPR-1 due to the impact on existing properties from increased flooding and drainage capacity problems, loss of Greenfield land to absorb water, increased traffic volumes on Lichfield Road particularly on a new Pingle Lane route.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-1 and SN-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Dr Rees) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-1 and SN-2 due to loss of greenfield land, impact on landscape and the environment. As an alternative it would be better to redevelop currently run down areas, on brownfield sites. Concerns were raised that the selection of development locations is already a 'done deal' and that public concern will not be taken into account.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-1 and SN-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (H & M Smart) – Object to proposed new housing development at SN-1 and SNPR-1 due to increased traffic congestion on Lichfield Road and the impact of proposed new roads, increased flooding events from surrounding higher ground, loss of privacy, increased anti-social behaviour and undermining the quality of life, impact

on biodiversity and wildlife, loss of local character and landscape, light pollution, increased pressure on local amenities and services including the Fire Service and medical facilities. Furthermore raised concerns about traffic congestion increasing from Location SN-2 and SNPR-2.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-1, SN-2 and SNPR-1, SNPR-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Hardt) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-1 and SN-2 on the grounds of increased population and associated issues of policing, anti-social behaviour, pressure on health services and schools, lack of infrastructure and the impact of housing on the environment which will conflict with the governments 'green' aims. Furthermore raises concerns about the difficulties experienced using the Borough Council and public consultation website.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-1 and SN-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (J & D Simms) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 on the grounds of impact on the Special Landscape Area, reduced quality of life for existing residents, noise and light pollution. Aston Lodge is already a large development with access and traffic pressures particularly for local schools and the new marina, water drainage, run-off and flooding problems. Furthermore the new proposals have not been widely communicated.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Meyers) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 due to the impact and loss of Special Landscape Area, impact on quality of life by increased development, noise and light pollution, lack of existing facilities in this area of Stone, traffic congestion and access at Pingle Lane and Lichfield Road, water drainage, run-off and flooding problems. The consultation document does not discuss, in detail, the type of housing to be delivered, the associated infrastructure work, nor the additional services and facilities to be provided. The proposals and have not been widely communicated in sufficient time for residents to make comments.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Furber) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 due to existing traffic and congestion problems on Eccleshall Road and the A34, particularly at rush hour, lack of education provision and the inability of current schools to take additional pupils, loss of character and identity as a market town and doctor's surgeries already at capacity.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Astle) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 due to impact on the local environment, loss of Green Belt, landscape and views, loss of open space, lack of local infrastructure, especially roads with bottlenecks and property devaluation.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Macy) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 due to increased traffic congestion on Eccleshall Road and the A34, impact on wildlife and biodiversity, and impacts on existing sheltered housing from increased disruption. Representation includes a list of signatures from Longhope Drive residents.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (J Rainey) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 as the proposals will drastically change the character of Walton, increase pressure on the traffic infrastructure due to existing local schools, increased noise and disruption. If the relief road in Walton is constructed it should be designed to avoid a rat run. Concern that no further school provision is required alongside new development. Walton has taken sufficient new development in the past with further development spoiling the character of the town.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (R Dee) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-1 due to the impact on privacy, landscape, access through existing estate roads and greenfield views. Significant concern raised about the lack of publicity for the consultation exercise, the diagrams used in the exhibition and hard copy documentation.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Wood) – Object to proposed new housing in Stafford and Stone to accommodate overspill residents from major conurbations and concern that there is a lack of finance to buy new homes evident by empty properties. Stone has no infrastructure in place for the additional new homes, experiences empty shops, unoccupied flats, and vast amounts of properties for sale. The public exhibition did not clarify the purpose of the consultation and concern about lack of democratic accountability.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Wright) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 due to lack of adequate road infrastructure and impacts on the A34 Walton roundabout and Eccleshall Road, overloaded medical facilities, oversupply of housing in Stone depressing property values, lack of adequate access, limited new education provision and a lack of partnership working between service providers.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (S Tyson) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-1 and SN-2 due to the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, overloading the existing road network, loss of countryside and greenfield land and loss of town character. Recommend using land off Westbridge Estate with existing road infrastructure allowing easier traffic flow on the A34 which is more of a main bypass on the edge of the town. Stone has a significant number of unsold and empty homes.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-1 and SN-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Gerrard) – Concern about the scale of proposed new housing development in Stone related to both growth scenarios which will impact on maintaining the character of Stone and create problems for current and future infrastructure, particularly local roads. The link between employment and housing seems over simplistic. Based on the current economic climate, the Borough Council should use the extra time to review the plans and establish proposals more locally acceptable.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Johnson) – Acknowledge the future need for affordable housing and employment opportunities for the next generation. Nevertheless object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-1 and SN-2 due to the scale and impact on the character of the town, loss of high quality landscape, access concerns for the proposed new roads on Lichfield Road / Pingle Lane and infrastructure issues. There are drainage / flood protection issues highlighted by the significant Aston Chase flood alleviation scheme in order to address existing flooding risks on Lichfield Road and Aston Lodge estate. Development in land north of Pingle Lane would have a significant impact on drainage of the area and flood risk pressure 'downstream'.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations SN-1 and SN-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (M & E Weaver) – Object to the proposed new housing and employment developments in Stone except for Location SN-2 as being too large due to insufficient doctors, insufficient schools, insufficient sewers, lack of capacity on existing local roads, risk of flooding as a result of new development and poor local amenities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (E Shannon) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-3 as this is common land enjoyed by the local community as a valuable amenity, lack of recreation for the local populace, pressure for increased services and facilities especially for the youth, impacts on the road system, lack of enhanced health care and education for new development and limited car parking in the town centre. Demand for extra homes needs to be supported by infrastructure, which is lacking in Stone. Concern about the lack of engagement through the consultation process.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Gallimore) – Support the inclusion of land at Little Stoke (south east of the Three Crowns Public House) to be considered for new housing development which would not damage the area's character, is close to local services and facilities whilst easily accessed by the highway network. A further site is also put forward at Aston-by-Stone for new housing development.

**ACTION:** Note support for client's land south east of Stone to be considered through the preferred development locations.



1 response (I H Leadley) – Object to further employment development being unnecessary due to the unoccupied warehouses north of Stafford on the A34. Object to proposed new development at Location SN-1 due to increased traffic congestion. Object to new housing development at Location SN-3 as this land is permanently flooded and further house building will only aggravate flooding problems to be overcome by the County Council, Severn Trent Water and the Environment Agency.  
ACTION: Note objections to Locations SN-1 and SN-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Walker) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 which would turn Walton into a dormitory town with no infrastructure or facilities, bring an increase in noise and pollution from traffic generation, impact on the character of the town as well as affect existing infrastructure, roads, schools and doctors. Furthermore there is a lack of youth facilities and recreational opportunities in the Walton area.  
ACTION: Note objections to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Whitehurst) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 due to additional population pressures on the local road network, including congestion and access problems on Lichfield Road and the A51. Significant concern that an element of social housing would bring associated social problems.  
ACTION: Note objections to Locations SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (J & S Cartwright) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-1 due to loss of good quality farmland, impact on the landscape and character of Stone, scale of infrastructure to bridge the West Coast mainline and additional pressure on the railway / road access across the level crossing at Little Stoke, lack of provision through existing local services and facilities including limited shops, doctors and schools as well as limited car parking provision. Recommends that new homes should be built on brownfield sites, use empty, neglected or poor quality housing to be upgraded whilst moving industrial units to business parks providing more housing land in towns. The Environment Agency have a proposal to use some of this land for a flood alleviation project to protect properties on Aston Lodge estate. With regards to commercial development query whether further provision is required due to existing numbers of empty shops, factories and warehouse units in the Stone area which should be filled first. Developments rarely provide local employment, being large storage areas with few employees. Query the need for more housing in general due to lack of property finance and infrastructure problems  
ACTION: Note objections to Locations SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (E A O Pick) – Object to the proposed increase in proposed new housing development in Stone and the additional population with both growth scenarios totally changing the character of the town. Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 due to limited new infrastructure provision undermining the quality of life and place to live caused by traffic congestion. Prior to any new housing development Eccleshall Road should be widened to a dual carriageway and the junction with the A34 modified with an entry sliproad for north bound traffic, or alternatively a new by-pass for the A34 built. Location SN-3 poses major traffic problems for the already very busy Pirehill Lane. Proposed new roads will lead to rat running and increased traffic pollution. Apart from SN-5 all of the plans for Stone are

undeliverable without major improvements in infrastructure, including more schools, doctors, sewage disposal, utility supplies and measures to prevent flooding on Eccleshall Road.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations SN-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (P & B Shaw) – Concern about the lack of democratic accountability and blame approach between the political parties which both object to the new housing in Stone. The Conservative party canvassed Walton highlighting the lack of infrastructure provision but stating there is limited action to influence the new planning process. Question where the additional population will come from.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations in Walton to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Williams) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations SN-3 and SN-4 as the building of so many new homes in Stone, and by the Eccleshall Road in particular, is not in the best interests of Stone or its people.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 in Walton to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Lovatt) – Object to the scale of proposed new development in Stone including the Plan's deliverability due to existing traffic problems, the poor condition of local roads and the pressure on existing facilities and services including lack of local employment.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (A Almond) – Object to additional houses in Stone due to loss of town character, pressure on existing services and facilities for new development, lack of retail variety in Stone town centre and lack of finance in the property market to purchase new housing.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Loch) – Object to proposed new housing development in Stone due to current levels of traffic congestion, flooding and increased surface water run off, no reference to additional new services and facilities to be provided alongside new housing for local people including recreational and leisure provision, lack of car parking and health services. There is a lack of brownfield land development compared to Greenfield sites.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Dawes) – Object to proposed new road SNPR-1 at Pingle Lane due to the increased noise and disturbance, loss of wildlife and trees, the increase in traffic and impact on Lichfield Road.

ACTION: Note objections to Proposal SNPR-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Flower) – Concerned about retaining the character of Stone with the scale of new housing development proposed.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Stone Labour Party) – Major new development should not proceed until a major environmental survey into infrastructure needs has been completed including drainage and flooding, power supplies, roadways, parking facilities, increased traffic, medical, leisure and educational provision, employment prospects and biodiversity and open space impacts. Further information on housing type and cost is required to avoid high densities and meet the needs of the population using energy efficient low cost schemes. Due to the landscape of Stone new development must be pleasant, sensitive to the landscape and environmentally friendly.

ACTION: Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

#### 8.17 2 responses received

1 response (E I J Slann) – Significant concerns raised about flooding above Aston Lodge Park in 2004 affecting the local road network and Lichfield Road towards Stone town centre with subsequent Environment Agency consultations leading to a flood alleviation scheme to be constructed to address existing surface water run off issues. Nevertheless the proposed new housing development at location SN-1 for 1,400 new homes would not be provided for by the existing scheme and Sustainable Drainage Systems may not overcome the flooding problems and increased level of surface water run off. Major infrastructure to increase downstream would require be required. The watercourse has now been classified as a major river by the Environment Agency and the Council should carry out further investigations before this land is allocated for new housing.

ACTION: Note the flooding issues raised in relation to location SN-1 in Stone to be considered through the preferred development locations and further evidence / investigations assessed.

1 response (Ms Mitchell) – Object to further housing development in Stone due to the impact on the nature of the attractive market town with inadequate public transport and road infrastructure for the existing traffic, problems of parked cars near to local schools, lack of education provision as well as limited leisure and recreation facilities for residents. The quality of life and environment will be destroyed together with the landscape if housing is built on greenfields.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

Spatial Options 2      7 responses received

1 response (Mrs Aldred) – Object to the proposal for new housing at Location SN-1 north of Pingle Lane due to the quality landscape, Tree Preservation Orders, impact on the local schools, surgeries and roads. There are sufficient empty properties in the area and not enough local jobs leading to increase commuting and congestion.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Dawes) – Object to proposed new development at Location SN-1 due to loss of greenfields and habitats, increased traffic congestion and commuting, pressure on local schools and loss of the Special Landscape Area. Access should occur on the proposed SNPR-2 road rather than Pingle Lane but other sites should be investigated.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Kinnibrugh) – Concern that development will impact on the character and landscape of Stone, worsen the current road problems and put pressure on Stone's already outdated infrastructure system. Recommends paying more attention to brownfield sites and creating new communities, such as Transition Towns, which will be less damaging to the environment to address the housing shortage.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Lewis) – Objects to proposed new development at location SN-1 for the following reasons: loss and impact on Special Landscape Area, congestion, impact on services and facilities, impact of development on the elderly, such as type of housing and availability of healthcare. Providing the infrastructure to support SN1 would be very expensive, and put more traffic onto the existing congested Lichfield Road.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (K & P Slater) – Oppose development at Lichfield Road and Pingle Lane for the following reasons: increased population pressure, safety issues, access implications of using Pingle Lane, traffic problems and strain on local resources including schools.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Hodson) – Oppose development at Lichfield Road and Pingle Lane for the following reasons: Loss of views and impact on the landscape and character of the town, and loss and impact of the Special Landscape Area through the new development proposed.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Evans) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location SN-3 due to impacts on the countryside, Green Belt, common land, flooding, drainage, congestion and extra traffic, wildlife and loss of green open space.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

Table 8.2 3 responses received

1 response (Mr Edwards) – Support the proposed plans for the whole area as this should benefit the whole community although doubt that the social aspects will be delivered.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Pert) – Object to the proposed new development at Location SN-1 with associated impacts on access roads and arterial routes. Public transport should be supported including re-opening the railway station as a mainline station with links to London. In other areas of Stone there is insufficient local transport infrastructure, which could be addressed by the proposed level of development in Stone.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Concerned about traffic congestion along Lichfield Road which needs to be considered as well as the times the crossing fails to function and traffic backs up at Little Stoke. Pedestrians should be considered as well as the existing parking problems and access to local schools.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

Table 8.3 1 response (Mrs Wright) – The employment locations seem well considered but access, both by car and public transport, needs to be improved.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

8.19 5 responses received

1 response (Mr Clegg) – No significant new development should go to Stone in the planning period as this will undermine the urban regeneration of the North Staffordshire. With regards to Location SN-1 there are concerns over the suitability of this area for development for the following reasons: greenfield land of high landscape value, site used for grazing and food production, impact on biodiversity, increased flooding, major new infrastructure and access. With regards to Location SN-2 there are concerns over the precise location making it difficult to assess the need for an additional road or its relation to the new marina development on the A51. The impact on development of this site would be less than SN-1 but there is still the overriding

concern that it undermines the regeneration of the north Staffordshire. With regards to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 the two sites do not appear to result in the same infrastructure costs linked to SN-1 and SN-2 and if junction improvements to the Walton roundabout can be achieved will result in less impact from additional congestion but concerns remains that any significant development in Stone undermines the regeneration of the north Staffordshire conurbation. With regards to Location SN-5 this sites appears to be infilling within the current town development boundary and is supported provided this is not in the flood plain. With regards to the possible employment locations Stone Business Park has damaged the landscape value of the valley side and any further development of employment land should include greatly improved landscaping and design whilst a further increase in distribution-shed uses is opposed in favour of office or small scale manufacturing.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Stone resident) – Oppose the new housing development at Location SN-1 effecting Pingle Lane for the following reasons: increased population pressure, traffic and strain on local resources, loss of rural area, loss and impact on Special Landscape Area as well as strongly opposing access via Pingle Lane. Stafford Borough Council should investigate alternative sites, including brown field site development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (N J Gumbley) – Opposes new housing development at SN-1 for the following reasons: increase in population, traffic and strain on local resources, loss of rural area, loss and impact of Special Landscape Area, loss of accessible green space and the dormitory effect on Stone. Furthermore oppose access via Pingle Lane but prefer the SNRP-2 access. Stafford Borough Council should investigate other suitable alternative sites including brownfield site developments.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mr Spencer) – More information is required to clarify the figures in the Regional Spatial Strategy, when these will be finalised and the Borough Council's response. The new Plan needs to acknowledge the current economic climate and 'credit crunch' particularly in relation to development with greater explanation required regarding the 2 growth scenarios. With regards to Location SN-1 development in this location conflicts with many aims set out in the Vision, a more appropriate description of the location would be Bordering the Northern side of the Aston Lodge Estate. Development is opposed on the grounds of Special Landscape Area designation, development creating a dormitory town, increase in traffic congestion and implications of access via Pingle Lane. With regards to Location SN-2 this would be less intrusive and visible, and has the advantage that the new road and railway bridge proposals could be designed to make a significant improvement to the road system in that area by avoiding the unsatisfactory railway level crossing on the B5027 Uttoxeter road.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 and SN-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Consideration needs to be made for those properties already located in the area and current issues such as impact on property values, capacity of local schools, pedestrian access and recreation uses for the elderly and young people.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

8.20 No responses received

8.21 3 responses received

1 response (National Trust) – With regards to Locations SN-3 and SN-4 these locations might be visible from land in National Trust care at Downs Bank, but are not considered that they would be fundamentally harmful to its landscape setting. These options are preferable to SN-1 which would harm Stone's landscape setting through substantial development on the high ground to the east of the town.

ACTION: Note objections to Location SN-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Richard Gough for Taylor Wimpey Ltd) – Considers that the potential Eastern Direction of Growth should be rejected on environmental and visual impact grounds. The topography of land to the west of the town, although also rising upwards from the River Trent Valley, better contains the land and the visual impact from any development in this location would be minimal. The most suitable location to accommodate further employment land is to the west of the A34 (site SN-b). This would extend the existing industrial area and build on its success. In order to create an integrated sustainable urban extension, it is considered that employment development in this location should be matched by housing development. Site SN-3 offers the opportunity to provide a 'first phase' of development extending around the west of the existing built up area to the south of Eccleshall Road towards the industrial estate to the west of the A34.

ACTION: Note support for Location SN-3 and SN-b whilst objection to the eastern direction of growth to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

1 response (Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates) – New housing development at Stone need not be omni-directional. The selected directions for growth are crude and generalised; all require infrastructure provision of substantial scale and cost and the question posed is a little misleading in implying that a single direction of growth must be chosen. Supports development of an extension of the Aston Lodge Park development that has the potential to create a successful housing scheme. The Fradley Estates site would round off development at Aston Lodge Park; would not extend further up the hillside than existing development; would occupy less visually sensitive land than a large part of the existing Aston Lodge Park development; would not breach the skylight and would not impact on the landscape setting of Stone when viewed from long distance. Unlike SN-1 and SN-2 therefore the Fradley Estates land would not require major highway investment or have significant landscape impact.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location SN-1 and SN-2 as opposed to the Fradley Estates land to be considered through the preferred development locations for Stone.

---

## **Eccleshall (EC) – Housing Location Options**

190 responses received

1 response (Mr Stringer) – Object to proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to existing inadequate road infrastructure within and surrounding Eccleshall at maximum capacity, increased flood risk problems, facilities and services within Eccleshall are barely sufficient for the current population and outlying villages, there is no local health centre and other essential facilities necessary to sustain an increased population. None of the proposed locations are suitable and the strategic plans should be reconsidered.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Adams) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3, which would mean extending the Residential Development Boundary on the south side of Eccleshall and concern that there are delivery problems related to access and ownership issues on Green Lane, increased flooding, surface water drainage problems, road safety issues and loss of landscape character. Previous consultation responses have highlighted problems but these are not reflected in the current Issues and Options document.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Barbers Rural Consultancy for Mr Peak) – Support proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 on behalf of client's owned land bordering existing residential development with limited impact on the open countryside, good vehicular and pedestrian access to the town centre and sports facilities, the site is currently low grade agriculture land with no pollution or contamination issues with gentle topography. All mains utilities are available to the site as well as a range of community services and facilities, with public transport and provision of affordable housing, open space and recreation on site.

**ACTION:** Note support for Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Hammond) – Accept the need for affordable housing and housing for the elderly but object to the scale of proposed development in the consultation document due to the current economic climate, loss of Greenfield land when brownfield sites and empty properties exist, a negative change of character and quality of life in Eccleshall which has limited amenities and infrastructure as well as traffic congestion and flooding problems.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.



1 response (Mrs Harding) – Concern about the level of detail and depth of site evaluation carried out in the Sustainability Appraisal report with proposed new housing developments in Eccleshall at Locations EC-1, EC-2 and EC-3 within the open countryside with wildlife and biodiversity value, used for agricultural purposes. Development would impact on the character of the historic town reducing visitor numbers and lead to a loss of landscape and environmental areas.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-1, EC-2 and EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Powell) – Support proposed new housing development at Locations EC-2 and EC-3 as sites to the south and east of Eccleshall are better options in terms of limiting congestion, drainage and flooding with a possibility to create a reed bed / nature area. Object to Locations EC-4 and EC-5 as development would have an impact on the road network and require additional education and leisure facilities.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-4 and EC-5 with support for Locations EC-2 and EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Powell) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-1 and EC-5 due to impact on wildlife and the need to relocate school facilities. In general it is important to reduce car use and congestion in Eccleshall and surrounding road network.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-1 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (K & CJ Weston) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to impact on the town's character and suggest smaller sites with infill development. Concerns raised about new development creating problems associated with sewerage and drainage, traffic congestion and increase the level of commuting whilst there is no clear need for additional housing.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (J Davies) – Object to the scale of new development in Eccleshall due to the impact on the historic character, lack of facilities for young people, limited capacity of schools and local roads, flooding problems and impact on the landscape.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Chew) – Object to proposed new housing development at Crown Surgery car park on Small Lane due to limited car parking provision in the town centre and the essential need at the surgery.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Yeomans) – Object to the proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to loss of character and identity, narrow local road infrastructure and increased commuting as well as issues of sewerage, electricity, surface water and doctors facilities. It would be more appropriate to meet the housing requirement through a new settlement equipped to provide all the new services and facilities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (J Yeomans) – With regards to proposed new development in Eccleshall brownfield sites should be fully utilised before greenfield development takes place, there is currently a lack of parking in Eccleshall and traffic congestion. Concerns raised about the current economic situation and people living beyond their budgets and means.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Berrys Property for Mrs Bourne) – Support proposed new housing development at Location EC-1 on behalf of client owned land to provide a necessary Greenfield site. Eccleshall has an extensive range of services with good transport links acting as a small town with rural hinterland and local employment opportunities. New development will support local businesses and schools together with community facilities. Access onto Stone Road and infrastructure to the sewage works is available for the site as well as providing affordable housing together with market housing needs. Development would not affect the North Staffordshire Green Belt, support provision of a link road and reduce traffic implications in Eccleshall High Street. Support further employment development at Raleigh Hall for the local community and favour Section 106 Agreements rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy.

**ACTION:** Note support for client's land at Location EC-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Chapman) – Concerned that the existing infrastructure is at capacity, in particular drainage, sewerage, transport, storm water and lack of parking which will require significant improvement ahead of large scale development. Locations EC-2, EC-3, EC-4 and EC-5 would lead to further drainage problems, evident from a recent planning application in Green Lane. Object to the proposed new road at ECPR-1 as not solving existing or future traffic problems. Accept the need for affordable housing but this should be sited within easy access to work opportunities, linked to local services and affordable transport routes such as the Blacksmiths yard and Location EC-4. Concern about new developments undermining property values and unviable financially.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (E Hyner) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall on the grounds of increased traffic and speeding, poor sewage and surface water system leading to flooding, loss of greenfields, occasional problems with electrical supply, lack of appropriate play areas, poor public transport links, pressure on the existing school, pressure on emergency and local health services as well as a lack of parking.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Dudney) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to impact on the landscape and environment, loss of historic character and identity of Eccleshall, lack of well paid local employment, increased commuting, significant strain on the transport infrastructure within the town and to surrounding areas, lack of education provision and safe access to existing schools, surface water drainage problems with flooding and lack of services and facilities including medical provision.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Leather) – New housing and employment development in key settlements to reflect existing limited infrastructure to support the Vision, key objectives and Option C. Object to the proposed development north of Stafford with development to Stone and other large settlements including Eccleshall, Hixon, Gnosall and Great & Little Haywood. Concerned about references to energy and the Eccleshall biomass plant not functioning properly, creating pollution and is not being monitored. Support protection of the Green Belt but minor releases, review and extensions to Residential Development Boundaries but no rural area development. Employment development to be directed to Stone and larger villages rather than Stafford but concern about access issues for Recognised Industrial Estates at Hixon, Raleigh Hall and Ladfordfields. The level of housing growth to Eccleshall should be limited to 250 – 400 homes with improved local services. Object to proposed new development at Locations EC-1, EC-2 and EC-3 but support Locations EC-4 and EC-5 including a further site between Newport Road to the east and Lonsdale School to the west as the most suitable locations for development due to distance from the town centre, not causing flood problems and being contained within the natural boundaries of Eccleshall.

At Gnosall development would lead to increased commuting due to a lack of local employment with limited road capacity for new industrial areas. Supports proposed new housing development at Locations GN-7, GN-8 and GN-9. At Hixon development of limited employment and housing provision is supported. At the Haywoods housing development limited to Locations GH-2 and LH-2 due to lack of employment and commuting impacts. Flooding problems in Haughton restricting development to Locations HN-3 and HN-4. Object to further development at Weston and Woodseaves due to lack of local employment and inadequate facilities. Oppose new development at Yarnfield and Tittensor due to the Green Belt and limited facilities and infrastructure. Object to new employment options at Ladfordfields due to loss of high quality agricultural land with the adjacent disused Seighford airfield suggested with new highway infrastructure. Further development at Raleigh Hall restricted until the impact of Heavy Goods Vehicles through Eccleshall is solved and in any event would lead to a loss of high quality agricultural land. Concern about energy efficiency of miscanthus being transported to Drax power station due to issues at the Eccleshall biomass plant. Alternative uses for employment sites in urban areas to be considered due to new accommodation requirements of modern employment needs. Floodplain areas to be expanded and protected as a result of new developments. Concern about loss of car parking provision in Stafford town centre. New highway infrastructure will be necessary for new development at the Recognised Industrial Estates but employment should be mainly focused on Stafford and Stone.

**ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Mr Biggs) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-3, EC-4 and EC-5 due to surface water run off and flooding pressures, increased traffic generation, loss of property values and views, lack of brownfield use and loss of Greenfield land, impact on the landscape and environment, local services and facilities. Raises question of vacant properties being considered in the total number of houses? Services and facilities to be expanded for new development with implications for traffic and the environment. The plan should follow best practice in terms of energy use, renewable energy, construction and design.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-3, EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (R K Jones) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-1 being contrary to established policies, in particular *Policy D1 - Sustainable forms of Development, Policy T11 - Management of traffic, Policy D8 - Infrastructure, Policy NC1 - protection of countryside, policy D6 - conserving Agricultural land and policy NC7C - Local nature conservation and Policy T1A - Design and environment quality of development*. Development will have impacts on education and medical services, traffic congestion on the poor local road network, loss of Greenfield land, habitats, town character and poor sewage facilities which currently creates a vast amount of noise pollution, light pollution and airborne particles. Furthermore there are flooding problems due to proximity of the River Sow.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Douce) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 due to its sensitive location close to the conservation area and its landscape visibility. Location EC-4 seems a logical choice, infill site with little impact on the village but would still result in increased traffic and congestion in the town centre. Eccleshall has poor services in terms of drainage, sewerage and car parking which would have to be improved before new development occurs.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Fox) – Strongly object to the proposed new road ECPR-1 development linking Stafford Road and Stone Road as well as the housing proposed at Locations EC-1 and EC-2 due to increased traffic and noise pollution, loss of greenfields and town character, dangers for pedestrians, drainage issues and impact on wildlife.

ACTION: Note objections to ECPR-1, Locations EC-1 and EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Davis) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to the landscape, countryside and skyline impacts, additional traffic to the already hazardous junction at the end of Green Lane and significantly increase the number of short journeys made by car to local services in Eccleshall. Further development would place additional population pressures on the existing infrastructure, community feel and historic town character.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Bradshaw) – Accept that some small scale housing development in Eccleshall is required for the elderly and first time buyers. However oppose large scale greenfield development at the scale outlined in the consultation document particularly Location EC-5. Brownfield rather than Greenfield land should be used to protect the historic town centre, greenfields and the Conservation Area's setting. Limited new houses are required due to the existing stock of empty homes with concerns raised about impact on wildlife, the current infrastructure in Eccleshall, in particular the inadequate sewerage system and traffic volumes on the local road network for current and future development. New development would undermine the Council's commitments to climate change targets signed in the Staffordshire Declaration due to increased commuting for school and employment needs. Object to further employment development at Raleigh Hall not meeting local needs and increasing traffic congestion.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Hammersley-Fenton) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to increased flooding and drainage problems, loss of greenfield land, impact on wildlife and habitats, increased traffic congestion on the local road network with safety implications. For Eccleshall in general there is local traffic congestion, problems with car parking and the level of local services and facilities is not sufficient to meet the needs of new development.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (R Jessop) – Concerned about the scale of new housing development proposed for Eccleshall leading to a loss of character and village identity, loss of greenfields, increased traffic congestion and pollution, lack of primary school provision including recreational open space, lack of library and medical services. There is poor access to many shops in Eccleshall for the elderly. Objects to development of Crown Street car park for housing, as this car park is required for visitors to the surgery.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Vernon) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall, in particular Location EC-1 due to proximity to the floodplain as well as increased traffic congestion and pollution impacting the local road network including the narrow High Street. If development is to take place a bypass is needed.

ACTION: Note objections including Location EC-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Ecclian Society) – Object to the scale of new housing development proposed for Eccleshall due to the impact on town character, lack of adequate local infrastructure, services and facilities including surface water run off problems and sewerage issues. Limited local employment will increase commuting and undermine environmental policies. Development should take account of the Town Design Statement with landscape and countryside to be preserved, in particular object to Location EC-5. Smaller scale infill development areas should be used with less detrimental impact on Eccleshall.

ACTION: Note objections including Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Roberts) – Accept the new housing development is needed but should be minimised due to increased traffic congestion and commuting on narrow low roads, drainage problems, impact on the Conservation Area, access problems to Crown Street surgery.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Horton) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to increased urban sprawl into agricultural land previously of high quality and housing not required for local people.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (D H Ballantyne) – Concern about the scale of new development at Eccleshall until a bypass is constructed to Raleigh Hall and substantial drainage / sewerage improvements occur. New housing will not benefit the residents of Eccleshall due to limited local employment opportunities and increased congestion.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (EP & WE Baskerville) – Concerned that proposed new housing development would increase commuting levels due to limited local employment, destroy the town's character and historic identity whilst local infrastructure, services and facilities are limited with drainage and sewerage system problems, traffic volume issues and lack of recreational facilities. Development should take account of the Town Design Statement whilst the landscape and Conservation Area must be preserved. Object to Location EC-5 but support small scale infill development to protect the nature and character of the town.

ACTION: Note objections including Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Hammersley-Fenton) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to lack of drainage, increased flooding, extra traffic and congestion on the narrow local roads, limited infrastructure to support the existing population including parking, lack of local employment subsequent commuting as workers at Raleigh Hall cannot afford to buy properties in Eccleshall.

ACTION: Note objections including Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Atkins) – Questions the need for the proposed new housing with concerns regarding the impact on wildlife and conservation areas, increased traffic congestion, noise and pollution.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-1, EC-2, EC-4 and EC-5 with concerns that the sewage and drainage systems are already fully stretched, the school is full and that large development would have a negative impact on the character and history of Eccleshall.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Eccleshall Resident) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-2 due to traffic, noise and light pollution impacts, drainage problems and loss of Greenfield land, devaluation of property values and trees with the proposed new road ECPR-1 increasing traffic and noise. In general oppose new housing development in Eccleshall rather than using brownfield sites due to impact on character and identity, increased traffic, lack of car parking, limited local infrastructure, services and facilities as well as a lack of local employment. Development should be spread more evenly across the Borough and not meet housing needs from adjacent authorities.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Fisher German for the Lichfield Diocese) – Support proposed new housing development at client owned land within Location EC-4 and EC-5 whilst support the vision, key objectives and development strategy with increased housing provision to other key settlements rather than Stafford and Stone through consideration of existing infrastructure, services and facilities. Support Green Belt protection and review of certain Residential Development Boundaries but generally no rural development except for affordable housing. Object to northern growth direction of Stafford, using low lying flood plain areas and run off problems. Development at Stone will require major new infrastructure and is not proportionate to the settlement. Eccleshall's existing facilities can accommodate at least 400 new houses although development to the east and south have flooding issues and loss of open countryside. Development to the west is most appropriate being close to the town centre, local services and facilities and bounded by the settlement. Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to lack of employment and increased commuting although support smaller infill sites north west of Gnosall. Large scale development at Hixon will require major infrastructure although small scale housing may be appropriate due to the level of local employment. Development at the Haywoods should be limited to Location GH-2 and LH-2 due to lack of local employment and commuting problems. Haughton could benefit from new housing development to support the vision for a new village centre on Locations HN-3 and HN-4. Development at Weston and Woodseaves should have regard to the existing settlement and facilities. Support retaining Green Belt boundaries and object to new development at Yarnfield and Tittensor. Support Greenfield development and a minimum provision of affordable and mixed tenure housing on Greenfield sites. Object to rural conversions but support rural exception sites. Re-use of existing employment sites to be considered on their merits and all development to avoid flooding problems whilst incorporating sustainable drainage systems and support telecommunications guidance in PPG8.

**ACTION:** Note support for client owned land at Location EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred options for Eccleshall. Note the various comments and observations to the other topics.

1 response (Fisher German for B Moat) – Support proposed new housing development at client owned land west of Eccleshall at Location EC-4 and EC-5 whilst support the vision, key objectives and development strategy with increased housing provision to other key settlements rather than Stafford and Stone. Object to energy and Eccleshall Biomass power plant references due to pollution, inefficient working and poor monitoring as well as carbon footprint to Drax power station for miscanthus grass. Support Green Belt protection and review of certain Residential Development Boundaries. The balance of employment provision to Stafford and Stone is too great and should be re-directed to other settlements. Object to northern growth direction of Stafford being contrary to the Local Plan policy whilst accept new development to the east and west of Stafford avoiding low lying flood plain areas. Development east of Stone will require major new infrastructure being financially unviable / undeliverable whilst development to the west of Stone would overload the local road network and increase traffic pressures. Eccleshall's existing facilities can accommodate at least 400 new houses although development to the east and south have flooding issues and loss of open countryside. Development to the west is most appropriate being close to the town centre, local services and facilities and bounded by the settlement with a further site between Newport Road and Lonsdale school to be included. Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to lack of employment and increased commuting although support smaller infill sites north west of Gnosall. Large scale development at Hixon will require major infrastructure although small scale housing may be appropriate due to the level of local employment. Development at the Haywoods should be limited to Location GH-2 and LH-2 due to lack of local employment and commuting problems. Development at Haughton should be restricted, as a result of flooding problems, to Locations HN-3 and HN-4. No development locations should be identified at Weston and Woodseaves due to the existing settlement, limited facilities and increased commuting. Support retaining Green Belt boundaries and object to new development at Yarnfield and Tittensor. Any new employment development at Ladfordfields should occur on the disused Seighford airfield rather than high quality agricultural land with new road infrastructure. Object to new employment development at Raleigh Hall due to increased traffic problems on the local road network, loss of high quality agricultural land and impact on the historic town of Eccleshall. Support Greenfield development as brownfield land is less deliverable, support a minimum provision of affordable and mixed tenure housing on Greenfield sites but object to 1 and 2 bedroomed homes due to lack of market demand. Object to rural conversions but support rural exception sites. Affordable housing to be provided by the Council using commuted sums from developments. Re-use of existing employment sites to be considered on their merits and all development to avoid flooding problems whilst incorporating sustainable drainage systems and support new telecommunications apparatus. Car parking should continue to be available in Stafford town centre to meet needs of the rural hinterland. A new bypass is required for Stone and no development in the floodplain. Stone Business Park to be extended with housing development to the west. New employment areas to be allocated at Stafford, Stone,



Moorfields and Ladfordfields but not at Raleigh Hall. New development to be supported by highway access.

**ACTION:** Note support for client owned land at Location EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred options for Eccleshall. Note the various comments and observations to the other topics.

1 response (Mr Harding) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to loss of historic character and countryside, impact on utilities, open space and drainage. Locations EC-1 and EC-2 will cause flooding and local road network pressures due to access and public safety as well as cause pollution and degradation of wildlife and habitats. Question why brownfield land in more sustainable settlements have not been considered rather than Greenfield land and question the even spread of development. Object to new employment development at Raleigh Hall due to traffic congestion and large sheds. Questions whether specific types of employment can be targeted, in particular high skilled manufacturing or servicing, as a way to address the issues of heavy goods vehicles on the local road network. Questions what political considerations will be made for local communities regarding the scale of new development. Response also includes the following

- Plan showing areas being reviewed with notes
- Plan from Eccleshall Town Design Statement
- Plan showing water, hedge and trees around public footpath to the east of Eccleshall
- Plan showing light pollution areas
- Plan showing some brief comments on suitability
- Set of photographs showing countryside areas of EC1 and EC2.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-1 and EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Hulme Upright Manning for H & H Holman Properties) – Support new housing development to be identified north of Eccleshall town centre as well as the vision, key objectives and development strategy together with the need for Greenfield sites supporting new infrastructure, services and facilities. Eccleshall has a good range of services and facilities. Development to the east of Eccleshall would require a new road which is financially undeliverable through the scale of proposed development whilst to the south and east would extend housing away from the settlement's centre increasing flooding problems. Support delivery of a retirement village, specialist housing and extra care provision as well as additional car parking facilities north of Eccleshall but outside of the floodplain to meet local needs and access to the High Street with available infrastructure.

**ACTION:** Note support for client owned land north of Eccleshall to be considered through the preferred options for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Harvey) – Concern about proposed new development in Eccleshall undermining the character of the town centre with further businesses, additional traffic congestion on the local road network affecting pedestrian safety and car parking. Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-1 and EC-2 due to limited access to the local primary school, increased noise pollution and congestion from the proposed new road ECPR-1 flooding issues and pressure on local services and facilities including medical provision.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-1 and EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Kirkham) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to loss of farmland and having to extend beyond the existing settlement boundary with landscape impacts. Object to Location EC-5 as development would create access and pedestrian crossing problems, increased road traffic in the town centre and would involve development outside the existing settlement boundary.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-3 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr S A Hall) – Concern about the scale of development due to inadequate existing infrastructure, in particular storm and sewage drainage, problems with the electricity supply and water pressure, poor quality local roads, unreliable public transport and medical services, gas supply and education provision at capacity. Concern about further housing development at Location EC-1 due to the flood plain and existing properties sinking, thus requiring rebuilding.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Pownall) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development at Locations EC-1 to EC-5 at Eccleshall due to the impact on the historic town's character and quality of life, impact on the open countryside and Special Landscape Area, lack of local employment leading to increased commuting, poor quality local roads for extra traffic including Heavy Good Vehicles. Any expansion at Raleigh Hall should be for the types of uses that are not dependent on heavy vehicles. Infill development within Eccleshall should not lead to the loss of green open space.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Stevenson) – Object to the proposed new housing development at Location EC-4 as this land should be used for outdoor recreation activities, such as bowls.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (A K Legge) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 due to the lack of adequate local infrastructure and significant new provision required, housing in this location would cause access difficulties for the elderly to the town centre and those travelling to employment north of Eccleshall creating more traffic in the town centre and finally the development would impact on the identity of Elford Heath.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Wilshaw) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-1 as there should be no further development along the River Sow valley or its tributaries due to flooding and drainage at full capacity, impact on wildlife and habitats as well as expensive foundation works required to make the ground suitable.

Locations EC-2, EC-3 and EC-4 would need total replacement of the existing drainage system due to flooding although Location EC-4 could be seen as a natural infill. Object to Location EC-5 due to the impact on the town's historic character, the steep topography causing flooding problems particularly to the town centre and church, the landscape impacts and loss of footpaths. It is accepted that new housing development is required but empty homes existing in Eccleshall, affordable housing could upset the community's fine balance and the quality of life.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Eccleshall Resident) – Oppose new housing development in Eccleshall on the basis of traffic impacts including from the local school, lack of car parking, lack of local employment, sewerage and drainage issues and the capacity of local medical services.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Starkey) – Concerned about the scale of proposed housing development on Greenfield locations leading to increased flooding problems, loss of town character, an inadequate sewage system for increased loads, the local road network would require significant upgrade and traffic congestion would increase, there are parking issues, loss of wildlife a lack of local services and facilities including schools, medical and open space provision, poor public transport as well as employment proposals at Raleigh Hall doubling in size thus impacting on open countryside with traffic problems. Smaller areas of infill within the town should be the preferred locations.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Boden) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall at Location EC-1 although some provision is required. Concerned for the local rural community with existing services and facilities unable to cope, loss of Greenfield land and flood plain with impacts on wildlife. Development would lead to increased noise, pollution and levels of commuting with traffic volumes due to limited local employment. More school, medical and shop provision would be required. Support limited infill development of up to 10% but object to Location EC-4.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Boden) – Object to proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to current traffic congestion increasing pressure on the local road network and pavements, problems of storm and sewage drainage, limited employment and impact on wildlife. In Stafford there is an oversupply of housing as well as lack of demand due to the current economic climate. Suggest using small infill plots and avoiding areas in the floodplain or with a negative impact on the Conservation Area. Infrastructure must in place prior to the new development including a new bypass and local services and facilities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs J Fox) – Concern about the scale of proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to impact on the local services and facilities as well as town character, the inadequate local road network and communications with pressure on the High Street from traffic volumes, limited public transport to access employment areas. ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (B J Banks) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-4 and EC-5 due to the impact on existing traffic levels with the local road network requiring additional improvements. Object to Location EC-3 due to loss of accessible open space and character as well as increased congestion and impacts on the road network.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-3, EC-4 & EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr A Fox) – Concerned that the proposed new housing development in Eccleshall will increase traffic volumes and congestion on poor quality country roads, in particular private cars whilst there is a poor public transport system and development will have an impact on local services and facilities. The new development will not fit the area.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Amos) – Object to the scale of proposed new development at Eccleshall due to the inadequate existing infrastructure, in particular sewage, drains and roads, lack of car parking, existing congestion on narrow local roads and poor public transport. Location EC-5 will have landscape and Conservation Area impacts as well as result in greater traffic volumes. Location EC-4 should be used as a school and for community recreation whilst the school's existing south site could be used for housing.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Apps) – Agree that some new housing development is required in Eccleshall, especially affordable housing and sheltered housing for the elderly. However Location EC-1 is not suitable due to flooding issues, outdated local infrastructure, traffic congestion including Heavy Goods Vehicles on the existing local road network, an inadequate sewage system, insufficient car parking in the town centre, inadequate education facilities, poor quality public transport, lack of open space and recreation, flooding problems and lack of local employment opportunities with increased development at Raleigh Hall increasing traffic problems.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (E Tams) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-4 and EC-5 due to the land's existing elevation and landscape impact, existing access problems, the existing sewage system would not cope, the location is within a Conservation Area and the scale is excessive for a settlement the size of Eccleshall.

Location EC-3 north of the community centre should be preserved as a recreation area.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-3, EC-4 & EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (M G Worth) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-4 as the land is needed for recreational use, is waterlogged that therefore not suitable for housing, narrow local roads are inadequate for increased traffic with safety concerns for pedestrians and the impact on town character.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Burnett) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-4 due to the inadequate road system, insufficient parking, transport to the community centre and congestion.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (J M Bland) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to current problems of traffic congestion on the narrow local road network, loss of landscape and Conservation Area as well as wildlife, lack of drainage and public transport services, limited parking and shopping provision as well as a lack of local jobs. Query the need for new housing due to the economic downturn, migrants returning to home countries and environmental impacts.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs O Harvey) – Concern about proposed new development in Eccleshall undermining the character of the town centre with further businesses, additional traffic congestion on the local road network affecting pedestrian safety and car parking. Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-1 and EC-2 due to limited access to the local primary school, increased noise pollution and congestion from the proposed new road ECPR-1 flooding issues and pressure on local services and facilities including medical provision. The views of local people should be considered.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-1 and EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall

1 response (Mrs Cartlidge) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-2 due to loss of open countryside and wildlife as well as restrictions on the public right of way. Development at Location EC-3 would further exacerbate the current traffic and congestion problems in Eccleshall.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-2 and EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Smith) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to poor drainage, increased traffic and rat-running as well as inadequate utilities infrastructure. Concern about Eccleshall town centre regarding insufficient parking, increased traffic congestion, noise and pollution, undermine the tourism and visitor appeal of the area, as well as increase pressure on education provision in the town.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Scott) – Object to the scale of proposed new development at Eccleshall being imposed by the West Midlands Regional Assembly with significant impact on the quality of life, the Conservation Area and Green belt. Concern about increased traffic implications on the local road network, limited local employment, flooding and drainage problems as well as education provision.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs S Jones) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-4 and EC-5 due to the unacceptable strain on an already busy local narrow road network through Eccleshall including heavy traffic, safety issues and impact on landscape character. Location EC-1 would be the least disruptive in terms of resources and historic views.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-4 and EC-5 but support Location EC-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (R Cliff) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-1 due to impact on the local narrow road network, in particular B5026 and A5013, lack of parking, structural damage to existing properties as well as the loss of wildlife and habitats. Object to the proposed new road ECPR-1 and the locality of the sewage plant to new housing including odours and light pollution.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-1 and ECPR-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (E Abbots) Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-1 due to impact on the local narrow road network, in particular B5026 and A5013, lack of parking, structural damage to existing properties as well as the loss of wildlife and habitats. Object to the proposed new road ECPR-1 and the locality of the sewage plant to new housing including odours and light pollution.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-1 and ECPR-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall

1 response (M Snape) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to the impact on local traders and visitors, increased traffic volumes and disruption from highway works.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Johnson) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-1 and EC-2 as well as proposed new road ECPR-1 due to increased rat running including Heavy Good Vehicles, structural implications for existing housing, loss of wildlife, lack of existing infrastructure including sewage and public

transport, lack of parking and pollution problems. Concerned about the method of consultation used, particularly internet access, and questions the definition of affordable housing.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-1, EC-2 and ECPR-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Snape) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to the significant impact on the town's historic character and community, impact of affordable housing on social dynamic and crime levels, inadequate local roads, lack of car parking, limited capacity of local services and facilities as well as flooding issues. Concerned about new housing close to the proposed 'in vessel' composteer at Chebsey due to biological safety.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Stuart) – Concern that the current infrastructure in Eccleshall cannot support a large number of additional houses, in particular the drainage / sewage system, roads and the school size.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Stuart) – Eccleshall requires small houses, which would allow young people to supplement the existing ageing population and enable some of the existing population to down-size their houses, thereby making larger houses available.

ACTION: Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (R Norris) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-3 and EC-5 due to flooding issues, the scale of new infrastructure required and location in the Conservation Area.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-3 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Q Smith) – Concern about the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall lead by Government direction but questions the need for development, the development funding available, future occupiers and access to local employment. Development would result in a loss of valuable farming land, brownfield should be used before Greenfield, lack of local infrastructure including sewage, health services and education facilities, the dormitory town effect, increased traffic congestion and impact on the local road network, parking problems, poor public transport and communication provision. Object to Location EC-3 with increased traffic, noise and pollution with a steep topography and loss of landscape character.

ACTION: Note objections including Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Ms Thomson) – Object to proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to loss of greenfields with impacts on food production and wildlife, increased risk of flooding, increased levels of heavy goods vehicles on the local road network, lack of local employment opportunities, limited services and facilities

including no secondary school provision, create a dormitory town effect, loss of environment and inadequate facilities for the additional population.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Mitchell) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to limited road links to the town, lack of businesses and local employment in the area, limited public transport, local infrastructure, services and facilities. Object to Location EC-5 as Kerry Lane is unsuitable for increased traffic, environmental impacts including light and drainage as well as implications on the Conservation Area. Eccleshall should retain its quality of life for the future.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (C Smith) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing in Eccleshall due to the loss of the historic town's character, impact on tourism, loss of agricultural land and its landscape, existing traffic problems would increase congestion and lack of public transport. Further development at Yarnfield is preferred. Object to Location EC-3 due to traffic issues, loss of character and countryside.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (M Simkiss) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-3 and EC-5 due to flooding problems, impact on the Conservation Area and the environmental impacts.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Locations EC-3 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Simkiss) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 due to the impact within and adjoining the Conservation Area.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (K P Bertram) – Accept the need for further housing in and around the Eccleshall area but the scale should be appropriate. Support new housing at Locations EC-1 and EC-2 with consideration to the Eccleshall Town Design Statement and historic character, Conservation Areas, increase in traffic on local narrow roads, lack of local employment, poor public transport, lack of existing infrastructure, services and facilities including schools and drainage.

**ACTION:** Note comments including Locations EC-1 and EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (C Hyland) – Concern about the scale of proposed new housing for Eccleshall with a more sensitive approach required in order to preserve the nature and character of the town. Site selection should be based on local need. Some sites



may have merit, but the overall figure provided in all options is considered too high for the size of the settlement and the local employment provision.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (The Eccleshall Alert Group) – Object to the scale of proposed new development in Eccleshall on significant greenfield areas but accept that some development, especially low cost housing for first time buyers and the elderly may be required in the future. Small infill development should continue to maintain the town's character and landscape setting. Concerned about new development due to the existing sewage system, surface water run-off and flooding, impact on the local road network and traffic volumes, lack of significant funding for future infrastructure, lack of a secondary school and after school activities resulting in greater commuting and carbon emissions, impact on wildlife and biodiversity. When selecting sites, regard would be given to Eccleshall Town Design Statement with development on brownfield land before Greenfield areas. Expansion of Raleigh Hall may not meet local employment requirements of the Eccleshall community but could increase commuting. Stafford town should be the main focus for new housing development.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall and the development strategy.

1 response (J Timmis) – Concerned about the scale of proposed new housing development due to impact on historic character and tourism, lack of parking and inadequate local road infrastructure for heavy goods vehicles, poor quality bus service, capacity of the local school, sewerage and surface water drain problems. Suggest that smaller, infill sites be used, in particular for affordable housing for young families with land behind Natwest Bank along Newport Road suggested. Question the delivery of new house building in the economic recession.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Eccleshall Resident) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to the impact on town character, particularly location EC-5.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Brady) – Understand the Government's requirements for new housing but concerned about the large scale development at Eccleshall with the strain on drainage, sewage and the local road network with significant impact on the town's character with no jobs.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (M Chordhory) – Object to proposed new housing development, particularly Location EC-4 due to increased traffic congestion on narrow local roads, lack of car parking, inadequate infrastructure, education and medical services, flooding problems and loss of Greenfield land.

**ACTION:** Note objections including to Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (R J Biggs) – There is a need for affordable housing, for first time buyers, single people and for young couples which can help to balance the local community with an ageing population. Infrastructure improvements need to be made prior to development taking place. Preferred location would be to the east of the town (EC1 and EC2) to include provision of a community hall in this area of town. Concerned that development to the west at Location EC-5 would be environmentally damaging although the lower part of the community centre and north of Cross Butts would fit in with past development with the land adjacent being used for recreational use. Manufacturing uses should be targeted rather than warehousing, in order to reduce heavy vehicles at Raleigh Hall including Location RH-a and RH-b.

ACTION: Note comments including to Location EC-1, EC-2 and EC-5 as well as Raleigh Hall RH-a and RH-b to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs York) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to the impact on the town's character and community, undermining the tourism visits with priority on brownfield sites. New development will require increased public transport, restrictions on Heavy Goods Vehicles, new pedestrian crossings, increased education provision and a local Post Office. Support proposed new development at Location EC-1 with preference to expand along Stone Road due to good access to the village centre, minimises traffic congestion and has least visual impact on landscape and existing neighbourhoods. Object to Location EC-3 due to being an accident black spot, existing flooding problems and loss of greenfields.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-3 and support for Location EC-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (M Holmes) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to existing inadequate drainage and sewage systems, significant new housing in the town since 1970, poor public transport, pressure to access Stafford for education and leisure activities, increased impact of traffic congestion on the narrow local road network and lack of parking. Brownfield sites should be used rather than large scale greenfield developments.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (P Rumary) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to increased flooding, loss of greenfields and high agricultural land including as a soakaway facility.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (L Kinnersley) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 as new infrastructure will be required to overcome surface water run-off problems, increased traffic issues with noise and pollution, loss of countryside views and wildlife as well as undermining the quality of life with increased flood liabilities.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Mellor) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-1, EC-2 and EC-3 due to impact on the town's character, loss of greenfield land rather than using infill development, impact on the local road network with congestion and loss of wildlife.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-1, EC-2 & EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Kinnersley) – Concerned about existing traffic problems and congestion in the High Street with parking difficulties. Object to Location EC-3 due to flooding issues along Green Lane.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Mellor) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-1, EC-2 and EC-3 due to the loss of greenfield land and open countryside including a 'wildlife conservation area', impact on the narrow local road network and loss of community identity. Suggest using other infill sites, such as those with planning permission or unused sites be used for smaller scale development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-1, EC-2 & EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr K Holmes) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to existing inadequate drainage and sewage systems, significant new housing in the town since 1970, increased impact of traffic congestion on the narrow local road network and lack of parking. Brownfield sites should be used rather than large scale greenfield developments.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Clowes) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall whilst accepting that small sympathetic development would bring social and commercial benefits to the town. Strongly object to Locations EC-4 and EC-5 due to the adverse impact on the environment, the Conservation Area, loss of wildlife, would create traffic problems due to the narrow local roads, lead to the loss of amenity, increase in noise and traffic pollution as well as a lack of infrastructure to cope with an increase in population particularly sewerage, roads, schools and flood schemes. Extra lorries would be generated by the Raleigh Hall employment proposals.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Emery) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall at the meadow due to increased flood risk, impact on wildlife and loss of town and historic character. Object to Location EC-5 due to increased traffic volumes including construction traffic, noise and pollution. The existing infrastructure is inadequate to cater for current let alone additional development as well as a lack of frequent bus services and cycle routes. Instead a new sports complex is required in Eccleshall to improve the health of residents.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (G M Bertram) – Accept the need for further housing in and around the Eccleshall area but the scale should be appropriate. Support new housing at Locations EC-1 and EC-2 with consideration to the Eccleshall Town Design Statement and historic character, Conservation Areas, increase in traffic on local narrow roads, lack of local employment, poor public transport, lack of existing infrastructure, services and facilities including schools and drainage.

**ACTION:** Note comments including Locations EC-1 and EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (M Brass) – Concerned that Eccleshall is already over developed and therefore no further housing provision should be made.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Emery) – Concerned about the imposition of proposed new housing development on Eccleshall from the West Midlands Regional Assembly and questions the source of funding for new local infrastructure improvements. New development will need to address and overcome the economic downturn, national debt, poor access to affordable housing, transportation and employment. Object to new development due to the impact on Green belt, the environment and Eccleshall's historic character with Locations EC-3, EC-4 and EC-5 having inadequate infrastructure including roads, utilities and flood schemes. There is limited parking in Eccleshall with pollution and noise impacting on the town and its wildlife. Infill on brownfield land, such as Hammonds coal yard would be preferable to greenfield development

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-3, EC-4 & EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Atkinson) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing for Eccleshall due to lack of local infrastructure, in particular storm and sewage drains during flooding, erratic water pressure and electric supply, increased problems with roads, schools and medical services. At the Meadows there are flooding and subsistence issues in the past. No further development should occur in Eccleshall.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (R Carroll) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-3, EC-4 and EC-5 due to increased traffic congestion, pressure on the local school, noise and pollution, loss of countryside and implications on drainage, flooding and the sewage system. Object to Location EC-1 as the site is within the flood plain, adjacent to the sewage plant and has limited public transport. There is no secondary school in Eccleshall. Support Location EC-2 east of Eccleshall with less impacts on existing housing although implications for the local road network would be required.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-1, EC-3, EC-4 & EC-5 with support for EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (C Hickey) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall leading to increased traffic and congestion including construction vehicles and piling for the new housing, pressure on existing infrastructure including sewage, public transport, noise and light pollution as well as an increase in flood risk.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr M Stone) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to the increased congestion along the High Street being exacerbated by extra traffic.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Miss N Middleton) – Object to the proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to increased traffic congestion. Object to Locations EC-4 and EC-5 due to education provision, lack of local employment, increased pollution and poor bus services.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-4 & EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr T Middleton) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to loss of green open space and countryside, increased traffic congestion especially on the High Street. Object to Locations EC-3, EC-4 and EC-5 due to poor quality road surfaces, increased flooding problems and safety hazards with the local school and community centre. Object to Location EC-1 due to flooding, impact on wildlife and limited existing infrastructure as well as its location close to the sewerage works. Limited local employment leads to increased levels of commuting and further carbon emissions whilst there are no cycle routes in Eccleshall.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-1, EC-3, EC-4 & EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Miss S Middleton) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to the impact on its character and identity, increased traffic and an inadequate narrow local road system and safety concerns when visiting the countryside. Object to Location EC-4 due to increased traffic and loss of open countryside. ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Middleton) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-4 and EC-5 due to the narrow local road network, road safety issues for local children, damage to wildlife and increased pollution. Eccleshall High Street currently has problems of flooding and traffic congestion whilst there is limited public transport. The environment of Eccleshall must be protected for future generations

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (G Garner) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to the impact on character and identity, the existing community spirit, Eccleshall's distance for other towns along narrow country roads, lack of public transport, limited local employment, increased congestion, lack of existing infrastructure including transport, drainage and flooding requiring significant improvements, lack of recreational facilities, impact on wildlife and habitats and loss of valuable floodplains. Question the scale of development at Raleigh Hall due to empty industrial units, increased Heavy Good Vehicles traffic, noise pollution and disruption. Local businesses would not be supported by the development which will undermine the quality of life. Development should refer to the Town Design Statement with phased small scale schemes.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (E Gittins) – Oppose new housing development in Eccleshall as it is an area of outstanding nature beauty in the River Sow valley and should remain this way for future generations.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (P G Hoppe) – Oppose development in Eccleshall, especially at Location EC-3 (Green Lane) due to existing infrastructure already overstretched, problems with parking as well as development spoiling the village and its atmosphere.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr G Allen) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall but understand the need for future housing. New development will place extra pressure on local amenities including schools and medical services as well as pressure on the local road network with increased traffic and further lack of parking. Concern that the local economy will be undermined as specialist shops rely on custom from elsewhere affected by a lack of parking. A major concern is drainage and loss of greenfields to reduce surface water run off whilst flooding problems already exist. Object to Location EC-4 due to flooding and drainage problems exacerbated.

ACTION: Note objections including to Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs A Moore) – Concerned about the detrimental impact proposed new housing development will have on Eccleshall with loss of character and identity, impact on wildlife and habitats, loss of greenfields, further problems of traffic congestion in the High Street and lack of parking.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs M Mitchell) – Object to proposed new housing developments in Eccleshall due to loss of town and rural character, existing inadequate infrastructure including drains and roads, increased heavy goods traffic and congestion from proposed new employment at Raleigh Hall and the narrow and unsuitable local road network. Questions the infrastructure improvements required west and south of

Eccleshall including its funding. Why has there been no environmental audit of Eccleshall and why has Norton Bridge not been considered as a location for new development?

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (L Shuker) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5, land adjacent to Kerry Lane, due to impact on village character and the Conservation Area.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Shuker) – Object to the planning proposals for Eccleshall due to the impact on the rural character of the town.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Tildesley) – Concern about recent work on farmland to avoid downstream flooding at Stafford town centre will be undone by the scale of new housing development at Eccleshall and specifically raises issues of surface water run off affecting a Listed Building property in the High Street. Further flood schemes measures are needed at Castle Meadows to resolve the problems created by existing housing developments in Eccleshall including flooding the High Street. Some properties in Eccleshall require sewage pumped out regularly, as there is insufficient fall on the sewer pipe.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (J Legge) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 due to the inadequate narrow local road network with lack of lighting and pavements, poor drainage and gas infrastructure, significant increase in traffic and limited public transport as well as the impact on the Conservation Area, open countryside, wildlife and historic character. Development of specialist housing for the elderly would not be appropriate in this location due to the distance from the town centre and the local school nearby is currently at capacity whilst there are few recreational and leisure facilities in Eccleshall.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (J & G Pinney) – Affordable housing should be provided in Eccleshall to encourage young people and re-balance an ageing population. Concerns are raised about limited infrastructure provision, lack of school provision, lack of car parking and traffic congestion, limited local employment and poor quality public transport options should large scale development occur in Eccleshall.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Rees) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-2 due to Green belt, loss of views and wildlife, loss of the public footpath as well as noise and pollution. Object to Locations EC-1, EC-3 and EC-5 due to the lack of

infrastructure, in particular roads and increased congestion, pollution problems and a lack of local employment. Smaller pockets of land within the existing settlement boundary should be used for development rather than greenfield sites.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC1-, EC-2, EC-3 & EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Colling) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to lack of local employment, loss of farm land for food production, increased traffic and loss of town character.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Colling) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development at Locations EC-4 and EC-5 due to loss of conservation area land, wildlife and habitats, concern about increased traffic on residential streets, loss of open countryside, lack of infrastructure particularly drainage as well as increased pollution from Raleigh Hall employment proposals.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-4 & EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Marles) – Concerned about the scale of new development in Eccleshall due to increased in traffic within the town on narrow local streets, exacerbated parking problems, road drainage issues as well as flooding and surface run-off. Suggests that the land south of Green Lane would be the preferred site, based on proximity to access points. A ‘new village’ should be considered as an alternative. ACTION: Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (D A Tomkinson) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall and Locations EC-1 and EC-2 due to lack of infrastructure and local employment, pressure on local schools and the narrow local road network as well as increased commuting to work and schools. Creation of a new settlement would be more appropriate. Sites either side of the B5026 are not suitable due to flooding, loss of wildlife, structural damage to properties and pressure on the existing road network. Other locations should be considered.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-1 & EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Tomkinson) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall at Locations EC-1 and EC-2 due to loss of Greenfield land and the negative impact on the town’s character, create further traffic problems and parking issues in the High Street as well as increase the flood risk. The most suitable site would be Location EC-3 on Green Lane due to increased accessibility. Nevertheless all locations in Eccleshall will have road infrastructure problems so the development of a new settlement should be considered, with the suggestion of land south of Penkridge at the crossing of A5 and A34

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-1 & EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.



1 response (Lingreen Properties Ltd) – Objects to proposed new large scale housing development in Eccleshall due to impacts on the quality of live and the Conservation Area, loss of town's character and identity whilst account should be taken of local need rather than Government external directives.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Burley) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-4 as the area should be developed for a recreational facility due to the increased population. There will be a definite need for the proposed new road ECPR-1 if development takes place to remove Heavy Goods Vehicles from the High Street. Support proposed new housing development at Locations EC-3 and EC-5 for family housing but unsuitable for the elderly due to topography and lack of transport. Object to the scale of proposed new housing development for Eccleshall due to lack of local employment, loss of agricultural land with impacts on food production and bio-fuels for the local renewable energy biomass plant.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-4 and support for Locations EC-3 & EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (P Allen) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall but understand the need for future housing. New development will place extra pressure on local amenities including schools and medical services as well as pressure on the local road network with increased traffic and further lack of parking. Concern that the local economy will be undermined as specialist shops rely on custom from elsewhere affected by a lack of parking. A major concern is drainage and loss of greenfields to reduce surface water run off whilst flooding problems already exist. Object to Location EC-4 due to flooding and drainage problems exacerbated.

**ACTION:** Note objections including to Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall

1 response (Mrs Starkey) – Object to any proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to the scale, capacity of sewerage system and the associated plant with flooding during heavy rains, upgrading of drains and sewage system, lack of suitable local roads and the road network to take additional traffic, lack of car parking, limited provision of school and doctors capacity and impact on wildlife.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Forrest) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to loss in quality of life, increased strain on the existing infrastructure and problems, in particular sewage, electricity, gas and storm water, increased traffic volumes and congestion, limited school capacity, loss of wildlife, development on the floodplains, over stretched health care provision and the dormitory effect. Questions whether there will be increased public transport availability and cycle routes.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Ms Banks) – Support proposed new housing development at Location EC-1 due to proximity to the town centre for the elderly and young families on flat ground rather than steep topography. Object to Location EC-3 due to difficulties in

accessing the town centre, loss of recreation area, poor access and narrow local road network which already ready suffers from sever congestion.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-3 and support for Location EC-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Major) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-4 and EC-5 due to existing poor drainage for storm water and sewage system inadequacies, increased traffic including for the local school. A ring road around Eccleshall would be the answer.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Rimmer) – Object to the proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to the negative impact on the town's character both visually and historically, impact on wildlife and the Conservation Area, increased traffic volumes and congestion with noise and pollution as well as increased pressure on the existing utilities infrastructure currently at capacity. There are more appropriate sites across the Borough and in Stafford and Stone that are available for development including brownfield sites.

**ACTION:** Note objections and comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (P & D Freshwater) – Object to the proposed new housing development due to the adverse impact on the historic town and its Conservation Area, development on the floodplain, lack of facilities, increased parking and congestion problems as well as ribbon development although recognising that Eccleshall must support the Borough's obligation to identify areas for possible development.

**ACTION:** Note objections and comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (R Bunting) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-4 and EC-5 due to increased traffic volumes on narrow local roads with noise and pollution, children's safety with traffic calming required, local school capacity, loss of open space, increased need for utilities infrastructure and public transport as well as a lack of local amenities. Object to Locations EC-1, EC-2 and EC-3 due to the inadequate surface water and foul drainage system with increased flooding, increased traffic volumes and commuting for employment, limited education provision, increased medical facilities as well as retail provision, inadequate public transport and capacity of current utilities, with adverse impacts on the historical village structure.

**ACTION:** Note objections to all locations to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Joyner) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 due to impact on the Conservation Area, loss of countryside and landscape, unsuitable narrow local road access as well as the loss of recreational provision and footpaths.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Joyner) - Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 due to impact on the Conservation Area, loss of countryside and landscape, unsuitable narrow local road access as well as the loss of recreational provision and footpaths.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall

1 response (J Atkins c/o P Atkins) – Concern about the increased size of Eccleshall and the impact on village life, concerned about increased traffic volumes, noise and pollution, the effect on wildlife and Conservation Areas as well as the lack of school capacity.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Dart) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-2 due to impact on the countryside and wildlife, noise and pollution, impact on the local road network and increased freight traffic, lack of local employment, insufficient infrastructure and loss of town character. The proposed new road will not ease the number of heavy vehicles using the High Street, which use the A519 from Telford to M6 route but will increase noise and pollution.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (D Simkiss) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-3 and EC-5 due to the impact on the Conservation Area and increased flooding problems.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-3 & EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (I Betts) – Object to the proposed new housing development at Location EC-5, Kerry Lane, due to the detrimental impact on the village's character, limited infrastructure and increased pressure on the road system.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Moss) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-1, EC-2 and EC-5 due to increased traffic volumes and congestion, problems resulting from parked cars, increased flooding and limited drainage system capacity, loss of agricultural land for food production and open spaces / rural views.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-1, EC-2 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Crombie) – Proposed new housing development in Eccleshall should take account of the need for social housing to be close to amenities, public transport and employment whilst respecting the existing village envelope and not encroach on open countryside of high environmental and landscape quality, particularly to the

south and west including impacts on the Conservation Area. Further housing will increase commuting movements to employment areas contrary to the Council's policies on sustainability and transportation. The selection of housing land should not prejudice the development of employment and commercial activities in the village with consideration of land to the north east of Eccleshall between the village and Raleigh Hall. Future plans to take account of all land uses and sustainable development. ACTION: Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (T & S Sager) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 south of Green Lane due to lack of public transport and car parking, increased traffic volumes and accidents due to access issues, increased pressure on local services and facilities including the local school and medical provision.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Eardley) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-4 and EC-5 due to loss of town character and identity, infrastructure improvements for the drainage and road system, increased traffic and congestion on narrow local roads, increased parking problems and flooding. Whilst there is no local park and few facilities there is also a low crime rate and limited anti social behaviour due to the community spirit in the area to be protected.

ACTION: Note objections to Location EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Aaron Chetwynd Chartered Architects) – Support proposed new housing development at Location EC-2 with good access to a range of local services and facilities, employment areas, highway network, and public transport. The landowners have strong community links with Eccleshall for engagement and partnership purposes with new facilities and well design schemes to the local area's character meeting all sustainable development, green infrastructure and design requirements with affordable housing needs.

ACTION: Note support for Location EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Neeld) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to current traffic volumes through the town, insufficient parking for the residents and visitors as well as limited public transport provision. Object to Location EC-4 due to loss of privacy and sunlight for existing properties, increased traffic and associated safety concerns for the local school and loss of views. The current infrastructure is insufficient to cope with new development.

ACTION: Note objection to Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Selecting appropriate housing locations is difficult due to pressures on local facilities, traffic and parking with negative quality of life impacts. Eccleshall has a strong community spirit providing local services as well as maintaining its character with concern that new development will increase commuting

due to the mismatch of local employment at Raleigh Hall therefore undermining community cohesion. Concern about lack of parking provision despite the level of services and facilities. Disappointed that development on greenfield land is accepted by the Council despite conflicts with biodiversity and environmental objectives leading to loss of wildlife and open spaces which cannot be compensated. The Council should first consider brownfield land anywhere in the Borough before Greenfield land is used and strongly oppose development on the western edge of Eccleshall, leading towards the RAMSAR at Copmere. Concerned that the top-down vision and aims are all loaded towards economic growth, population growth with the provision of extra services being seen as 'good' whilst such principles are not always championed in the countryside. New development is not needed to sustain services.  
ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (R & C Clark) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to inadequate infrastructure, damage to town character although limited growth would support a vibrant range of services. Selection of the proposed new housing locations should take account of the Conservation Area, impact on the open countryside and landscape as well as increased traffic volumes whilst accepting that some Greenfield development will be necessary due to lack of brownfield land. Object to Location EC-5 west of the town due to the landscape damage and Conservation Area. Furthermore object to proposed development by the landowner at part of Town Meadow in Castle Street due to great harm to the landscape. Support modest development at Location EC-4 provided building heights are constrained and landscape preserved although the site would better support community facilities. Object to Location EC-3 due to open countryside and would only be acceptable if a bypass route were established. Support Location EC-2 as the most appropriate direction for housing growth together with Location EC-1 due to limited landscape harm, provided the building heights are limited and River Sow floodplain protected. Concern about the traffic volumes in Eccleshall with increased congestion and lack of car parking on the narrow local road network with a new bypass supported by new housing development extended across the River Sow. Local services and facilities would be supported by an increased population although query Gnosall's medical centre providing for Eccleshall. Support new employment uses at Raleigh Hall for labour intensive rather than warehousing activities to reduce the number of Heavy Good Vehicles. The full implementation of the proposed housing development in Eccleshall would overwhelm the town's infrastructure and damage its character and environment. However, if Eccleshall is to continue to enjoy a good range of local services, and benefit from future service developments, some housing growth is desirable. This must be so scaled and sited as to avoid harm to the character of the town, and should be linked to a plan to reduce traffic congestion.

ACTION: Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (S Neeld) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to current traffic volumes through the town, insufficient parking for the residents and visitors as well as limited public transport provision. Object to Location EC-4 due to loss of privacy and sunlight for existing properties, increased traffic and associated

safety concerns for the local school and loss of views. The current infrastructure is insufficient to cope with new development.

**ACTION:** Note objection to Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Barbers Rural for Mr Peak) – Support proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 as it borders existing residential development, limited impact on the open countryside, good quality access with no major road construction required, the land has limited agricultural value whilst above the floodplain and has no pollution or contamination with gentle topography. All main utilities are available to the site with access to amenities and local schools as well as public transport. Affordable housing, open space and play areas will be provided on the site with no major infrastructure improvements.

**ACTION:** Note support for Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (L Rippon) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 as new affordable residential properties would be out of character to the existing area and loss of greenfields for food production, pedestrian safety concerns, devaluation of property values and loss of wildlife and habitats, unsuitable narrow local roads for increased traffic volumes and dangerous junctions onto busy main roads. In general for Eccleshall the town should be preserved for future generations, there is limited services and facilities including open space, traffic congestion and pollution on rural roads, a lack of local employment and poor bus services so development is inappropriate.

**ACTION:** Note objection to Location EC-3 and comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Price) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to lack of infrastructure, services and facilities including school, emergency and medical capacity, an inadequate sewerage system and car parking, increased traffic causing congestion, pollution and structural problems for properties on the narrow local roads, significant negative impacts on town character and adjacent landscape, increased risks of flooding and loss of habitats and protected species. Particular concern about Locations EC-1 and EC-2 from increased flooding and implications for Stone Road.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-1 and EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Woods) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to increased traffic on local roads, road safety considerations, access pressures and further congestion.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Cllr Chapman) – Significant concern about the impact of large-scale development on Eccleshall's historic town nature and character with major impacts on the skyline. In recent years small developments have been permitted which have merged tastefully into the town. There is still scope for similar enclaves which would assure the sustainability of local facilities and amenities. The demographic nature of the locality is such that there is an increasing need for sheltered accommodation within easy reach of services which would not be met by the five possible areas of growth indicated. The current infrastructure is inadequate to support any major additional housing on the outskirts of the town, in particular drainage, the road network, lack of pedestrian routes and cycle routes at Locations EC-3, EC-4 and EC-5. Concern that the proposed new road ECPR-1 would not relieve traffic congestion pressures in Eccleshall High Street and heavy good vehicles passing through the town with associated safety problems. Eccleshall does not have sufficient services and facilities to meet the increased population needs and its existing rural hinterland so would increase commuting. Object to Locations EC-1 and EC-2 due to floodplain and landscape / skyline impacts. Development consideration must be given to Location EC-4, land north of the Community Centre at Trinity Road, which is currently within the residential development boundary. However there have been problems with drainage on the land north of this site due to surface water run off to be resolved by new drainage systems and mitigation for the loss of recreational open space. Further employment development at Raleigh Hall should not increase heavy good vehicle movements in the area but better located next to the national road network and object to housing at this location. Support minor housing development at Croxton. Eccleshall is a proud picturesque and historic country town which attracts visitors to its shops and eateries. It is the wrong place for major housing development. Small tasteful expansion may work but would need to be matched by improvements in the infrastructure. Throughout the country there is a need for affordable housing. If this demand is to be effectively met then it needs to be matched to sound transport links and employment opportunities.

ACTION: Note comments concerning locations to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (S Pelter) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to access problems including speeding traffic and increased volumes, loss of valuable wildlife and habitats as well as the breaching of the natural border of Eccleshall with new development extending towards other villages nearby. Suggests the focus should be on Locations EC-2 with the proposed new road as a boundary.

ACTION: Note objection to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (A J Pelter) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to access problems including speeding traffic and increased volumes, flooding issues, loss of valuable countryside, wildlife and habitats as well as the breaching of the natural border of Eccleshall with new development extending towards other villages nearby. Suggests the focus should be on Locations EC-2 with the proposed new road as a boundary.

ACTION: Note objectionsto Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Staunton) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall as the existing infrastructure, in particular the local roads and public amenities are already stretch by the current population. Concern about Eccleshall continuing to being a dormitory town with increased commuting and traffic volumes to Stafford, Stoke on Trent and beyond due to limited local employment. High levels of car ownership occur due to the lack of public transport to Eccleshall as well as implications for tenants of affordable housing. There are currently no children play area facilities and limited community recreation provision. Query the scale of development with limited infrastructure, services and facilities to sustain more residents.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (E Edginton) – Accept that new affordable / social housing would benefit the community to enable young local families enter the property market and local businesses. Support new development at Location EC-2 and the proposed new road ECPR-1 to address traffic congestion but would also benefit from improved public transport provision. No land should be identified around Eccleshall for new employment development and Location EC-4 to be used for recreational purposes to maintain the historic town and landscape.

**ACTION:** Note comments and support for Location EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Eccleshall Parish Council) – Eccleshall Parish Council is strongly opposed to large scale developments proposed which would destroy the character and identity of the town. The Parish Council believes that Eccleshall could accept a small amount of new development by way of infill or in limited quantities within a close, tight framework of the main settlement. Any development should be phased to allow integration and mellowing of small developments following the historical pattern of expansion in the town. Small sites could be identified within the Residential Development Boundary and whilst not implying that the Parish Council would necessarily support such sites that may be identified, to indicate that smaller areas in fairly discrete locations would be much more appropriate than the identified sites. There should be little development in the Conservation Area apart from small amounts of infill, such as the Blacksmith's Yard on Castle Street and should definitely exclude the Town Meadow and parts of the area to the west of Eccleshall identified as EC-4. Development on sites to the West of Eccleshall would impinge on the very picturesque rural landscape leading to the SSSI at Copmere.

Eccleshall Parish Council believes that some minor development would be appropriate in Croxton to maintain the existing amenities and services, as the village serves a large hinterland between Eccleshall and Loggerheads.

The Parish Council considers that any development in Eccleshall should blend in with, and complement, the existing buildings to retain the special character of the town. Sympathetic, small and mixed developments such as Yates Yard, Perle Brook and Spring Hollow are preferred to large estates. Infrastructure improvements would need to be delivered prior to development taking place including transport, utilities and flooding whilst consideration should be given to the impact on the conservation area, increased traffic the numerous listed building in the town as well as to the environment and wildlife in the area. Some development would maintain the demand



for facilities and amenities in the town, including the range of shops, banks, pubs, churches, etc...but currently there is a lack of provision leading to commuting. Brownfield sites should be used rather the release of Greenfield land.

The Parish Council can see no benefit in providing a new road from the A5013 to the B5026 as this would not relieve traffic congestion in the town and would merely create additional traffic on other local roads.

It is believed that there will be an increasing demand for sheltered accommodation within easy reach of local amenities. The overall need for affordable housing must be matched to the infrastructure and employment opportunities. This type of accommodation is probably better matched to Stafford and Stone. With regard to additional industrial, commercial and retail development at Raleigh Hall, it would be difficult to justify further expansion of the present site as this is a rural location and further development would encroach onto existing farmland. Such employment development should be focused on Stafford and Stone closer to the national road network. Any new development at Eccleshall should take account of the Eccleshall Town Design Statement, limited building heights and the historic landscape.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (A Adamson) – Concern about the number of new people moving to the country putting pressure on housing needs with extra strain on infrastructure. Object to the proposed scale of new housing in Eccleshall due to increased traffic volumes, commuting and congestion as well as narrow local roads, lack of cycle routes, poor quality bus services, local schools on high ground, increased crime, change in town character, increased flooding and concern of affordable housing. Support Location EC-1 as on flat land, limited extra traffic and support cycle routes. Extra infrastructure support is required from the local Councils. An opportunity exists to develop a railway station at Norton Bridge and therefore this would become a better location of future development or alternatively a greater focus on Stafford town.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (C Silcox) – Object to proposed new housing developments in Eccleshall due to insufficient local infrastructure including school and medical provision, lack of local employment, narrow local roads with increased congestion, increased flood risk and loss of town character. If additional houses are required in Eccleshall these should be built sympathetically in small developments and not as large scale new housing estates. Brownfield sites in Stafford, Stone, Yarnfield should be used being closer to areas of potential employment and would have less impact on the existing community. Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3 due to increased traffic volumes and congestion, increased flooding, impact on the environment and wildlife as well as impact on views and landscape.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (L Hall) – Object to proposed scale of new housing development in Eccleshall and wish it to remain a great place to live.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Lunn) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-4 due to loss of community open space used for school fundraising. Object to Location EC-5 due to impact on the historic town centre, the Conservation Area and surrounding countryside. Both sites have difficult access problems with insufficient road infrastructure to support this scale of new houses and undermine the quality of life.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-4 & EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Roberts) – Aware of the requirement to meet Government set targets whilst professional planning obligations. Eccleshall has reached its maximum sustainable capacity concerning infrastructure with limited car parking, flooding problems, impact on the historic character, narrow local roads with traffic congestion only increasing with new development. Support the proposed new road ECPR-1 although a ring road would be more effective at alleviating traffic congestion and heavy good vehicles removed from the High Street. Concern about drainage issues and flooding exacerbated by Location EC-3, EC-4 and EC-5, reference to planning application for 21 Green Lane (06/07147 and 08/10226). Disagrees with the statement that no additional infrastructure would be required for these locations due to drainage, parking and traffic measures. Object to Location EC-1 as this land lies within the flood plain. Support Location EC-2 provided drainage infrastructure is provided.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-1, EC-3 to EC-5 with support for Location EC-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (H Rimmer) – Object to proposed scale of new housing development at Eccleshall lead to a strain on the town centre and existing infrastructure including utilities and sewerage systems, impact on the local school, traffic congestion with increased employment at Raleigh Hall and impact on the Conservation Area. Object to Locations EC-3, EC-4 and EC-5 due to narrow local roads and object to EC-1 and EC-2 due to traffic and wildlife impacts. Conserve the rural areas.

**ACTION:** Note objections to all the locations to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Turner) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 due to inadequate local roads, access and infrastructure, capacity of the local school, environmental and Conservation Area impacts and adverse effects on existing properties.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Cartwright) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-1 due to close proximity to the Severn Trent Recycling Centre and associated odours, flood plain area, loss of agricultural land for food production, existing heavy use of the local road network and congestion, lack of local

employment and recreational provision, impact on settlement character, limited parking, drainage and sewerage infrastructure.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (B & T Dawson) – The infrastructure is not in place to support the scale of new housing development proposed for Eccleshall. There is already considerable traffic congestion, limited capacity at the local school, doctors surgeries etc... which would have to be enlarged. Object to Location EC-3 due to ribbon development at Green Lane and the overall impact on the historic town's character.

**ACTION:** Note objections including to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Norton) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-1 due to aesthetic intrusion on the River Sow valley and being located next to the existing sewage works. Object to Location EC-2 due to loss of wildlife habitat and impact on the surrounding countryside. Object to Location EC-3 due to the unacceptable impact on the unspoilt hillside south of the town. Object to Location EC-4 due to loss of community space which should be retained. Object to Location EC-5 due to loss of open countryside and landscape impacts with a key public footpath. Suggest a park with increased trees and ponds with very limited country dwellings but not significant new housing proposals. Concerned about the increased population and lack of existing infrastructure, services and facilities, increased traffic with noise and air pollution, loss of character and identity for Eccleshall's town and community, loss of local and visitor trade from businesses. Brownfield infill development should be used.

**ACTION:** Note objections to all the locations to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (D W Wright) – A modest increase in population for Eccleshall would support existing shops, pubs and other community facilities. Object to the scale of proposed new housing development due to destruction of Eccleshall's town centre character. Location EC-4 is reasonably well located to existing housing but would be insufficient to meet Eccleshall's share of the new housing allocation. Critically Eccleshall looks toward Stafford with the A5013 being the most important route for local traffic. Therefore either Location EC-2 with access via a new road leading from the A5013 or Location EC-3 with improvements to Green Lane would be acceptable extensions to Eccleshall. Object to Location EC-5 due to unsatisfactory access and impact of increased traffic through Eccleshall town centre as well as Location EC-1 due to no new road. No new employment land should be allocated adjacent to Eccleshall although new housing development should facilitate home working through office use in ground floor rooms with wider residential streets and lower residential densities.

**ACTION:** Note objections and comments to all the locations to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Baines) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-1 and EC-2 due to existing traffic congestion being exacerbated, structural problems with properties, inadequate local infrastructure, lack of parking on the High Street and the proposed new road ECPR-1 not being suitable for the area. Object to Locations EC-3 and EC-5 due to increased traffic problems, the beautiful area, scale of development for Eccleshall whilst infill development would enhance the

town. Housing is needed for first time buyers and elderly people near the town centre with more car parking and play areas.

**ACTION:** Note objections and comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Downton) – Object to proposed new housing development in Eccleshall at this scale due to the overloaded drainage system is overloaded, detrimental to town character, inadequate parking, limited public transport and lack of amenities for teenagers.

**ACTION:** Note objections and comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Bosson) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-4 due to impact on landscape views, loss of wildlife, problems of traffic and parking and inadequate existing local infrastructure including drainage problems. Accept a small number of affordable houses to be built in Eccleshall for young people.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Boulton) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-4 due to loss of recreational land for public use. Eccleshall requires a play park as well as a bowling green.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (H Martin) – Object to the proposed scale of new housing development due to implications for community cohesion in Eccleshall, increased crime and undermining family lifestyle, lack of adequate facilities and services, impact on the landscape, no account of existing empty properties, increased traffic and congestion on narrow local roads, lack of new facilities proposed and impact on existing properties.

**ACTION:** Note objections and comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Baldry) – Object to the proposed scale of new housing development at Eccleshall due to loss of open countryside, limited existing infrastructure insufficient for existing and future requirements, increased traffic and congestion on country roads with noise and pollution, lack of car parking and local employment provision. There is less Government emphasis on using conservation and green belt land. Traffic problems would be created by new employment land at Raleigh Hall and the proposed new road. Object to Location EC-5 due to impact on the Conservation Area and open countryside, the properties linked to a public footpath, access problems on the narrow local road network and children's safety. Object to Location EC-4 due to narrow congested roads and access with parked cars.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Baldry) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 due to the Conservation Area and protected trees, inadequate access points, increased traffic on congested narrow local roads, impact on the public footpath and

legal implications for adjoining properties, de-valuing of property, impact on countryside and wildlife. Object to Location EC-4 due to access point difficulties, narrow local roads and problems of on street parking. In general Eccleshall has limited existing infrastructure with implications on sewage and surface water drainage, increased traffic congestion, commuting and parking limitations. Concern about new employment development proposed at Eccleshall with increased heavy good vehicles congestion, not alleviated by the proposed new road ECPR-1. Concern about loss of open countryside, wildlife and property devaluations in the local area.

ACTION: Note objections including Location EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs & Miss D & J) – Concern about the scale of proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to landscape impact, loss of open countryside, increased traffic and associated noise on narrow local roads, loss of peace and tranquillity as well as spoiling the unique and special character of our village.

ACTION: Note objections and comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Fletcher) – Low density housing of a good quality is required to enhance the historical market town of Eccleshall.

ACTION: Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (B Bradley) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to increased greenhouse gas emissions from increased traffic as residents commute to work, in particular the locations to the west of Eccleshall.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (S Chambers) – Concerned about the scale of proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to loss of Green Belt and open countryside to traffic and development. Brownfield sites should be used near to employment areas and more sustainable settlements with services and facilities. Shaws Lane and other areas of Eccleshall are prone to flooding which needs to be addressed before development as well as local roads used for recreation purposes.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Moore) – Object to the proposed new housing development in Eccleshall with a proportion of empty properties already unsold on the local property market. Only a small fraction of the potential new houses could be accommodated without serious consequences in terms of increased flooding, traffic problems and overloading of local services. There is severe traffic congestion within Eccleshall High Street as well as the local road network towards Stafford. Other minor developments face difficulties being approved but the scale of development seems to support the profits of landowners and developers. Disappointed by the displays at the Community Centre where the Council was only exhibiting larger versions of the maps from the consultation document whilst the local support group had to explain the exact parcels of land involved. Little detail has been provided as to the commitments

which will be made in terms of road and drainage infrastructure improvements, particularly for Location EC-3.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Knowles) – Concerned about the future prosperity of Eccleshall and its local economy with small businesses due to the recession as well as traffic congestion in the High Street caused by through traffic on narrow local roads. Whilst it is inevitable that part of Stafford Borough's allocation will have to be met in Eccleshall there should be a mix of affordable housing need provided including for the elderly. Furthermore new employment provision should be made a Raleigh Hall. However the scale of proposed new housing number in Eccleshall is totally disproportionate to the current size of the town and will overwhelm its character. Concerned about the lack of available infrastructure, services and facilities including school and medical provision, drainage capacity, increased flooding, limited public transport to the locations identified and loss of wildlife. Location EC-1 concern about the nearby sewerage works, public transport limitations, flooding from the River Sow, drainage and the need to build on high ground. Location EC-2 concern about the loss of wildlife and butterfly colony from new development and distance from the town centre whilst the proposed new road through the area would benefit the town if continued north of Stone Road through to the Newcastle Road. Location EC-3 would not be popular with residents on Green Lane due to loss of open countryside but is well placed for public transport although existing drainage infrastructure could be compromised. Support Location EC-4 for infill development as it is under utilised and closer to the town centre than Location EC-2. Location EC-5 concern about access on narrow local roads and drainage implications on the Meadows. Welcome the fact that land on the north side of the town either side of the A51 Castle Street is not being considered due to flooding. Support new development at Location EC-4.

**ACTION:** Note objections and support for Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs M Middleton) – Object to the proposed new housing development in Eccleshall due to its scale undermining the town's historic character and directly conflict with the Council's own vision. There are a number of infrastructure issues connected with this scale of development impacting on the existing problems including traffic congestion, lack of employment, increased commuting and lack of infrastructure with only one proposed new road to the east but no consideration of the implications to the west and south of Eccleshall. Object to Location EC-4 due to the loss of recreational land. Previous developments have not lead to the provision of services and facilities.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (H G Bathurst) – The proposed new housing development would involve the loss of open countryside with the views of local residents to be considered in the decision making process. Improvements to the local road network need to be considered based on traffic volumes as well as infrastructure provision for drainage, schools, medical facilities and car parking. It would be helpful if the Council would indicate it's future thoughts and intentions.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr I Moore) – Concern about the proposed scale of new housing development in Eccleshall due to lack of existing infrastructure with improvements necessary for local roads, drainage, sewers and public services. Object to Location EC-3 off Green Lane due to dangerous access for traffic and loss of open countryside whilst only benefiting the landowners and question viability in the economic climate as well as the reduced quality of life. In general there are flooding problems in Eccleshall which should be addressed.

ACTION: Note objections including Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Stringer) – Object to proposed new housing development at Eccleshall due to existing inadequate road infrastructure within and surrounding Eccleshall at maximum capacity, increased flood risk problems, facilities and services within Eccleshall are barely sufficient for the current population and outlying villages, there is no local health centre and other essential facilities necessary to sustain an increased population. None of the proposed locations are suitable and the strategic plans should be reconsidered.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Bosson) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-4 due to impact on the town's historic character and landscape views, loss of wildlife, property devaluation, problems of traffic and parking as well as inadequate existing local infrastructure including drainage problems.

ACTION: Note objections including Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr D Pownall) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-4 due to current drainage and flooding problems increasing, existing sewage system under pressure, loss of recreational open space and access problems on narrow local roads, parked cars and no children's play areas.

ACTION: Note objections including Location EC-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

8.22 1 response (Mr Allen) – Concern about proposed new development at Locations EC-1 and EC-2 due to the traffic burden. Location EC-3 has highway safety issues already considered by Staffordshire County Council. Location EC-4 should be used for sport. Location EC-5 has a number of development problems including difficult access, limited local road infrastructure, loss of prime agricultural land, flooding and drainage problems.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

Spatial Options 3 7 responses received

1 response (Carruthers) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-3. Eccleshall village centre is already seriously congested, services are overstretched and unable to support further development, increased commuting due to limited access to local employment opportunities whilst extensive development

would fundamentally change the character and nature of Eccleshall. Development at EC-3 would lead to loss of greenfields, habitats and wildlife, increase flooding problems, lead to greater traffic accident risks and avoid the use of more appropriate brownfield sites elsewhere.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Dr Douce) – The existing community in Eccleshall require smaller homes suitable for the elderly and those wishing to downsize, which would release family homes onto the market. Any new housing should be on the flat and within walking distance of the town centre to enable people to walk into town and use local facilities.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (First City Limited) – The land identified as Location EC-4 situated north of Shaws Lane and west of Trinity Road extends to about 3.57 hectares should be used for new housing development. The Parish Council own the existing community building and there is an opportunity to enhance this facility as part of an overall proposal with the balance of the site comprises school buildings and curtilage. The site is unallocated on the current Local Plan Proposals Map but is located within the Residential Development Boundary for Eccleshall. with the potential to accommodate around 85 dwellings as well as ancillary open space, landscaping and new infrastructure.

**ACTION:** Note support for client's land for development to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Fletcher) – Concerned about proposed new housing development at Location EC-1 due to drainage problems from sandy soil and Location EC-3 due to surface water run off and further sewage treatment works required. Support the development of EC-2 as the landowner prepared to develop this area which is natural infill between Stafford Road and Stone Road as well as good links to the sewage works on Stone Road. Furthermore support Location EC-4 & EC-5.

**ACTION:** Note support for owned land for housing to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Atkins) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 due to loss of character and identity for the town and the Conservation Area, impact on the landscape, narrow local road access points, traffic congestion, safety, noise and pollution, impact on public access to local footpaths, increased parking problems and loss of settlement character. There is no need for new housing development in the current economic and property market climate.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mrs Smith) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-2 and ECPR-1 due to loss of greenfields, and character of the town, a rise in antisocial behaviour, lack of improvement to local businesses for increased residents, de-valuing of property associated with loss of views and impact on landscape. The



proposed road would not reduce the number of vehicles and heavy goods vehicles using the High Street in Eccleshall.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-2 and ECPR-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (K & P Lockett) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 due to the impact on the Conservation Area and the character of Eccleshall, problems of drainage and increased surface water run-off as well as increased traffic on narrow local roads.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Location EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

Table 8.4 3 responses received

1 response (Dr Douce) – Eccleshall is a small market town with limited road infrastructure unsuitable for large volumes of traffic; inadequate drainage; few facilities for young people and little in the way of open spaces. The town centre is extremely congested and unable to cope with any increase in traffic with no local employment except at Raleigh Hall, which is limited. Lack of parking already encourages people to travel out of the town to shop as well as work. All of these issues need to be addressed before any significant increase in the number of households is considered.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Pert) – Developments of 200+ houses in Eccleshall is wholly inappropriate and ignores the nature of development in Eccleshall over the past couple of hundred years as set out in the Town's Design Statement. Instead development through small infill developments with a variety of different, unique characteristics is more appropriate and sympathetic for Eccleshall. Support proposed new housing development at Location EC-4 at the rear of the community centre allowing residents to access Eccleshall's town centre on foot and is about the maximum size of development targeted for Eccleshall. Therefore development at EC-5 is not necessary as there are plots of land around the existing residential development boundary, which could be used for small scale housing schemes, say 20 - 30 homes as well as limited development along Stone Road. Concern about the capacity of local infrastructure and services in Eccleshall as flooding occurs regularly and the school has moved to a single form entry, so significant new housing development may have large implications on the support network. Eccleshall has long been the 'poor relation' when it comes to leisure facilities with further investment highlighted as part of the Borough Council's Leisure and Open Spaces Plan Consultation for facility development and in particular an all weather playing surface. Small scale development of the outlying villages to Eccleshall could also help reduce the massive impact on large settlements with limited services and facilities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr/Mrs/Miss Jones) – Support the proposed new housing development at EC-2 and the new road at ECPR-1 being co-owner of the field in Eccleshall which backs onto Badgers Croft just off the Stone Road being willing to consider the sale of the field.

ACTION: Note support for Location EC-2 as landowner to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

8.24 2 responses received

1 response (Dr Douce) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location EC-5 as the land is part of Eccleshall conservation area and a visually important site within Eccleshall being the main view from Holy Trinity Church and a key area of transition from town to country, the land has issues with rainwater drainage from these fields causing flooding problems for houses on Church Street and an increase in traffic congestion compounded by development at Location EC-4.

ACTION: Note objections to Locations EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Norton) – There is a need for some more (small-scale) rural industry in the area to boost employment. However development should not be of the scale proposed in the issues and options consultation document. A much more sensitive and demand-focused approach is required. Eccleshall does not currently have the level of existing services sufficient to absorb the expansion envisaged with the medical provision, library and Post Office at capacity as well as congestion on the local road network. Development would undermine the Conservation Area and historic character of Eccleshall.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

8.25 No responses received

8.26 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – The western side of Eccleshall is very rural and provides a green corridor towards the RAMSAR at Copmere. Development in this area would not be in keeping with the character of the surroundings.

ACTION: Note objections to western direction of growth to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

8.27 3 responses received

1 response (Dr Douce) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations EC-4 and EC-5 as the current road access is poor and comprises small roads through residential areas. For location EC-5 the access would be via Shaws Lane, which would require significant upgrading, would increase traffic along the road separating a split site school with pedestrian dangers and major work would be required on the drainage system along Church Street and the High Street.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations EC-4 and EC-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK) – Western direction of growth for Eccleshall is the most suitable and sustainable location for proposed new housing development due to proximity to the town centre, thereby providing good access by foot and cycle to services and facilities. The topography of the area, sloping down from south to north, will reduce any visual impact from development within the landscape envelope of the town.

**ACTION:** Note support to the western direction of growth to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd) – Support new housing development on the edge of Eccleshall and encourage opportunities to provide additional housing land at Raleigh Hall to complement employment proposals. Eccleshall has a significant level of services and facilities for a relatively small population and the Plan's Vision indicates that Eccleshall will expand its services and facilities to sustain the surrounding rural area including Raleigh Hall for housing.

**ACTION:** Note support for new development at Eccleshall and promotion of land at Raleigh Hall for housing and employment to be considered through the preferred development locations for Eccleshall.

---

## **Gnosall (GN) – Housing Location Options**

129 responses received of which 66 are PDF responses

1 response (Mr F Humpherys for Mr & Mrs Bagnall) – Support GN-9 for the following reasons: it is not in open countryside, is well contained with existing housing and would not affect biodiversity or the environment, the site would deliver a small number of affordable and market housing for Gnosall to support local services and facilities, is accessible to public transport and not on a dangerous road.

**ACTION:** Note support for GN-9 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Herbert) – Strong objection to new development at Gnosall due to lack of infrastructure and impact on community viability.

**ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Mr Ryan) – Object to new development at Gnosall due to loss of agricultural land on eastern side of village, development to the north east would increase traffic congestion in the village and to local facilities, significant new infrastructure would be needed due to traffic and parking, avoid Gnosall becoming a dormitory town, lack of services & facilities, impact on sewage capacity and commuting patterns. Concern about lack of clarity and consultation process so no new development should occur.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Collier) – Concern about development of GNPR-1, GN-1 and GN-2 causing increased rat running along Ranton Road to work as inevitable lack of employment in Gnosall, impact on services and facilities including specialist shops, sewage, local roads and the fire station. GN-1 has a major gas pipeline across it. Avoid loss of agricultural land so keep boundaries in place. GN-1 and GN-2 absorb run-off preventing local flooding with lack of access to the school and public transport.

**ACTION:** Note objection to GN-1 and GN-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Halliday) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to lack of infrastructure, services and facilities, impact on the local road network and existing vacant properties. Object to GN-1 on drainage issues, poor access, loss of agricultural land and wildlife impacts. GN-4 is preferred location due to impact and scale of development, access and locality to existing urban area including the health centre.

**ACTION:** Note objection to GN-1 and support for GN-4 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Halliday) – Object to new development at Gnosall. Consultation material was vague and misleading regarding scale and location of new development. Gnosall has little employment and therefore new development would increase commuting, lack of infrastructure. Oppose GN-1 and GN-2 on access and flooding issues but accept GN-4 if required.

**ACTION:** Note objection to GN-1 and GN-2 with support for GN-4 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Brown) – Object to new development at GN-1 and GN-2 on landscape grounds, flooding issues and local road implications with commuting. There are other more suitable areas in Gnosall.

**ACTION:** Note objection to GN-1 and GN-2 with support for GN-4 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (A Dyke) – Object to new housing development in Gnosall not delivering affordable housing so preventing the ability to buy.

**ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (W Pitchford) – Object to new housing development at GN-2 due to lack of services and facilities, lack of local employment, increased commuting, flooding and sewage issues and loss of recreational open space. Eccleshall has more services and facilities than Gnosall.

**ACTION:** Note objection to GN-2 with support for Eccleshall to be considered through Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Cllr Ms Burgess – Gnosall Parish) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to lack of infrastructure, increase in traffic and commuting causing a dormitory town, loss of community spirit, social unrest by affordable housing and lack of employment, loss of agricultural land. GN-4 is the most appropriate location for new housing but consider burial space nearing capacity.

**ACTION:** Note objections with support for GN-4 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (S Knight) – Questions the scale of development for the Borough and impact on existing villages affecting character, quality of life and congestion not least for Gnosall. Object to GN-1, GN-2 & GN-3 due to loss of recreational open space, impact on local road network, loss of wildlife and landscape character. Development should be kept within the existing boundaries. Gnosall has a lack of employment, services and facilities to avoid commuting to Stafford and implications on the Newport Road.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-1, GN-2 and GN-3 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Gough) – Oppose all development at Gnosall especially at GN-1, GN-2 & GN-3 due to loss of agricultural land.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-1, GN-2 and GN-3 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Freer) – Object to new development at Gnosall due to loss of agricultural land on eastern side of village, development to the north east would increase traffic congestion in the village and to local facilities, significant new infrastructure would be needed due to traffic and parking, avoid Gnosall becoming a dormitory town, lack of services & facilities, impact on sewage capacity and commuting patterns. Concern about lack of clarity and consultation process so no new development should occur.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Ward) – Gnosall has reached its optimum size to maintain character based on infrastructure and flooding issues. Since 2001 a loss of services & facilities has occurred and Stafford leisure centre is inadequate. Eccleshall does not provide facilities to meet Gnosall's needs due to distance and local road network. There is lack of public transport and over-provision of houses in Gnosall together with no employment so commuting will increase. Object to GN-2 on access, loss of wildlife and recreational open space matters. GN-4 is the preferred location for new development.

**ACTION:** Note objection to GN-2 with support for GN-4 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Adams) – Object to new development at Gnosall due to loss of agricultural land on eastern side of village, development to the north east would increase traffic congestion in the village and to local facilities, significant new infrastructure would be needed due to traffic and parking, avoid Gnosall becoming a dormitory town, lack of services & facilities, impact on sewage capacity and commuting patterns. Concern about lack of clarity and consultation process so no new development should occur.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (C A Large) – Concern about building 2,000 houses in Gnosall which would require 2 new high schools and a new industrial estate to reduce commuting. The rural character would be destroyed with agricultural land lost and significant impact on the local road network.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (I & A Clark) – Concern about new development at Gnosall with lack of infrastructure and impact on services & facilities. GN-1 & GN-2 have flooding, drainage and loss of recreational open space issues. Question need for new housing in the current economic climate impacting on the rural villages and character of Staffordshire.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-1 & GN-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (G R Knight) – Support modest development at GN-8 rather than GN-1 and GN-2 in Gnosall due to loss of recreational open space, distance from local services & facilities, increased traffic, impact on character, flooding and run-off flows. Support development at GN-4 due to locality with school and access with links to Gnosall Heath as well as GN-5. Oppose GN-6 on same grounds as GN-1 to GN-3 and no view regarding GN-7 except distance for facilities. Gnosall has lack of employment and poor road links north and south. Suggests a parkland area be created at Audmore Loop.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-1, GN-2 & GN-3 with support for GN-4 to be considered through Gnosall preferred development locations.

1 response (Mr Large) – Object to new development increasing straggled village form and question the need for more housing, uptake of new properties, employment opportunities locally, impact on infrastructure and character. Brownfield land in more sustainable locations should be used.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Miss Sandyford) – Great Haywood representation.

**ACTION:** Refer to Great Haywood responses.

1 response (Mrs Pitchford) – Object to new development at GN-2 due to impact on the local road network, increased children commuting to Stafford, dangerous new road proposal GNPR-1, loss of recreational open space, flooding and sewerage problems, impact on landscape and wildlife.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-2 and GNPR-1 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (S Godfrey) – Object to new development at Gnosall due to loss of agricultural land on eastern side of village, development to the north east would increase traffic congestion in the village and to local facilities, significant new infrastructure would be needed due to traffic and parking, avoid Gnosall becoming a dormitory town, lack of services & facilities, impact on sewage capacity and commuting patterns. Concern about lack of clarity and consultation process so no new development should occur.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (County Cllr Winnington) – Central Government is imposing new housing development on Stafford Borough with no account of infrastructure implications. Proposals at Gnosall, Woodseaves and Haughton should consider the opposition of local residents to plans and use the normal planning process, infrastructure should be in place first and regard given to impacts on surrounding villages and infrastructure.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Herbert) – Object to new housing development in Stafford Borough on greenfields and question level of infrastructure required. Gnosall would need new sewage infrastructure and a new bypass so future housing should be restricted to infill. Question the clarity of options.

ACTION: Noted with further considerations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Booth) – Existing housing developments have not been supported by new infrastructure with less services and facilities in Gnosall compared to Eccleshall and Stone. New development should not affect the landscape and agricultural land but should be close to main roads. Oppose GN-8 and GN-9 due to flooding issues, loss of countryside and steep topography. Support GN-4 with extension of burial ground potential. Affordable housing should be allowed next to the health centre and more open space links at Brookhouse Road.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-8 & GN-9 with support for GN-4 to be considered through Gnosall preferred development locations.

1 response (W & S Mockett) – Strongly oppose new development at Gnosall due to increased freight traffic from Donnington combined with commuting leading to congestion to Stafford, lack of infrastructure, downward pressure on house prices, loss of community spirit and village atmosphere, over-capacity of the local road network.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (L Hoeth) – Object to further housing development due to impact on existing services & facilities, inadequate sewerage infrastructure and lack of shops causing commuting, impact on existing property prices, impact on wildlife and environment, and number of empty properties. Implications on Cowley Lane of new development including traffic and environmental impacts.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (A Tunnicliffe) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall and concern about loss of natural environment and character, traffic problems within Gnosall and surrounding routes to Stafford. There has been poor communication of proposals from Council officials.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (P Tunnicliffe) – Object to housing development at Gnosall and GN-2 due to loss of open countryside, increase in traffic and loss of rural village character.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Lane) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to impact on local road congestion, noise & pollution levels, need for new infrastructure including sewerage, increased number of services and facilities, impact on wildlife and Conservation Area, and current lack of employment.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Ison) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall and GN-2 due to impact on recreational open space and wildlife, scale of proposal, lack of local employment leading to increased commuting, increased pollution and flooding problems. Question the ability to amend the Residential Development Boundary.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Dykes) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to scale of development related to existing services and facilities, impact on sewerage system and increase in flooding, impact on the A518 without a new bypass. Would support 10% increase in housing with new infrastructure and employment provision but how is this guaranteed?

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through Development Strategy approach for Gnosall.



1 response (Mrs Reynolds) – Object to new housing development affecting Cowley Lane (GN-5?) due to loss of countryside, impact of increased traffic and no requirement for more housing.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Ingram) – Good transport systems are needed to facilitate people travelling to work elsewhere avoiding use of cars. No further housing at Gnosall without infrastructure. Question land owned by Staffordshire County Council and influence compared to residents.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs Horton) – Concern about flooding at Wharfe Road being increased by housing development at Gnosall Heath as well as increased traffic requiring management, school provision and public transport. Greater research is required for the new infrastructure.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (J Gardiner) – Object to new housing development in Gnosall due to scale of development, impact on services and facilities, meeting needs of migrants and central Government wanting to concrete the countryside.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Walker) – Support development of GN-7 as landowner.

ACTION: Noted support for GN-7.

1 response (Mr Pritchard) – Strongly object to new housing development at Gnosall due to lack of infrastructure, services and facilities for existing housing, impact on A518 including road safety concerns, increased noise pollution, an inadequate assessment of existing provision in Gnosall, lack of employment and increased commuting on local road network. Question the need for more housing, whether supported by new employment and traffic problems.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Dykes) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to lack of current infrastructure, an inadequate main road, sewage and flooding issues, loss of agricultural land, oversupply of existing houses in Gnosall and loss of character.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Major Prendergast MBE) – Oppose the significant housing development proposed for Audmore due to disruption, lack of employment leading to commuting, lack of surface water drainage and sewage capacity, inadequate road and parking capacity, lack of utilities, impact on wildlife and historic assets and loss of recreational open space. Audmore should be treated separately from Gnosall and not have any development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Harris) – Object to new housing development at GN-5 and GN-6 due to impact on wildlife and village character including Cowley Lane, impact on utilities and a new road across the floodplain required. Less impact would occur from the other development areas in Gnosall.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5 and GN-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Fownes) – Oppose new housing development affecting the Brookhouse Road estate and loss of greenfields but support GN-3 & GN-4 to make some provision in Gnosall and not require significant infrastructure.

**ACTION:** Note objections and support for GN-3 & GN-4 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Foster) – Object to new housing development affecting Cowley Lane at GN-5 and GN-6 including the new link road GNPR-2 due to flooding issues, impact on landscape and village character. Other locations should be considered to meet the needs of local families.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5 and GN-6 including GNPR-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (R Jobson) – Object to new housing development at Old Barn Close due to inadequate infrastructure, Greenfield land, surface run off problems, impact on the local road capacity and avoid Gnosall becoming a town. Other development sites in Gnosall are more appropriate.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Barker) – Strongly object to new housing development at Gnosall which would undermine its character. There is a lack of infrastructure, services and facilities to provide for the new development. Other locations with employment provision would be better for new housing. Questions to the level of investigation undertaken for such development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (C Barker) – Strongly object to new housing development at Gnosall which would undermine its character. There is a lack of infrastructure, services and facilities to provide for the new development. Other locations with employment provision would be better for new housing.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (L Barker) Strongly object to new housing development at Gnosall which would undermine its character. There is a lack of infrastructure, services and facilities to provide for the new development. Other locations with employment provision would be better for new housing.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Payne) – Concern about previous impact of housing development on the local road capacity in Gnosall including Cowley Lane and road safety issues only being exacerbated by more housing. Concern about the impact on village character and loss of Greenfield land to produce food in the future despite current levels of empty properties in Stafford and elsewhere.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (P G Stewart) – Object to the lack of clarity concerning where, when and how many houses will be built, with account of infill development needed. There is significant concern amongst the general public.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (S Jobson) – Object to new housing development at GN-1 Old Barn Close due to inadequate infrastructure, Greenfield land and loss of agricultural land, surface run off problems, impact on the local road capacity and avoid Gnosall becoming a town. Other development sites in Gnosall are more appropriate.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-1 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall

1 response (Mr Ruscoe) – Object to new housing development at GN-5 and GN-6 including GNPR-2 due to loss of wildlife and rural character, property values, cost of the new road and noise pollution. Support new development at GN-8 and GN-9 as not prone to flooding and close to existing village facilities whilst improving the local road network.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-5 and GN-6 whilst support for GN-8 and GN-9 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Uttridge) – Whilst accepting the need for more residential development concern about delivering more employment in the area, the need to increase infrastructure provision in advance of more homes. Object to GN-5 and GN-

6 with the new link road GNPR-2 affecting wildlife and question viability from new housing development as well as construction traffic impact on existing roads and implications on global warming, energy use and increased emissions from cars. Normal planning channels should be used to reject further development at Gnosall.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5, GN-6 and GNPR-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Deeley) – Questions the number and types of houses and need for gypsy provision. Notes impact on property prices, need to improve infrastructure, local road congestion, increased school and retail provision, improve community facilities. Overall lifestyle will be undermined.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (S Edmondson) – Object to new housing development imposed by central Government with no consideration of local communities. Impacts on infrastructure including sewage problems and flooding, traffic problems on local road network, destruction of historic character. Questions the employment provision and ability to pay for the developments.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Hingley) – New development at Gnosall to be kept to a minimum for local needs due to lack of employment, limited infrastructure and increase in commuting. Minimise Greenfield development and visual impact south of A518. Object to GN-5, GN-6 and GNPR-2 on landscape and environment, flooding issues leading to construction on high ground with visual impacts. Significant hazard on local road network and impact on local school access.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5, GN-6 and GNPR-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (R R Hubbard) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall and questions who has decided the number of houses and who will occupy them, why are the houses needed in light of economic climate and cost of construction. Consider lack of infrastructure, services and facilities, environmental and wildlife impacts, loss of rural character and landownership. Who gains from the development. Previous development has failed to deliver new infrastructure. Gnosall's development would lead to loss of rural area for Stafford and other villages have better infrastructure and wish for new housing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Evans) – Object to GN-5 and GN-6 being suggested during a recession and impact on property prices as well as flooding issues and lack of education provision. Object to GN-1 to GN-4 due to increase in houses built and loss of employment.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-1 to GN-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Perry) – Object to GN-5 due to impact of noise and disturbance together with GNPR-2 due to impact on wildlife, air pollution and loss of environment.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-5 and GNPR-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (J and P Boulton) – Object to new housing development at Audmore Loop due to lack of infrastructure, loss of wildlife and recreational open space, impact on property prices and local road network.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Deakin) – Support the development of GN-5 but less suitable than GN-6 both on our land with appropriate road junction improvements.

ACTION: Note support for GN-5 and GN-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr White) – Object to new housing development at Audmore Loop due to loss of countryside and recreational open space.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (H Swan) – Object to new housing development at Audmore Loop due to loss of rural character, inadequate infrastructure and impact on local road network, construction traffic and loss of agricultural land.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Wanless) – Object to new housing development at GN-5 and GN-6 due to local road implications, loss of wildlife, flooding issues from surface run off and lack of need for local population.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-5 and GN-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall

1 response (D J Woolridge) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall and queries the inaccurate and vague maps. Concern about the historic environment of Gnosall, narrow High Street and provision of services and facilities, implications of more housing on traffic problems. Concern about loss of historic assets through development of GN-1 and GN-2 as well as hydrological issues in east and north east areas of Gnosall regarding surface run off and flooding. GN-4 and GN-8 are least damaging.

ACTION: Note objections but potential at GN-4 and GN-8 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Hill) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall and suggest allocations at Stafford and Stone being more sustainable. Villages to retain character, infrastructure implications of new village development and oppose use of County owned farmland for new houses.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Buck) – Strongly object to GN-3 due to lack of infrastructure, insufficient drainage, A518 being a dangerous road without any increase in traffic, loss of wildlife and public right of way, loss of services and facilities recently.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-3 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Brown) – Object to new development at GN-1, GN-2 and GN-3 due to loss of village character and wildlife, flooding and surface run off problems and impact on local road network. There are better areas to build houses in Gnosall.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-1, GN-2 and GN-3 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Thomson) – Object to new housing development at GN-6 due to increase in traffic levels causing a danger and need for new road infrastructure, flooding problems through surface run off, loss of wildlife and recreational open space, need to improve infrastructure significantly, lack of employment and increase in social pressures. Other towns would benefit from such investment with Gnosall Heath not a priority for low cost housing.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (G Groves) – Object to new housing development at GN-1, GN-2 and GN-3 due to destruction of flora and fauna, loss of country views, impact on existing infrastructure, increase in traffic, lack of employment, danger of new road. Preferred location is GN-4.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-1, GN-2 and GN-3 with support for GN-4 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Groves) – Object to GN-1 and GN-2 due to loss of flora and fauna as well as local road network. Preferred location is GN-4 with limited infrastructure required and disruption.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-1 and GN-2 with support for GN-4 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Wright) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to loss of agricultural land east of village, local traffic congestion in the village and A518, significant infrastructure required and loss of village character.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr R Grigg) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall in particular the Audmore Loop due to impact on rural character and loss of recreational open space, A518 not coping with current traffic volumes, flooding and surface run – off, impact on education provision, increase in anti-social behaviour and lack of infrastructure.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Rowe) – Questions the existing infrastructure to cope with new housing development due to the local school, increasing commuting, inadequate local road network, sewage and flooding issues, lack of demand for housing and infrastructure improvements.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Buck) – Object to GN-3 due to lack of infrastructure, insufficient drainage, A518 being a dangerous road without any increase in traffic, loss of wildlife and public right of way, loss of services and facilities, devaluation of property prices and extension of village although new development could occur at Lowfield Lane.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-3 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall

1 response (Mrs Webb) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to insufficient infrastructure, flooding of existing sewage system, local traffic congestion, loss of services and facilities. Two sites would lead to loss of privacy and views, ill conceived plans and lack of link between planning and highways, the need for more housing, and use of Greenfield land resulting in loss of agricultural land rather than brownfield to deliver the options.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Webb) - Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to insufficient infrastructure, flooding of existing sewage system, local traffic congestion, loss of services and facilities. Two sites would lead to loss of privacy and views, ill conceived plans and lack of link between planning and highways, the need for more housing, and use of Greenfield land resulting in loss of agricultural land rather than brownfield to deliver the options.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (JM & RJ Winkle) – Object to assessment of local services and facilities, lack of parking compared to Eccleshall, loss of character, narrowness of the High Street, significant infrastructure requirements. GN-2 and GN-3 have a very high

water table with surface run off and flooding issues, narrow access leading to loss of historic properties, loss of local environment, wildlife and recreational open space.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Bradley) – Object to new housing development in Gnosall which is already big enough and has sewage problems.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (J Thomas) – Object to new housing development in Gnosall due to loss of rural character, inadequate infrastructure, traffic problems and increasing commuting to Stafford, impact on services and facilities. Avoid loss of a beautiful village.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (C Bandurak & E Holton) – Object to new housing development in Gnosall due to impact on A518 and road safety with new road links exacerbating problems, concern about increase in population levels on infrastructure and village status, loss of local amenity including footpaths, wildlife and trees, lack of inadequate infrastructure, services and facilities. The Government has exacerbated the problem with private ownership initiatives and lack of affordable housing provision.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (S & S Rowe) – Concern about new housing development in Gnosall due to loss of village character and few facilities, increased volume of traffic on A518 which currently struggles to cope, loss of wildlife and increase in anti-social behaviour.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Barnfather) – Concern about level of new housing development at Haughton and Gnosall having an impact on the local road network at Bradley with increased traffic. A risk assessment is required.

**ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Tweed) – Object to increased housing development in Gnosall as impossible to sustain, lack of new services and facilities with existing housing and lack of affordable housing impacting on viability, lack of employment, increase in commuting, water consumption and traffic problems and narrowness of A518 road. Stafford needs a new bus station. Loss of agricultural land will impact on food production, loss of recreational open space at Audmore Loop, flooding and sewage problems. Cumulative effects need consideration.



**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (K Robinson) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall with existing development failing to deliver new services and facilities. Objection based on lack of employment, creation of a dormitory town, lack of services and facilities, inadequate infrastructure, narrow local road network and dangerous A518 road. Plans show no new employment or retail provision with lack of education requirements. Gnosall is unsuitable for new development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (D Sydney) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to lack of employment causing an increase in commuting contrary to reducing emissions, lack of connectivity through existing road network and high accident rates, congestion on the A518. Other villages such as Eccleshall, Woodseaves, the Haywoods, Hixon and Weston have better road links.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (A Wanless) – Object to new housing development at GN-5 due to topography causing flooding and surface run off problems, loss of wildlife and noise and air pollution.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5 and GN-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Dr Robotham) – Object to new housing development at GN-5, GN-6 and GNPR-2 due to access across agricultural land and floodplain, drainage and limited sub-soil, unstable rock strata, surface run-off problems, land movements, water pressure and sewage issues, loss of agricultural land and sunlight.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5, GN-6 and GNPR-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (C Spencer) – Queries Stafford's ability to act as a Growth Point and implications on surrounding villages. Questions the services and facilities assessment along with failure to secure a recent affordable housing site. New development must consider existing and new infrastructure requirements, pressure on the A518 and its narrowness with improvements needed and record of accidents, lack of employment opportunities, services and facilities, commuting increasing. School is large enough but community facilities lost with a split village reducing social cohesion, loss of village character, flooding and drainage issues and loss of agricultural land. GN-8 is liable to flooding and GN-9 is western expansion. GN-2 and GN-3 have a pipeline crossing the site and are liable to flooding (GN-2) with a new road being very expensive. Part of GN-4 would be needed for increased burial space and should provide new playing fields. GN-5 and GN-6 would need a new road, would affect the Conservation Area and are liable to flooding as well as GN-7.

ACTION: Note objections and location specific comments to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (S Booth) – There is no need for new housing in current economic climate. Gnosall has limited infrastructure and no secondary school leading to commuting, village character would be lost with countryside. Avoid increasing the size of Stafford and impact on villages.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (K Ingram) – Object to new housing development at GN-6 due to nesting birds and impact on biodiversity and habitats.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (S Appleford) Object to new housing development at Gnosall and queries the inaccurate and vague maps. Concern about the historic environment of Gnosall, narrow High Street and provision of services and facilities, implications of more housing on traffic problems. Concern about loss of historic assets through development of GN-1 and GN-2 as well as hydrological issues in east and north east areas of Gnosall regarding surface run off and flooding. GN-4 and GN-8 are least damaging.

ACTION: Note objections but potential at GN-4 and GN-8 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Sydney) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to existing residential development not providing infrastructure, services and facilities. New infrastructure is needed with new housing to address the existing sewage and flooding problems, query new roads being built and existing local road network capacity. Eccleshall has more services and facilities. Queries the revised settlement assessment and conclusions for Gnosall. Strongly object to new housing at GN-1 and GN-2 due to loss of rural character and countryside. In order of preference development could occur at GN-4, GN-8, GN-9, GN-7 and then GN-3

ACTION: Note objections to GN-1 and GN-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Lee) – Questions the Regional Spatial Strategy housing provision in light of the economic downturn and delivery of new infrastructure, drop in house prices and increase in housing for sale. Brownfield land should be used before Greenfield locations and associated loss of agricultural land supported by the RSS. It is not appropriate to allocation Greenfield locations due to impact on property prices. New services and facilities would be needed with new housing and question the deliverability of new employment in Gnosall so increasing commuting. There are traffic problems and infrastructure issues with the A518 road. GN-1, GN-2 and GN-3 experience flooding problems as well as a new access road linked to the A518 but who would provide it? Agricultural land would be lost together with wildlife,

recreational open space and public footpaths. Other locations in Gnosall may have less impact but there is still inadequate infrastructure, services and facilities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-1, GN-2 and GN-3 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Thorne) – Recognise the need for limited new housing development but object to the increase in village size with impact on character, detrimental to the community and particularly object to GN-6 rather than new development on Stafford side of Gnosall.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Anthoney) – Object to new housing development at GN-2 and GN-3 due to narrowness of access road and safety implications, sewerage problems, the need for new infrastructure, flooding and surface run off drainage issues, loss of wildlife and recreational open space. Suggest new housing at GN-4, GN-8 and GN-9 due to access of services and facilities with road infrastructure.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-2 and GN-3 with support for GN-4, GN-8 and GN-9 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (A Anthoney) Object to new housing development at GN-2 and GN-3 due to narrowness of access road and safety implications, sewerage problems, the need for new infrastructure, flooding and surface run off drainage issues, loss of wildlife and recreational open space. Suggest new housing at GN-4, GN-8 and GN-9 due to access of services and facilities with road infrastructure.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-2 and GN-3 with support for GN-4, GN-8 and GN-9 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (A Farmer) – Object to new housing development at GN-5 and GN-6 affecting Cowley Lane due to inadequate existing infrastructure, surface water run-off pressures on the drainage system, increased traffic on existing local road network including commuting, noise and pollution, loss of local amenity space, lack of employment opportunities, limited local services and facilities, affordable housing leading to anti-social behaviour, telecommunication problems, loss of village atmosphere and play areas for children, loss of wildlife and hedgerows. Development of new housing and employment would be better placed in larger settlements such as Telford and Stoke-on-Trent to avoid loss of village life and Stafford congestion problems.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5 and GN-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Burgess) – Question the infrastructure requirements to meet new housing development in Gnosall with concern about road capacity, police presence, ability of local services and facilities to cope and impact on wildlife and Conservation Areas. Wishes to know target dates and timescales.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Martindale) – Object to new housing development at GN-5 and GN-6 including GNPR-2 due to even greater building in the future, devastation on existing countryside, increased flooding, upgrading services, increased traffic movements and improvements, provision of public transport, education and health services, children commuting to school and the need for new housing in current property market. Central Government fail to appreciate local communities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5, GN-6 and GNPR-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Franklin) – Strongly object to new housing development at GN-3 due to the dangerous local road network, poor drainage and surface run off issues, requirement for significant new infrastructure, improvements to the A518 road, impact on property prices, lack of need for affordable housing in Gnosall. Any development should be restricted to infill and the main focus should be on Stafford with its associated infrastructure.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-3 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr S) – Object to the scale of new housing development at Gnosall due to damage of village character and rural setting, lack of road capacity and safety issues on A518, lack of services and facilities, lack of employment and commuting, crime issues and disproportionate to size of settlement.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (M Kinnersley) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to village status and lack of services and facilities. If development occurs make the houses affordable for village people who are prepared to contribute to the community, concern about vandalism and lack of facilities for young people.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Kinnersley) – Gnosall has a lack of services and facilities, inadequate local road network and increased volume of traffic to take new housing development off Cowley Lane but support Lowfield Lane for more homes.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5 and GN-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (B Kinnersley) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall. New housing should be on infill land, avoid use of agricultural land, not impact on the village due to lack of services and facilities and increase in social problems. Housing should be low cost to help younger people purchase homes.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Salt) – Concern about Gnosall changing from a village to small town including destruction of countryside, a new road (GNPR-2) affecting canal area and increased traffic on A518 affecting Stafford.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Gnosall resident) – Strongly object to new housing development at GN-3 due to the dangerous local road network, poor drainage and surface run off issues, requirement for significant new infrastructure, improvements to the A518 road, impact on property prices, lack of need for affordable housing in Gnosall. Any development should be restricted to infill and the main focus should be on Stafford with its associated infrastructure.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-3 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (M Dickinson) – Object to new housing development at GN-5 and GN-6 with new road link GNPR-2 due to loss of views, reduced property prices, exacerbated traffic problems on A518, impact on wildlife, flooding and drainage issues as well as lack of sewage capacity.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5, GN-6 and GNPR-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Sullivan) – Object to new development at Gnosall due to loss of agricultural land on eastern side of village, development to the north east would increase traffic congestion in the village and to local facilities, significant new infrastructure would be needed due to traffic and parking, avoid Gnosall becoming a dormitory town, lack of services & facilities, impact on sewage capacity and commuting patterns. Concern about lack of clarity and consultation process so no new development should occur.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Pitt) – Note the options status of the consultation with priority given to infill development necessary. Two sites off Brookhouse Road should be investigated for future development: south of surgery & grazing land next to High Street considered for mixed use development. GN-4 is preferred due to limited infrastructure needs and improvement to road access. Concern about GN-5 and GN-6 due to narrow access road. GN-7 is grazing land and has difficult access unsuitable for traffic. Full assessment of transport, drainage / flooding and agricultural land is needed. Favour some level of affordable housing but not to undermine rural character.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5, GN-6, GN-7 and GNPR-2 but support for GN-4 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Woodhall) – Support new housing development for local people flooding and drainage problems at Audmore Road must be taken into account.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (M & N Frost) – Object to new housing development in Gnosall due to impact on road infrastructure and A518 road by increased traffic. Particularly object to GN-5 due to impact on properties, air & noise pollution, reduction in quality of life and property prices, new infrastructure required with new road GNPR-2.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5 and GNPR-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Dickerson) – Infrastructure at Gnosall is inadequate for new housing development, A518 is too narrow for freight traffic.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (J Lloyd) – Object to new housing development at GN-5 due to impact on tranquillity, habitat and wildlife, loss of recreational open space, lack of privacy, decrease in house prices and quality of life. GNPR-2 would ruin the area and increase accidents with A518 and noise whilst loss of environment and wildlife.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5 and GNPR-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Fowell) – Object to new housing development at GN-5 due to impact on wildlife, flooding issues, danger of new road (GNPR-2) joining A518 and increased traffic. GN-4 Lowfield Lane is a preferred location with direct access to A518 and potential to increase burial space.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5 and GNPR-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Piwko) – Concern about scale and proportion of new housing development in Gnosall. New housing should be supported by new infrastructure, services and facilities with preferred locations being GN-3 and GN-4 with access directly onto A518 rather than GN-1 and GN-2 having less adequate access.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-1 and GN-2 whilst support for GN-3 and GN-4 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Chesters) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to loss of village character, community life and beauty. Development should take place in Stafford town due to less environmental impacts.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Henderson) Object to new housing development at Gnosall and queries the inaccurate and vague maps. Concern about the historic environment of Gnosall, narrow High Street and provision of services and facilities, implications of more housing on traffic problems. Concern about loss of historic assets through development of GN-1 and GN-2 as well as hydrological issues in east and north east areas of Gnosall regarding surface run off and flooding. GN-4 and GN-8 are least damaging.

**ACTION:** Note objections but potential at GN-4 and GN-8 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall

1 response (Mrs Adcock) – New infrastructure must be in place before new housing including road improvements but questions who will pay. Non-agricultural land must be used to avoid food shortages

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Astwood) – Concerned about scale of development at Gnosall due to size of village currently able to sustain services and facilities so develop in villages which struggle, increased commuting and lack of employment opportunities, impact of increased emissions and loss of countryside whilst other villages (Hixon & the Haywoods) have infill potential, increased education provision causing more car journeys. Object to new housing development south east of Gnosall due to impact on house prices and views, loss of countryside when infill development would be preferred, historic village pattern changed, loss of agricultural land and wildlife, flooding issues and drainage. A new link road will increase traffic issues, dangerous access onto the A518 and increased traffic conflicts.

**ACTION:** Note objections to south east of Gnosall to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Astwood) – Concerned about scale of development at Gnosall due to increased commuting and lack of employment opportunities, impact of increased emissions and loss of countryside, use infill potential, increased education provision causing more car journeys. Object to new housing development south east of Gnosall due to impact on house prices and views, loss of countryside when infill development would be preferred, historic village pattern changed, loss of agricultural land and wildlife, flooding issues and drainage. A new link road will increase traffic issues, dangerous access onto the A518 and increased traffic conflicts.

**ACTION:** Note objections to south east of Gnosall to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall

1 response (Mr & Mrs Griffiths) – Object to GN-5 and GN-6 due to adverse effect on wildlife, flooding issues, increased traffic on busy roads, devaluation of existing properties with other options having less infrastructure need to be considered.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-5 and GN-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Fownes) – Only minimal housing development should take place in Gnosall with a priority on infrastructure. GN-3 and GN-4 would require least infrastructure and disruption whilst GN-8 and GN-9 would cause problems in the vicinity of recent health centre development including loss of open countryside.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-8 and GN-9 whilst support for GN-3 and GN-4 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mrs Cox) – Object to new housing development at Gnosall due to impact on village status, local needs can be met by small scale schemes rather than huge developments and impact of infrastructure. Normal planning channels should be used rather than national and regional governance.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (M Hughes) – Object to more than 50 new houses being built in Gnosall. Past mistakes with Brookhouse Road causing flooding problems, sewerage system to capacity and lack of facilities used to reject affordable housing scheme. Gnosall has a lack of services and facilities, is not second only to Stafford and Stone in the Borough, has traffic problems and no employment. More development will lead to a dormitory town with no reference to the electorate.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (B Hawkins) – Concern about lack of clarity of maps and consultation process. Object to new housing development at GN-6 due to inadequate existing sewage system, flooding and surface run off problems, capacity of village school, increased parking and traffic issues leading to dangerous conditions for children, and loss of wildlife.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GN-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Fraser) – Concern over loss of agricultural land, flooding at Gnosall, inadequate emergency service provision, increased freight movements and accidents along A518 due to Donnington project so need road improvements. Stafford town centre will need access improvements with new roads and Park & Ride, repair roads. Question how this can be afforded.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (J Carr) – Information on new developments is too vague with serious infrastructure problems, increased traffic on A518 and impact on Stafford including Donnington freight scheme, impact on village character and sense of community.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.



1 response (Mr Griffiths) – Object to new housing development at Audmore Ring due to loss of recreational open space, historic character and wildlife. Avoid a dormitory town being created.

ACTION: Note objections to GN-2 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr Smith) – Existing services and facilities struggle to cope with current population and a great level of out-commuting. New development will lead to loss of environment and redevelopment of the High Street being detrimental to the historic village character.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

Spatial Options 4      1 response (Cowley Lane / Wharfe Road Residents petition) – Strongly oppose GN-5 due to environmental and wildlife impacts. Other locations in Gnosall should be considered with in situ infrastructure, less environmental impact and in keep with other residential areas.

ACTION: Note objection to GN-5 to be considered through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

Table 8.5      No response received

8.28      3 responses received

1 response (Mrs Bagnall) – Support new employment at Gnosall at GN-3 and GN-4 due to direct access onto A518 reducing village traffic.

ACTION: Noted and consider through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr B Wiseman) – As the landowner support commercial use of land at Brookhouse Road and High Street to provide new retail facilities alongside new housing development to reduce commuting patterns. Development at this site could ease congestion and has storm drains already in place.

ACTION: Noted and consider through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

8.29 2 responses received

1 response (Mr G Brown) – Strongly object to new housing development at GN-1 and GN-2 due to impact on the natural environment and rural setting, road safety and loss of recreational open space. There are other more suitable development locations in Gnosall.

ACTION: Noted objection to GN-1 and GN-2 to consider through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (Mr M Smith) – Object to new housing development at GN-1 and GN-2 due to over-capacity of local road network, loss of recreation open space at GN-2 and current lack of services and facilities particularly for younger people.

ACTION: Noted objection to GN-1 and GN-2 to consider through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

8.30 1 response (Mr & Mrs Bagnall) – As agents to owners of GN-9 raise the following points. Land has good drainage and does not flood, it is not Greenfield or in the Green Belt, it is accessible by public transport. Furthermore the land is adjacent to the Residential Development Boundary, is brownfield, no loss of agricultural land, good access to services & facilities, is well contained within the landscape and is a level area. Affordable housing on this site is being supported by Housing Associations.

ACTION: Noted points regarding GN-9 to consider through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

8.31 3 responses received

1 response (Mr & Mrs Dean) – Object to development at GN-5 and GN-6 due to wildlife impacts, lack of infrastructure and delivery of affordable housing, and carbon footprint. Gnosall struggles with traffic, new shops would not improve job opportunities with more housing increasing commuting and concern about education provision.

ACTION: Noted objection to GN-5 and GN-6, to consider through preferred development locations for Gnosall.

1 response (British Waterways Wales & Border Counties) – Development south-east of Gnosall to involve British Waterways in pre-application discussions to enhance the canal corridor.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support development to north west of Gnosall with GN-8 already physically contained by the existing urban area.

**ACTION:** Note support for GN-8 and north west direction of growth.

## **Hixon (HI) – Housing Location Options**

223 responses received

1 response (Mrs Haynes) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location HI-4 and HI-5 due to adverse impact on landscape character on rising and prominent ground, loss of local historic character and distinctiveness, loss of greenfield land with no defensible boundary when brownfield alternatives should be used, unsatisfactory vehicular access on narrow local roads as well as a lack of transport infrastructure, services and facilities in Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations HI-4 and HI-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Stowe by Chartley Parish Council) – Supports development to the south and west of Hixon due to access to local services and facilities as well as employment areas whilst development to the north would increase congestion, lead to loss of open countryside, has a lack of pavements and transport infrastructure, limited utilities infrastructure, drainage and flooding issues on higher ground as well as poor car parking for local shops. New development would require new retail and medical provision.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Farrington) – Object to the proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to lack of local residents working in Hixon, the scale of past housing development compared to other areas which would benefit from affordable housing and employment. Concern about the lack of information and out of date maps provided through the public exhibitions as well as the position taken by elected Councillors.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Mitchell) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to the scale of recent residential development, increased traffic congestion and commuting as most residents are not employed in the village. Concern about the loss of rural character and identity, impact on wildlife and habitats, loss of greenfields, problems of children's safety with limited pavements and no traffic calming provision, impacts of existing air and noise pollution next to the local school and homes. Object to the inadequacies of the public exhibition with lack of detail as well as other settlements not being provided with development. Object to the

suggested new gypsy and traveller site due to lack of local services and facilities as well as devaluation of property values.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Overton) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon with concern about the lack of accurate information through the public exhibition and, due to lack of legitimacy the consultation process should be repeated.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Overton) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon with concern about the lack of accurate information through the public exhibition and, due to lack of legitimacy the consultation process should be repeated.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (C & P E Hutchinson) – Object to the proposed new development at Hixon due to the scale of housing and employment schemes, lack of accountability, the greed of landowners and regional target. Concern that local residents are ignored, lack of control regarding existing employment development and destruction of the community from proposed new developments.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A Tebay) – Concern about the lack of infrastructure funding for Hixon and object to the proposed housing, employment and gypsy site developments with lack of accurate public consultation using out of date maps as well as limited development to other areas. Hixon has limited services and facilities, inadequate parking, narrow local roads and few pavements. Concern about traffic congestion and commuting, lack of local employment for residents, increased pollution from employment areas, loss of grass verges due to unsuitable routes used by Heavy Good Vehicles, devaluation of property due to the gypsy site as well as the lack of need for further employment due to empty units at Stafford and Rugeley.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Owens) – Object to the proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon with significant development in recent years and totally inadequate infrastructure provision despite other village receiving investment to address traffic problems. There are problems of traffic congestion within and accessing the village, narrow local roads and limited pavements together with no traffic calming measures and construction traffic pressures. There is a lack of services and facilities, in particular medical provision whilst Hixon has received

significant new development and population increases and few local people work nearby.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Owens) – Object to the proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon with significant development in recent years and totally inadequate infrastructure provision despite other village receiving investment to address traffic problems. There are problems of traffic congestion within and accessing the village, narrow local roads and limited pavements together with no traffic calming measures and construction traffic pressures. There is a lack of services and facilities, in particular medical provision whilst Hixon has received significant new development and population increases and few local people work nearby.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Grimes) – Concern about the current scale of development in Hixon and over capacity of existing services and facilities whilst other villages, such as Stowe by Chartley, receive no development and therefore face loss of local shops and limited facilities. Object to new development in Hixon until more accurate information is provided for the decision making process.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (W Penberthy) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to lack of local residents employed in the village, increased traffic congestion from commuting, significant brownfield land in Stoke on Trent not being used, limited community infrastructure including schools and medical provision and increased traffic movements through the village close to the local school. Hixon has experienced significant development recently and particularly object to Location HI-5 due to access problems.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location HI-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (Mr & Mrs Myatt) – Object to proposed new developments at Hixon due to lack of local infrastructure, services and facilities, increased traffic on narrow local roads, loss of village character and access problems using the highway network into and out of Hixon with increased congestion. New development would require major infrastructure investment for the roads, medical and education provision as well as community facilities. Hixon has already taken significant development so other settlements should be targeted.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (K Hopcroft) – Object to proposed new developments in Hixon due to the steady increase in housing previously, lack of public services and infrastructure, loss of open countryside, no footpath provision, lack of development directed to other settlements requiring affordable housing, lack of amenities including shops for local people, limited bus services and no doctors surgery. The local school suffers noise and pollution from nearby employment areas, there are inadequate drainage systems whilst the narrow local road network has significant congestion, limited traffic calming and no enforcement of weight restrictions for Heavy Good Vehicles. Concerned about the public exhibition with lack of accurate maps and information.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Hodgkins) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to lack of infrastructure, services and facilities, narrow local roads, no footpaths in the village, lack of local employment at existing industrial estates, increased commuting and surplus employment provision. Other settlements should be targeted for growth and concerned about the misleading maps at the public exhibition.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (E Marcraft) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to loss of village character, lack of services and facilities, increased traffic congestion and property devaluation. Concern that development is not being supported by new infrastructure, services and facilities, road provision medical services as well as other settlements not being targeted for new development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A Pavlovic) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to significant existing housing and employment provision, deficiency of amenities including medical and education facilities whilst other settlements are not being targeted. The consultation process should be cancelled due to inadequate and misleading maps whilst local Councillors should listen to the local people.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (J Ashford) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to significant existing housing and employment provision, deficiency of amenities including medical and education facilities whilst other settlements are not being targeted. The consultation process should be cancelled due to inadequate and misleading maps whilst local Councillors should listen to the local people.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Hopcroft) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to large housing estates already constructed, lack of public amenities, lack of public transport and medical provision. New employment development does not require new housing as existing employees live outside of Hixon. Other settlements should be targeted.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (L Fielding) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon and agree with the consultation process being suspended due to lack of accurate information and outdated maps. Hixon has limited infrastructure and facilities for new housing development, which should be distributed to other villages. Object to proposed new employment development due to increased noise, pollution and lack of employees living locally. The new plan should be suspended.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Fielding) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon and agree with the consultation process being suspended due to lack of accurate information and outdated maps. Hixon has limited infrastructure and facilities for new housing development, which should be distributed to other villages. Object to proposed new employment development due to increased noise, pollution and lack of employees living locally. The new plan should be suspended.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Fielding) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon and agree with the consultation process being suspended due to lack of accurate information and outdated maps. Hixon has limited infrastructure and facilities for new housing development, which should be distributed to other villages. Object to proposed new employment development due to increased noise, pollution and lack of employees living locally. The new plan should be suspended.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Wilebur) – Concerned about the adverse effect of proposed development at Hixon with disproportionate expansion in recent years compared to other communities undermining the identity and character of the village, increased traffic volumes and congestion affecting children's safety, increased employment land and associated pollution affecting the local school as well as children's health and safety, limited number of local residents working in Hixon and the housing sites with poor access on narrow local roads for the volumes of extra traffic and lack of infrastructure. Hixon should not be changed into a small town to preserve other villages nearby with development to be shared. Concern about the consultation process with inaccurate maps and poor detail.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Powell) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to the scale of recent development and growth targeted to the village rather than elsewhere such as Gayton and Stowe by Chartley. Object to being swamped by further industrial development with increased traffic on narrow local roads, no pavement and overstretched local services whilst access to the A51 is poor. Vacant properties should be considered for affordable housing instead.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Willardwillard for Mr & Mrs Price) – Support proposed housing development at Location HI-3 for client's owned land to deliver high quality residential provision due to good transport links, key facilities and local employment, not within the Green belt and partly brownfield land, lack of provision within Hixon's residential development boundary, next to existing residential areas, site not prone to flooding, has good road access as well as utility provision whilst having no geological, architectural or ecological features, will not effect landscape quality, contribute to a sustainable community, has no environmental constraints, has no legal constraints to development, potential developer interest, would incorporate the public footpath and include renewable energy technologies.

**ACTION:** Note support for Location HI-3 as land owned by client to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (L Williams) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to loss of countryside, empty industrial and housing properties not being utilised elsewhere and lack of infrastructure, services and facilities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Hixon resident) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to past development undermining the area, loss of open countryside as well as causing flooding and drainage problems with the village having poor infrastructure, narrow country lanes, lack of pavements, increased traffic volumes and noise pollution, impact on property values and lack of need for more employment. Financial gains should not override local residents quality of life. Concerned about the public exhibition supporting Government's growth ambitions to gain funding.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (MDB for Mr Brown) – Support proposed new housing and employment development at Location HI-5 and HI-a on client's owned land in Hixon with landowner promoting development. The new employment location is next to existing



industrial areas, has good highway access, is flat and well drained with no flooding, has all main services and a well defined area. The new housing location is currently agricultural land with recent new development adjoining, has highway and pedestrian access to the village, close to the local school, has structured landscaping and could contribute to a new village centre whilst having all the main services.

**ACTION:** Note support for Location HI-5 & HI-a as land owned by client to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (C Finlayson) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to its scale and expansion including recent developments with no community benefits, lack of services and facilities, loss of character and identity, limited employment for local residents from existing industrial areas, increased traffic congestion, lack of traffic calming and pavements. Concern about the public exhibition and vague maps.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (C J Willard) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to targeting of further development despite recent population increases, lack of improvements for local amenities and services, limited number of local residents employed at Hixon's industrial areas as well as narrow local roads. Eccleshall has more retail provision. Concern about the public exhibition and inaccurate documents.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Finlayson) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to its scale and expansion including recent developments with no community benefits, lack of services and facilities, loss of character and identity, limited employment for local residents from existing industrial areas, increased traffic congestion, lack of traffic calming and pavements. Concern about the public exhibition and vague maps.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Atkin) – Concerned about the public exhibition with out of date maps and inaccurate information meaning the consultation should be suspended. Object to proposed new development due to repeat targeting of Hixon rather than to other settlements, increased population with no new services and facilities, lack of pavements for local school children and no medical provision. Concern about increased employment development with noise and industrial pollution, increased traffic congestion and volumes on the A51 but no infrastructure improvements.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Atkin) – Concerned about the public exhibition with out of date maps and inaccurate information meaning the consultation should be suspended. Object to proposed new development due to repeat targeting of Hixon rather than to other settlements, increased population with no new services and facilities, lack of pavements for local school children and no medical provision. Concern about increased employment development with noise and industrial pollution, increased traffic congestion and volumes on the A51 but no infrastructure improvements.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Hixon resident) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to targeting of further development despite recent population increases, lack of improvements for local amenities and services, limited number of local residents employed at Hixon’s industrial areas as well as narrow local roads. Eccleshall has more retail provision. Concern about the public exhibition and inaccurate documents.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Stafford Trades Union Council) – Hixon’s limited social amenities could be increased with new development alongside existing employment and education facilities. New services and facilities should be provided with proposed new housing for a better village community.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Fletcher) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to past development undermining the area, loss of open countryside as well as causing flooding and drainage problems with the village having poor infrastructure, narrow country lanes, lack of pavements, increased traffic volumes and noise pollution, impact on property values and lack of need for more employment. Hixon should not take further development whilst other villages receive none. Concerned about the public exhibition supporting Government’s growth ambitions & funding.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Jones) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to its scale, repeat targeting of Hixon for further growth rather than providing social housing to other villages nearby, limited number of local residents employed at the industrial areas and the fact that new housing does not need to accompany new employment.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A Jones) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development as Hixon is a village not a town with limited infrastructure, services and facilities, existing empty industrial units, limited employment for local people so lack of need for more housing, increased traffic congestion making it unsafe for pedestrians.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Kelly) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to health, safety and the environment, increased industrial traffic, lack of pavements, increased litter, limited number of local residents working in Hixon, increased commuting, noise and air pollution from existing industry, existing empty industrial units, impact from industry on the local school, lack of local infrastructure, poor utilities services, problems of flooding, narrow local roads and no pavements with pedestrian safety issues, capacity of school and medical provision, poor housing market, loss of open countryside, community, wildlife and habitats. Concern about the public exhibition exercise with inaccurate maps and information. Suggest proposed housing and employment to be located close to the motorway network at Stafford and Stone road with good access.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Kelly) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to health, safety and the environment, increased industrial traffic, lack of pavements, increased litter, limited number of local residents working in Hixon, increased commuting, noise and air pollution from existing industry, existing empty industrial units, impact from industry on the local school, lack of local infrastructure, poor utilities services, problems of flooding, narrow local roads and no pavements with pedestrian safety issues, capacity of school and medical provision, poor housing market, loss of open countryside, community, wildlife and habitats. Concern about the public exhibition exercise with inaccurate maps and information.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A W Hassell) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to existing increased population and new development creating a town larger than Eccleshall whilst other villages are not targeted. Over 95% of workers commute to Hixon with new development impacting on traffic access to the village.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Reid) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to traffic implications resulting for workers commuting to the industrial areas whilst there are limited numbers of residents working in Hixon, safety concerns and reduced quality of life from noise and air pollution as well as loss

of community identity and character with few local amenities and loss of rural environment.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Hitchin) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to current empty properties unused and increased traffic on inadequate local roads & congestion.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (M D & P J Kincaid) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon changing the village to a town without the infrastructure, vague maps at the public exhibition, need for a new village centre, significant increase in current population and development, significant industrial growth yet limited local employment, major transport improvements for the A51, increased commuting and congestion on narrow local roads, loss of open countryside, the local school at capacity with new services and facilities required.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Hixon resident) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon due to repeat targeting for growth of housing and employment. Road networks should be upgraded before new development due to commuting and pollution pressures whilst few local residents working in Hixon, the lack of amenities and impact on the countryside / village environment. Concern about the public exhibition and lack of detail.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Jones) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to further growth, limited number of local residents working in Hixon with increased commuting and traffic, lack of traffic calming measures and pavements whilst new housing will be unaffordable for local people.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Smith) – Concern about the significant population increase in Hixon and existing industry, lack of pavements and increased traffic causing safety problems, particularly on Stowe Lane.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (J Willend) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to repeat targeting of the village with increased population becoming larger than Eccleshall whilst other villages have no development. Proposals fail to deliver new amenities and services such as medical provision, increase traffic dangers whilst limited numbers of local people work in Hixon. Object to housing development at Locations HI-2 to HI-5 and concern about the lack of accuracy at the public exhibition.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Lowe) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development, particularly at Locations HI-2 and HI-3 Puddle Hill due to poor access and increased traffic. Hixon should be retargeted for further development and population growth. Concern about the public exhibition and poor quality maps for decision making.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (W & G Collyer) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to lack of services and facilities including small local school, no health surgery, narrow local roads and lack of pavements, loss of open countryside and village character. There has been significant development in Hixon over recent years whilst other villages have not been targeted such as Stowe and Gayton

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (D & D Biggar) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to capacity of infrastructure, services and facilities, loss of the village character and community if changed to a town as well as loss of countryside and quality of life. Suggest use of brownfield land or creation of new villages rather than further expansion.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (E Pavey) – Strongly object to the proposed new housing and employment development for Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to development locations for Hixon.

1 response (K E Pavey) – Strongly object to the proposed new housing and employment development for Hixon due to roads and pavements.

**ACTION:** Note objections to development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Jones) – Other villages should receive further development rather than retargeting Hixon, which has limited infrastructure and increased traffic as few local residents work in Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A Randles) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to past development undermining the area, loss of open countryside as well as causing flooding and drainage problems with the village having poor infrastructure, narrow country lanes, lack of pavements, increased traffic volumes and noise pollution, impact on property values and lack of need for more employment. Financial gains should not override local residents quality of life. Concerned about the public exhibition supporting Government's growth ambitions to gain funding.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Randles) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to past development undermining the area, loss of open countryside as well as causing flooding and drainage problems with the village having poor infrastructure, narrow country lanes, lack of pavements, increased traffic volumes and noise pollution, impact on property values and lack of need for more employment. Financial gains should not override local residents quality of life. Concerned about the public exhibition supporting Government's growth ambitions to gain funding.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (Mrs Jarvis) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to past development undermining the area, loss of open countryside as well as causing flooding and drainage problems with the village having poor infrastructure, narrow country lanes, lack of pavements, increased traffic volumes and noise pollution, impact on property values and lack of need for more employment. Concerned about the public exhibition supporting Government's growth ambitions to gain funding.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (P Dillard) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to repeat targeting of the village with increased population becoming larger than Eccleshall whilst other villages have no development. Proposals fail to deliver new amenities and services such as medical provision, increase traffic dangers whilst limited numbers of local people work in Hixon. Object to housing development at Locations HI-2 to HI-5 and concern about the lack of accuracy at the public exhibition.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (S Jones) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to retargeting for increased growth of housing and population whilst other village receive no development, lack of local residents working in Hixon, highway safety problems on narrow local roads with lack of pavements and limited local amenities. Concern about the public exhibition with vague maps, no site boundaries, roads missing and locations in the wrong place.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (H Tortoishell) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to narrow local roads and lack of pavements with increased traffic volumes, the local school at capacity with pollution problems for neighbouring industry, storm water drainage and flooding problems requiring sustainable drainage systems with new development requiring major infrastructure, service and facility provision including a new school and medical information. Significant concerns about the public exhibition material with lack of information, inaccuracies and no feasibility surveys for new infrastructure provision whilst query the capacity of contractors to adequately provide new services.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (E Allan) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to past development undermining the area, loss of open countryside as well as causing flooding and drainage problems with the village having poor infrastructure, narrow country lanes, lack of pavements, increased traffic volumes and noise pollution, impact on property values and lack of need for more employment. Financial gains should not override local residents quality of life. Concerned about the public exhibition supporting Government's growth ambitions to gain funding.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Phillips) – Hixon is incapable of support new housing, employment and traveller sites without losing its identity whilst construction traffic will cause major problems and ignore the need for new roads, lack of pavements and a medical centre. Prospective property purchasers will be put off by the scale of development leading to housing devaluations. Local councillors support the local people.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (J R Phillips) – Object to the lack of public consultation and the encouragement given to landowners to bring forward land for new development, concern about the public exhibition with inaccurate and misleading maps and lack of

information with anomalies, restricting the timing of public consultation for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and lack of public accountability through the complaints procedure. Object to the waste of public money on the consultation exercise, property devaluation, the Council volunteering for growth and funding received, empty properties not be used and loss of open countryside with village character. The process should be suspended.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (C Williams) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to repeat targeting of the village with increased population becoming larger than Eccleshall whilst other villages have no development. Proposals fail to deliver new amenities and services such as medical provision, increase traffic dangers whilst limited numbers of local people work in Hixon. Object to housing development at Locations HI-2 to HI-5 and concern about the lack of accuracy at the public exhibition.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Galley) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon due to retargeting for further growth whilst not providing additional amenities including medical and school provision. The current planning process should be suspended & listen to local people.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Galley) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon due to retargeting for further growth whilst not providing additional amenities including medical and school provision. The current planning process should be suspended & listen to local people.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (H Jones) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to impact on the village, increased traffic, local school and medical services at full capacity as well as the loss of village character and identity due to industry.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Barlow) – Support the proposed new housing development at Location HI-2 and HI-3 by the landowner and surrounding properties with highway access to the land, footpath improvements to the village centre, all main utilities are available with no sewage or water supply problems, use of brownfield flat land, not in the floodplain and provision of new services and facilities.



**ACTION:** Note support for Locations HI-2 and HI-3 by the landowner to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Hall) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to retargeting for increased growth of housing and population whilst other village receive no development, lack of local residents working in Hixon, highway safety problems on narrow local roads with lack of pavements and limited local amenities. Concern about the public exhibition with vague maps, no site boundaries, roads missing and locations in the wrong place.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Collett) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to loss of rural aspect and character, narrow local roads and lack of pavements, current services and facilities including the local school at capacity with existing industrial units causing noise and pollution, lack of development being directed to other villages across Stafford Borough to lessen the impact on the community. Hixon should not be changed from a quiet village into a town which is currently sustainable yet should not be retargeted with further growth.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (W Middleton) – Object to proposed new housing development at Hixon due to past over development and loss of rural character. Object to proposed new employment development due to current pollution problems, loss of wildlife habitats and narrow roads.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (V M Evans) – Concern about the public exhibition and out of date maps with inaccurate information and lack of site boundaries. Object to proposed scale of new development in Hixon due to significant growth in recent years and lack of amenities, limited pavements and narrow local roads, existing industrial units empty and limited number of local residents working in Hixon so increased commuting. New services and facilities including school, medical provision, shops and traffic calming is required prior to construction.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Wheat) – Object to proposed scale of new housing and employment development in Hixon due to recent developments increasing the village population with pressure on medical provision and lack of amenities, lack of need for new development, local people not employed in Hixon and impact on the narrow local road network with increased traffic. Hixon should not be retargeted for increased development whilst other village receive none. Concern about public consultation, inaccurate maps and lack of detailed information.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Wheat) – Object to proposed scale of new housing and employment development in Hixon due to recent developments increasing the village population with pressure on medical provision and lack of amenities, lack of need for new development, local people not employed in Hixon and impact on the narrow local road network with increased traffic. Hixon should not be retargeted for increased development whilst other villages receive none. Concern about public consultation, inaccurate maps and lack of detailed information.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Reid) – Object to the current size of the village and its population whilst no increase in amenities and shops, lack of improved local road infrastructure and problems accessing the A51. Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to impact on the village character, ignoring development directed to other settlements, impact of industry on the local school, lack of notice for local residents concerns, flooding problems and drainage issues off Church Lane as well as a lack of open space and a village centre.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Miss Harmer) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon which is being retargeted for further growth and population rather than to other villages, loss of village identity, limited local residents working in Hixon, problems of traffic volumes and highway safety on narrow local roads with limited pavements particularly Location HI-2 and HI-3 at Puddle Hill, lack of medical facilities and impact of construction on the village community. Concern about the public consultation with out of date maps, no boundaries and inaccurate information with an industrial site in the wrong place and no reference to the types of housing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Miss Kelly) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to impact on the village character and environment, the urban scale of housing development being out of keeping, increased noise and disruption, narrow local roads effected by increased traffic congestion, lack of traffic calming, pavements and access points on the A51, the need for new infrastructure, services and facilities including schools, drainage and medical provision whilst housing development should be spread across other settlements instead. Object to proposed new employment development due to increased traffic and the limited number of local people working in Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (D Jones) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to the recent scale of developments and population increase, loss of village character and increased traffic congestion. There is sufficient employment in Hixon and object to further growth due to lack of services and facilities with a lack of footpaths. Concern about the waste of money spent on the public consultation exercise and lack of information. Local residents should be listened to.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Z Elkin) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to recent schemes being allowed with no account taken of local residents, the Council accepting Government funding and directing growth to Hixon, the significant increase in the population without any contribution to amenities with a need for new community building, medical centre, footpaths and traffic calming measures, loss of village character and identity. New development would create a town with no infrastructure and devaluation of house prices due to the industrial development, the narrow local road system is insufficient and commuting will increase as limited numbers of local residents work in Hixon and increased heavy goods vehicles on unsuitable lanes. Object to the proposed gypsy site in Hixon due to litter and increased crime. Local councillors should listen to the local community and reject the planned developments.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Brooke) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to the impact on village character becoming a town, increased young people causing elderly distress, narrow local roads and increased congestion including from large vehicles and retargeting of Hixon for further development rather than other villages. Object to proposed new employment development due to limited number of local people working in Hixon, increased commuting causing congestion, lack of pavements and overall impact on the quiet village environment. Concern about the public consultation exercise and lack of detail meaning the planning process should be suspended.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Connell) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon due to recent rapid growth without local services whilst other settlements have had limited development as well as concerned about the public exhibition with inaccurate maps and Growth Point funding. Object to proposed new employment development due to increased traffic and emissions, existing vacant floorspace with additional industry undermining the village character. Support development growth next to the M6 and M54 but not to Stafford Borough's rural hinterlands.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A E & U E M Marston) – Object to proposed new employment development at Location HA-a due to loss of arable land and public footpaths, proximity to residential properties and new housing locations, traffic congestion on narrow local roads, pedestrian safety concerns and access problems onto nearby A roads.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location HA-a to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (County Cllr Bloomer) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to lack of infrastructure, health care facilities, shopping provision, public transport and youth facilities. The development is totally unacceptable due to current problems in the village with heavy good vehicles negotiating narrow local roads, shortage of pavements and public footpaths and lack of investment. Local people need to be respected with the planning process to reflect such considerations along with strategic objectives.

**ACTION:** Note comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Cropper) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development undermining the quality of life and local character, no provision for allotments, footpaths or social housing. Object to insensitive planning in the Hixon area.

**ACTION:** Note comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A Read) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to lack of education and medical facilities, poor roads and loss of open countryside with housing development to be directed to the disused airfield whilst no new employment development is required as only 2% of local people work in Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (G Turner) – Object to proposed new development changing Hixon from a small, friendly village into a town, lack of need for new employment development, poor local road network, recent developments and lack of growth to other areas and concern about the public exhibition material being inaccurate.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Salt) – A number of specific comments to paragraphs throughout the Issues & Options document raising the following points set out below. Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to substantial growth in recent years, population increases and other villages having limited development should be targeted. Object to the figure of 10,000 new homes for Stafford Borough due to the impact on rural life, pollution, increased traffic, lack of facilities and limited investment particularly for health provision in the current

economic climate. Object to new housing development at Church Lane as this will not increase local employment but undermine the environment, the local school, green areas, increase traffic, congestion and pollution on the narrow local roads and deter wildlife with loss of open countryside. There is a lack of parking, services and facilities including roads, health and education provision, flooding problems as well as limited infrastructure funding. People living in rural areas wish to retain its character rather than increase traffic and townscape such as Stafford whilst only 6% of local residents work in Hixon. Suggest development at Locations HI-1 & HI-6 if necessary but object to Location HI-5. Support natural gas use, meeting the needs of the ageing population, re-using employment sites for employment, developing new parks and open space, protecting natural areas, adhere to telecommunication guidelines but affordable housing in rural areas below 40%. Acknowledge need for gypsy site but not in Hixon due to existing pressures on services and facilities. Employment development should occur at other Recognised Industrial Estates, such as Raleigh Hall but not at Hixon. Query infrastructure provision through the Community Infrastructure Levy.

**ACTION:** Note comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (N K Buel) – The following order of preference for employment development at Hixon: HI-a, HI-b, HA-c, HA-b and HA-a.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (C Bendall) – Object to proposed new housing development at Hixon which should be limited due to implications on the village with limited infrastructure and facilities including narrow local roads, increased traffic, lack of pavements, few shops and no GP surgery, limited bus services and loss of rural village character with less than 10% of local people working in Hixon yet an expanding industrial estate. Object to proposed new employment development due to increased heavy good vehicles on unsuitable local roads, increased pollution and noise / vibrations as well as loss of open countryside, rural character and wildlife with landscape screening measure ineffective to date.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Miss Simmonds) – Object to proposed new housing, gypsy and employment developments in Hixon due to lack of infrastructure, the local school at capacity with access pressures from Location HI-5 and existing industry causing problems, lack of GP surgery at capacity, increased traffic volumes and congestion with no traffic calming measures and pavements as well as access problems. Location HI-5 has been refused planning permission due to access issues, traffic congestion, impact on landscape and outside the existing boundary. Object to Hixon being targeted for further development compared to other villages, levels of affordable housing and property devaluations. Concern about the public exhibition

with out of date maps and inaccurate information so the consultation process should be repeated.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr D Elkin) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to recent scale of development and increased population levels becoming larger than Eccleshall, retargeted for growth whilst little development to other villages, limited numbers of local people working in Hixon so no justification for further housing, impact on the rural environment and landscape implications. Concern about the public exhibition and material due to out of date maps, inaccuracies, lack of information including road surveys, highway safety, number of pavements and amenities. The Local Development Framework process should be suspended.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Dr Ireson) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon with the public exhibition being full of inaccuracies and limited information whilst the village currently experiences increased traffic and industrial pollution yet no traffic calming measures. Object to proposed housing development due to the scale of growth above existing residential levels undermining the rural character and quality of life, lack of infrastructure including education and medical provision. Object to proposed employment development due to lack of detail concerning industrial types, limited numbers of local people working in Hixon, vacant units and loss of Greenfield land when brownfield sites exist. Object to gypsy and traveller site although no information was made available about details.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Hixon Parish Council) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to recent population growth in excess of other villages some of which have experienced a reduction, the scale of recent developments and retargeting for further growth is inappropriate without any clear justification as new employment development fails to equate to a greater number of local jobs with only 6% of residents working locally. There has been very few new amenities, services and facilities provided to Hixon except for the games areas and a new road bridge whilst other key settlements have significant provision and less development. Object to proposed new housing development due to lack of local employment serving Hixon residents, lack of footpaths, impact on the village and landscape character particularly by Locations HI-2, HI-3 & HI-4 with access problems for Location HI-1. Object to proposed new employment development due to impact on village gateways, over development of industry, lack of new job opportunities for Hixon residents, increase in commuting and emissions rather than employment spread across the Borough with concern about existing employment areas used for housing. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material due to out of date and vague information, incorrect maps and locations, lack of detail concerning

type, density and site locations, lack of survey, new amenities and highway evidence so suspend the process.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (S Chell) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to existing residential and population growth so why retarget the area, lack of amenities, highway safety, narrow local roads and few pavements, implications from a lack of health, policing and education provision whilst limited numbers of local residents work in Hixon. Concern about the public exhibition with inaccurate maps and lack of information with the consultation process to be suspended.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A J Cartwright) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to impact on the rural community turning a village into a town, recent significant growth, loss of open countryside, inadequate local road network, few local residents employed in Hixon so query industrial growth, empty units unused and increased traffic problems. Concern about the public exhibition due to inaccuracies with the consultation to be suspended.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Mellors) – Object to proposed new development for Hixon due to child safety concerns, property devaluation and loss of landscape character with limited infrastructure, services and facilities such as one local school and church, no GP surgery, park or pavements on narrow local roads and the scale of development changing Hixon into a town. Based on the options document and the actual Government requirements for 3,000 new homes outside Stafford it is logical to leave Hixon alone.

**ACTION:** Note comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (K Hilton) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to past scale of recent developments outgrowing the local infrastructure, increased employment leading to more traffic, pollution and environmental impacts, property devaluation and loss of local community spirit, narrow local roads without sufficient capacity, increased heavy good vehicle traffic and safety concerns, scale of employment development is disproportionate with limited numbers of local people working in Hixon and other areas should receive some industry. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material with inaccurate maps and misleading information. Question the democratic approach.

**ACTION:** Note comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (J M Hilton) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to past scale of recent developments outgrowing the local infrastructure, increased employment leading to more traffic, pollution and environmental impacts, property devaluation and loss of local community spirit, narrow local roads without sufficient capacity, increased heavy good vehicle traffic and safety concerns, scale of employment development is disproportionate with limited numbers of local people working in Hixon and other areas should receive some industry. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material with inaccurate maps and misleading information. Question the democratic approach.

**ACTION:** Note comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (C A Hilton) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to past scale of recent developments outgrowing the local infrastructure, increased employment leading to more traffic, pollution and environmental impacts, property devaluation and loss of local community spirit, narrow local roads without sufficient capacity, increased heavy good vehicle traffic and safety concerns, scale of employment development is disproportionate with limited numbers of local people working in Hixon and other areas should receive some industry. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material with inaccurate maps and misleading information. Question the democratic approach.

**ACTION:** Note comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Cunnion) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to recent expansion of growth and population with lack of new services and facilities leading to the change for a village to a town larger than Eccleshall and limited infrastructures support. Few local residents actually work in Hixon leading to increased commuting and heavy good vehicles on narrow and inadequate local roads. Object to proposed new housing development due to increased young people putting pressure on limited village services and amenities whilst new development to be spread across other settlements to reduce the impact.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Ashton) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to loss of village identity with few local services and facilities as well as significant growth in recent years and limited numbers of local people working in Hixon, loss of countryside which is unnecessary with existing empty properties, loss of a high quality local school, increased traffic with highway access, safety concerns and a lack of pavements, lack of police force with increased anti social behaviour, no GP surgery and pharmacy. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material with inaccurate information, locations in the wrong place and out of date maps. There will be increased noise and traffic at Puddle Hill.



**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (S R Abercrombie) – Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material making objections to the plans difficult due to the lack of information whilst Hixon has very limited infrastructure, services and facilities to provide for the new developments as this has not been provided to date by current schemes.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Woodward) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to current level of empty properties and industrial units, large areas of brownfield land, Hixon being retargeted for new growth whilst other village receive no new development, lack of facilities and destruction of the landscape and village character, no democratic accountability to the local population and misleading information as well as the impact of the new gypsy site.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Barton) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to existing empty properties not being utilised, loss of open countryside and lack of new infrastructure, services and facilities including roads, local school and medical services with the current provision in the village at capacity.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (P Barton) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to scale of existing developments, increased heavy good vehicles accessing the industrial areas, safety implications for school children with increased traffic volumes and lack of policing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (J & J Youde) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to the existing sewerage problems, heavy good vehicles using narrow local roads and speeding traffic with no traffic calming. The consultation process should be suspended due to out of date maps and inaccurate information.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Wilson) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon with the public exhibition and consultation information being inaccurate, out of dated maps and misleading whilst Hixon is retargeted for growth rather than other settlements despite road access, lack of education and medical facilities as well as flooding problems. A new village is suggested on the disused

airfield area. Object to proposed employment development due to existing industrial capacity and limited numbers of local people working in Hixon. The consultation process should be suspended.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Wilebur) – Concerned about the adverse effect of proposed development at Hixon with disproportionate expansion in recent years compared to other communities undermining the identity and character of the village, increased traffic volumes and congestion affecting children's safety, increased employment land and associated pollution affecting the local school as well as children's health and safety, limited number of local residents working in Hixon and the housing sites with poor access on narrow local roads for the volumes of extra traffic and lack of infrastructure. Hixon should not be changed into a small town to preserve other villages nearby with development to be shared. Concern about the consultation process with inaccurate maps and poor detail.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A M Wilebur) – Concerned about the adverse effect of proposed development at Hixon with disproportionate expansion in recent years compared to other communities undermining the identity and character of the village, property devaluations, lack of facilities including no pavements and play areas, increased traffic volumes and congestion affecting children's safety, increased employment land and associated pollution affecting the local school as well as children's health and safety, limited number of local residents working in Hixon and the housing sites with poor access on narrow local roads for the volumes of extra traffic and lack of infrastructure. Example the new village centre concept. Hixon should not be changed into a small town to preserve other villages nearby with development to be shared equally. Concern about the consultation process with inaccurate maps and poor detail.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Cadman) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to existing empty properties, the economic recession undermining housing delivery whilst the Council provided an unreasonable public consultation exercise with out dated maps and inaccurate information, the scale and distribution of development should not be unfairly targeted to Hixon which has experienced significant growth in recent years and limited new infrastructure, services and facilities including no GP surgery and lack of highway access on narrow local roads. Object to Location HI-1 due to the scale and density of proposed new housing and devaluation of existing properties. Object to proposed new employment development due to limited local people working in Hixon, increased traffic and environmental pollution affecting village life.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Chapman) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon together with the new gypsy site, in particular Locations HI-4, HI-5 and HI-a due to loss of green fields, existing empty properties, lack of local need, inappropriate distribution of development and impact on the school playing field. Object to Hixon being retargeted for significant new growth despite recent development providing no new infrastructure, services and facilities including road safety issues, lack of public transport and shopping provision and loss of village character. New development should include increased public transport, new traffic calming, new education and health provision, increased shopping areas and open space. Concern about the public exhibition and the consultation material due to out of date maps, lack of boundaries and inaccurate information. Object to Location HI-4 and HI-5 being identified after numerous planning applications being refused due to road safety, lack of pavements and narrow local roads. Object to the Growth Point funding which is insufficient to provide real infrastructure whilst there is poor local hospital provision. The local community will not benefit from new development but suffer increased crime, including for the gypsy site, property devaluation, limited services and facilities, inappropriate scale and loss of open countryside. The disused airfield should be used for new housing and industrial units as a new village separate from Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Miss Simmonds) – Object to proposed new housing, gypsy and employment developments in Hixon due to lack of infrastructure, the local school at capacity with access pressures from Location HI-5 and existing industry causing problems, lack of GP surgery at capacity, increased traffic volumes and congestion with no traffic calming measures and pavements as well as access problems. Location HI-5 has been refused planning permission due to access issues, traffic congestion, impact on landscape and outside the existing boundary. Object to Hixon being targeted for further development compared to other villages, levels of affordable housing and property devaluations. Concern about the public exhibition with out of date maps and inaccurate information so the consultation process should be repeated.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Baxter) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to recent scale of residential schemes and a lack of provision for new infrastructure, no traffic calming and environmental impacts, limited number of residents work in Hixon, there are highway safety concerns on narrow local roads and few pavements, limited education and medical provision, loss of wildlife and habitats as well as particular issues at Location HI-6 from flooding and loss of green space. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material being inaccurate and out of date.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Kemp) – Specific comments relating to Location HI-1 with a limited level of housing development to take account of landscape character and provision of open space through the delivery of 45 – 60 new houses, access from Legge Lane and potential provision for a new health facility. The landowner is stated as supporting this approach.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered and further investigated through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Stainforth) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon with the public exhibition material being inaccurate and inadequate whilst leading to increased traffic and pollution and no traffic calming provision has been delivered. Object to new residential development due to retargeting Hixon for further growth and lack of infrastructure provision for new roads, education and medical services as well as undermining the quality of life. Object to new employment development with a lack of local people working in Hixon, loss of Greenfield land rather than brownfield sites when empty industrial units are unoccupied as well as impact on the village. Concern about the lack of information regarding a new gypsy site as well as the loss of open space in Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Gale) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon with real concerns about the public exhibition and consultation material due to inaccurate information, out of date maps, locations in the wrong place, poor quality booklet, lack of scaled information for housing and employment areas, no reference to the proposed gypsy site, new air ambulance facility or the waste recycling plant. Further detail provided by the full consultation document but object to the statements concerning Hixon due to narrow local roads, lack of infrastructure and unsuitable link made between new housing and employment.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Miss Phillips) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to retargeting for further growth rather than to other settlements, problems of traffic speeds and highway safety concerns on narrow local roads, lack of retail, education and medical provision at capacity, devaluation of property and loss of quality of life whilst proposed employment will increase traffic, pollution and noise. Concern about the public exhibition and inaccurate information provided.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Stephens) – Object to new housing and employment development in Hixon as well as the poor quality information, out of date maps and consultation material at the public exhibition. Object to Locations HI-2 and HI-3 due to surface water run off, narrow local roads with no pavements and access problems with any development closer to the A51 such as on the disused airfield. Object to Hixon being retargeted for further growth rather than being spread across a number of villages, significant increased in traffic, noise and pollution, limited number of people living and working in Hixon, inadequate local infrastructure and services including medical and health provision as well as highway safety.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Cadman) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to scale of recent housing and employment schemes, the link made between new housing and industry, inadequate local infrastructure with lack of provision from developments to date, highway safety and footpath problems, limited local residents working in Hixon, increased traffic, pollution and environmental impacts. The consultation process should be suspended due to inaccurate maps.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Deakin) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to retargeting of the area despite recent major schemes and lack of development to other villages, limited numbers of local people working in Hixon, lack of infrastructure and vacant industrial properties.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (C, N, O & H Bratt) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to loss of village character and identity, undermine the existing environment, infrastructure, services and facilities, the impact of increased population, industrial and traffic causing highway safety problems and pollution. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material being inaccurate and out of date with the planning process to be suspended. Other villages should receive further development rather than retargeting Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (C Bratt) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to loss of village character and identity, undermine the existing environment, infrastructure, services and facilities, the impact of increased population, industrial and traffic causing highway safety problems and pollution. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material being inaccurate and out of date with the planning process to be suspended. Other villages should receive further development rather than retargeting Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Sinkins) – Object to proposed scale of new housing development in Hixon with recent residential schemes and dispute the reason being existing employment areas due to the lack of residents employed locally, the narrow local road network and highway safety, lack of services and facilities including schools and medical provision. Oppose development at the Police skid pad and steady increase in development. It is unfair to target Hixon for more development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Elkin) – Object to any more development at Hixon for housing or employment due to existing development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Eden) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon with recent residential schemes failing to provide new infrastructure and simply delivered a small play area, the scale of new development proposed not be necessary due to existing empty homes and loss of open countryside, there is inadequate infrastructure and locating industry away from the motorway network increases pollution as well as traffic on narrow local roads. Object to loss of village character, Greenfield land and the gypsy site.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (L Walker) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to the scale of recent development, increased traffic on narrow local roads causing safety problems for children and lack of pavements with the local school at capacity. Object to Locations HI-1, HI-2, HI-3, HI-4 and HI-5 due to landscape impact, flooding concerns and inadequate road access whilst if any development is necessary Location HI-6 is suitable on flat land with no flooding or drainage issues and good footpath and road access. Object to the gypsy site due to lack of law enforcement and appropriate facilities for this community. Object to proposed employment development due to existing empty units, limited local people working in Hixon, increased traffic congestion and commuting whilst the best location would be off Pasturefields Lane away from residential property but concerned about increased pollution. There are limited infrastructure, services and facilities in Hixon such as no doctors and supermarkets leading to increased greenhouse gas emissions.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Adams) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to level of empty properties in other areas and loss of greenfields

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Higginson) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to scale of recent developments, limited local infrastructure, services and facilities including highway problems and loss of village character. Concern about lack of accurate information and ill-conceived plans.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Miss Baxter) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to recent scale of residential schemes and a lack of provision for new infrastructure, no traffic calming and environmental impacts, limited number of residents work in Hixon, there are highway safety concerns on narrow local roads and few pavements, limited education and medical provision, loss of wildlife and habitats as well as particular issues at Location HI-6 from flooding and loss of green space. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material being inaccurate and out of date.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Quarton) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to retargeting the village with further development, loss of village character and lack of medical services and other community amenities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Baxter) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to recent scale of residential schemes and a lack of provision for new infrastructure, no traffic calming and environmental impacts, limited number of residents work in Hixon, there are highway safety concerns on narrow local roads and few pavements, limited education and medical provision, loss of wildlife and habitats as well as particular issues at Location HI-6 from flooding and loss of green space. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material being inaccurate and out of date.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (K & P Appleton) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon due to loss of quality of life, lack of regard for new housing and employment development to other areas, problems of air and noise pollution, lack of enforcement for existing industries and inaccurate maps with information through the public consultation exercise. New development will lead to industrial domination, destroy the village character and identity, require new road buildings and increased traffic on narrow

local roads, lack of a village centre and new amenities as well as property devaluations.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (E Tebay) – Object to proposed new housing development due to recent schemes providing no new services and facilities but increasing traffic volumes on narrow local roads with no pavements, increased pollution and devaluation of property. Object to proposed new employment development due to inadequate access, increased traffic congestion and volumes of heavy good vehicles with limited number of local people working in Hixon as well as impact on the local school. Traffic volumes in the Haywoods and Stafford will also increase. Object to a new gypsy site due to past experience of problems. Object to development due to loss of village character with a better distribution to be achieved in other settlements and object to the Government funding secured through Growth Point and extra houses.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (P Sephton) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon due to lack of adequate road infrastructure and pavements, poor quality utilities and local highway repairs, problems for local school children’s safety, increased traffic volumes and speeds as well as loss of village character and identity.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Elkin) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to the scale of existing developments, lack of local amenities including doctor’s surgery, local shops, narrow local roads and no pavements with new development increasing the village to a town larger than Eccleshall without the infrastructure. The proposed employment development is excessive due to the traffic volumes created as well as existing pollution problems affecting the local school yet local councillors fail to represent the residents concerns. The local community should be listened too.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Phazey) – Object to any proposed new development in Hixon due to considerable housing and employment schemes built to date through a lack of local Government performance and limited community provision. The public exhibition is suspected as being used to prepare for less significant developments actually coming forward in due course but new development must not occur until community needs are supported rather than providing for landowners. There are significant empty industrial units in the area whilst affecting the environment through poor visual and landscape impacts.



**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Garner) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon due to the impact of past housing and employment schemes, loss of village character and identity, the scale of growth proposed, lack of supporting infrastructure, loss of working countryside and a safe community. Concern about the democratic authority to provide such development, the requirement to meet Government targets and the lack of brownfield development elsewhere. There is no need for a new village centre. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material due to inaccurate information and out of date maps.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Homer) – Object to proposed housing and employment development in Hixon due to the lack of infrastructure, services and facilities when compared to Eccleshall, no doctor's surgery, two shops and a post office. The public exhibition has inaccurate information so whilst accepting some development is needed the Council has the wrong approach.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Anon) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to the scale of previous schemes, the increased population and lack of infrastructure provision including roads and amenities. The traffic volumes including heavy good vehicles lead to highway safety problems on narrow local roads with no pavements, industry is over powering the village with increased air and noise pollution affecting open spaces and countryside whilst limited numbers of local people work in Hixon. Development should be directed to other settlements.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Ms Lawrence) – Hixon is an attractive area to live with some industrial employment but limited local employees, an inadequate road system for increased traffic and few local facilities especially for young people. Hixon has experienced significant growth in recent years so brownfield land in Stafford or development in other villages should now occur. Object to new development undermining the rural character of the area being pushed through by inaccurate and limited information.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (J & N Astle) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to the scale of recent developments and population with limited new infrastructure whilst other villages have not been subject to such pressures, increased traffic and loss of green space and open countryside.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (A Lewis) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to scale of existing developments and increase in population without sufficient infrastructure, services and facilities as well as the misleading public information and inaccurate maps through the exhibition exercise.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (Mr Aspden) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location HI-1 due to impact on wildlife, the public footpath and being outside of the Residential Development Boundary.

ACTION: Note objections to Location HI-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (W J Rollason) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location HI-1 due to impact on wildlife, the public footpath and being outside of the Residential Development Boundary.

ACTION: Note objections to Location HI-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Kirby) – Object to the public consultation exercise due to the lack of detail, misleading maps and inaccurate information with the consultation process to be suspended.

ACTION: Note objections.

1 response (Mr Salt) – A number of specific comments to paragraphs throughout the Issues & Options document raising the following points set out below. Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to substantial growth in recent years, population increases and other villages having limited development should be targeted. Object to the figure of 10,000 new homes for Stafford Borough due to the impact on rural life, pollution, increased traffic, lack of facilities and limited investment particularly for health provision in the current economic climate. Object to new housing development at Church Lane as this will not increase local employment but undermine the environment, the local school, green areas, increase traffic, congestion and pollution on the narrow local roads and deter wildlife with loss of open countryside. There is a lack of parking, services and facilities including roads, health and education provision, flooding problems as well as limited infrastructure funding. People living in rural areas wish to retain its character rather than increase traffic and townscape such as Stafford whilst only 6% of local residents work in Hixon. Suggest development at Locations HI-1 & HI-6 if necessary but object to Location HI-5. Support natural gas use, meeting the needs of the ageing population, re-using employment sites for employment, developing new parks and open space, protecting natural areas, adhere to telecommunication guidelines but affordable housing in rural areas below 40%. Acknowledge need for

gypsy site but not in Hixon due to existing pressures on services and facilities. Employment development should occur at other Recognised Industrial Estates, such as Raleigh Hall but not at Hixon. Query infrastructure provision through the Community Infrastructure Levy.

**ACTION:** Note comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (P Sephton) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon, particularly HI-2, HI-3, and HI-4 at Puddle Hill and Egg Lane due to lack of adequate road infrastructure and pavements, poor quality utilities and local highway repairs, problems for local school children’s safety, increased traffic volumes and speeds as well as loss of village character and identity.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (Mrs Cockbill) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to vague and inaccurate public consultation, retargeting of growth despite previous developments and population growth with lack of development to other settlements, highway issues with narrow local roads and no footpaths. Object to proposed new employment development due to increased traffic, noise and pollution, lack of local people working in Hixon, increased commuting to retail facilities, loss of community character and village identity, lack of amenities whilst new housing could be built on the disused airfield. Object to the gypsy site in the community. Object to Location HI-2 due to narrow local access roads, loss of open countryside, wildlife and habitats, increased traffic through the village centre, flooding problems and lack of pavements. Object to Locations HI-3 and HI-4 due to access on narrow local roads and resident disruption. If development is required Location HI-6 should be used due to improved access and least disruption.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations HI-2, HI-3 and HI-4 with support for Location HI-6 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A Evans) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to village character, increased traffic impacts on narrow local roads, no footpaths causing risks to pedestrians and limited number of local people working in Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Carmichael) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to the recent scale of developments with the local school at capacity, increased industrial development but very limited new infrastructure support. Suggest providing developments across a larger number of village to reduce the impact and investment requirements rather than focusing on Hixon which will require significant infrastructure including a new doctor’s surgery, school and local roads, improved public transport provision and traffic calming measures with increased volumes of traffic.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Kirby) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon with the village being retargeted for growth and increased population rather than directing development to other villages including the use of brownfield sites to avoid loss of Greenfield land. Limited numbers of local residents work in Hixon, there is a lack of infrastructure, services and facilities including highway safety, lack of a surgery, poor public transport, drainage, sewage and water pressure. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material with misleading information and out of date maps so the process should be suspended. Avoid villages becoming small towns.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr James) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to recent scale of growth and increase in population whilst other areas have no development, problems of sewerage, no pavements, narrow local roads, lack of education and medical provision whilst limited numbers of local people work in Hixon so object to proposed new employment growth. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material being inaccurate and misleading. The consultation process should be suspended.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (C Gaunt) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to loss of village character and identity, increased pollution, overcrowding and has a lack of facilities with new schools, doctors and public transport required whilst other villages have been excluded for new development.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs MacGregor) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to lack of services and facilities including education and medical provision, highway safety problems on narrow local roads with no pavements, retargeting the village rather than considering other settlements, limited local people employed in Hixon, increased traffic congestion and devaluation of properties. Concern about the public exhibition and inaccurate consultation material without clear site boundaries and locations in the wrong place.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Vockins) – Object to the proposed scale of new housing and employment development in Hixon whilst other village receive no development pressure or disruption from construction. There are highway safety problems on narrow local roads and no footpaths as well as a lack of services and facilities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Cooper) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to increased traffic on narrow suitable local roads, loss of village character and status, increased population and crime, property devaluation, pollution from industry already affecting the local school area and loss of open countryside, wildlife and habitats. Object to the new gypsy site near to Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Hughes) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to lack of infrastructure, limited number of local people working at the industrial estates and the scale of recent developments and increased population.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (T Matthews) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon as well as the gypsy site with limited information provided, increased traffic volumes, speeds and congestion, dangers to local children playing on open space, lack of pavements, pressure accessing the A51 road, lack of public transport provision, doctors and police with limited numbers of local people working in Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Elkin) – Object to the proposed scale of new housing and employment development at Hixon although appreciate modest increases are required. Such inappropriate development will have major implications on the local infrastructure including roads, sewers, services and the local school. Hixon should not be allowed to double in size again although query the position of local politicians. Even significantly less development will be unacceptable to the local community, which is unreasonable, unfair and not wanted.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Field) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to recent growth and increased population, limited numbers of local people working in Hixon, loss of village character and the consultation process inadequate and information out of date.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A Hutchins) – Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material with inaccurate information, out of date maps, lack of detail, missing roads and industrial locations in the wrong place so the consultation process should be suspended. Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to recent schemes and increases in population leading to a town larger than Eccleshall whilst other villages receive no development pressure, limited local people working in Hixon, highway safety concerns from lack of pavements and narrow local roads whilst there are few amenities and lack of medical provision. Object to Location HI-5 due to open countryside, poor access, a lack of traffic calming measures, impact on property prices and the local road network. There is a lack of amenities. Planning officers should work for the councillors and take account of local community views.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Andy Hutchins) – Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material with inaccurate information, out of date maps, lack of detail, missing roads and industrial locations in the wrong place so the consultation process should be suspended. Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to recent schemes and increases in population leading to a town larger than Eccleshall whilst other villages receive no development pressure, limited local people working in Hixon, highway safety concerns from lack of pavements and narrow local roads whilst there are few amenities and lack of medical provision. Object to Location HI-5 due to open countryside, poor access, a lack of traffic calming measures, impact on property prices and the local road network. There is a lack of amenities. Planning officers should work for the councillors and take account of local community views.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (L Hutchins) – Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material with inaccurate information, out of date maps, lack of detail, missing roads and industrial locations in the wrong place so the consultation process should be suspended. Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to recent schemes and increases in population leading to a town larger than Eccleshall whilst other villages receive no development pressure, limited local people working in Hixon, highway safety concerns from lack of pavements and narrow local roads whilst there are few amenities and lack of medical provision. Object to Location HI-5 due to open countryside, poor access, a lack of traffic calming measures, impact on property prices and the local road network. There is a lack of amenities. Planning officers should work for the councillors and take account of local community views.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Hodgkiss) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to recent growth pressures and increased population as well as no new infrastructure investment, increased heavy goods vehicles and traffic along narrow local roads with no pavements, impacts of industrial areas with increased pollution, noise and encroachment on the open countryside whilst few local people work in Hixon, loss of village character, identity and community spirit whilst other villages do not experience development pressures.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (C Horwill) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to recent population increases, loss of village character being changed to a town without a market, lack of infrastructure including education and medical provision, increased traffic congestion and heavy good vehicle movements with highway safety concerns, few local people working at the industrial estates so no benefits, increased pollution and pressure on the narrow local road network from residential traffic whilst other villages have been protected for development, impact on property values and undermine views from Cannock Chase. Object to Location HI-4 due to single lane poor access, increased noise and loss of open countryside.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location HI-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Winter-Wright) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to past large scale schemes and increased population, lack of infrastructure, few local people working in Hixon, poor quality narrow local roads, increased rubbish and litter as well as damage from heavy good vehicles. Object to development not being redirected to other villages. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material being inaccurate, lacking detail and out of date maps with missing information.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Horwill) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to impact on the village character and rural identity whilst other villages do not experience such development pressures. Concern about increased traffic, lack of pavements, pedestrian safety, pressure on local shops, illegal parking, narrow local roads, Location HI-4 on a single track country lane as well as impact on views from Cannock Chase and Stowe by Chartley by new housing development. Significant local opposition to the scale of development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Collett) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to loss of rural aspect and character, narrow local roads and lack of pavements, current services and facilities including the local school at capacity with existing industrial

units causing noise and pollution, lack of development being directed to other villages across Stafford Borough to lessen the impact on the community. Hixon should not be changed from a quiet village into a town which is currently sustainable yet should not be retargeted with further growth.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Miss Harrison) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to significant recent developments and population increases with other areas to be considered rather than re-targeting the village, concern about pollution and emissions for existing and new industrial activities. Whilst appreciating development targets need to be met the scale of proposals at Hixon are inappropriate.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Umerah) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to loss of open countryside and green open space at Location HI-1, other villages to be considered for development rather than retargeting Hixon with further population increases despite the lack of infrastructure and public transport provision, increased employment development will increase traffic, air and noise pollution whilst few local people work in Hixon, accident rates will rise and property devaluations occur.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (P Kent) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon impacting on the local village community, its character, high quality school and quality of life. Object to Location HI-6 due to lack of access and loss of open space. Hixon is being retargeted for growth and increased population making it larger than Eccleshall whilst other villages receive no development, few local people work in Hixon, there are highway safety problems on narrow local roads with no pavements, a deficiency of amenities, the local school is at capacity, there is no doctor's surgery and significant construction would lead to disruption. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material due to inaccurate information, outdated maps, lack of detail, missing roads and employment locations in the wrong place so the consultation process should be suspended. Object to a gypsy site close to the village.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location HI-6 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (S J Kent) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon impacting on the local village community, its character, high quality school and quality of life. Object to Location HI-6 due to lack of access and loss of open space. Hixon is being retargeted for growth and increased population making it larger than Eccleshall whilst other villages receive no development, few



local people work in Hixon, there are highway safety problems on narrow local roads with no pavements, a deficiency of amenities, the local school is at capacity, there is no doctor's surgery and significant construction would lead to disruption. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material due to inaccurate information, outdated maps, lack of detail, missing roads and employment locations in the wrong place so the consultation process should be suspended. Object to a gypsy site close to the village.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location HI-6 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (L M E Kent) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon impacting on the local village community, its character, high quality school and quality of life. Object to Location HI-6 due to lack of access and loss of open space. Hixon is being retargeted for growth and increased population making it larger than Eccleshall whilst other villages receive no development, few local people work in Hixon, there are highway safety problems on narrow local roads with no pavements, a deficiency of amenities, the local school is at capacity, there is no doctor's surgery and significant construction would lead to disruption. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material due to inaccurate information, outdated maps, a lack of detail, missing roads and employment locations in the wrong place so the consultation process should be suspended. Object to a gypsy site close to the village.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location HI-6 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Hixon Resident) – Object to the planners being vandals, destroying the village and changing its character into a town.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Jackson) – Concern about the volume of traffic on narrow local roads between Hixon and Stowe-by-Chartley conflicting with pedestrians and horse riders, narrow access to Location HA-a as well as Locations HI-1 to HI-6 not assisted by highway improvements leading to loss of character and environment, vacant industrial units at Hixon and Stafford whilst few local people work in Hixon due to training and skills base mis-match so increased commuting, increased pollution, ground water problems and emissions, impacts on biodiversity, light pollution, loss of green fields and landscape. Rural communities and character are being lost to town developments, extension of Residential Development Boundaries for proposals undermining open countryside and character, loss of agricultural employment and historic landscape. Significant impact on quality of life for local residents leading to people moving property to avoid inappropriate developments and loss of property values. If development is required this should take place south of Hixon at Location HI-4 or HI-5 with employment development at Location HI-a, HI-b or HA-c.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (J & A Hall) – Object to proposed employment development in Hixon at Location HA-a due to narrow road access from Stowe Lane, being in Stowe-by-Chartley Parish, an open agricultural field with public footpaths, commercial traffic having to pass through Hixon as well as being close to residential developments at Location HI-1 and HI-6. Object to Location HA-b due to being an open agricultural field, over half a mile from the bus route, increase congestion around the airfield industrial estate area, speeding traffic and commercial vehicles having to pass through Hixon on narrow local roads.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Locations HA-a and HA-b to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Baxter) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon due to recent scale of residential schemes and a lack of provision for new infrastructure, no traffic calming and environmental impacts, limited number of residents work in Hixon, there are highway safety concerns on narrow local roads and few pavements, limited education and medical provision, loss of wildlife and habitats as well as particular issues at Location HI-6 from flooding and loss of green space. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material being inaccurate and out of date.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Chapman) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon together with the new gypsy site, in particular Locations HI-4, HI-5 and HI-a due to loss of green fields, existing empty properties, lack of local need, inappropriate distribution of development and impact on the school playing field. Object to Hixon being retargeted for significant new growth despite recent development providing no new infrastructure, services and facilities including road safety issues, lack of public transport and shopping provision and loss of village character. New development should include increased public transport, new traffic calming, new education and health provision, increased shopping areas and open space. Concern about the public exhibition and the consultation material due to out of date maps, lack of boundaries and inaccurate information. Object to Location HI-4 and HI-5 being identified after numerous planning applications being refused due to road safety, lack of pavements and narrow local roads. Object to the Growth Point funding which is insufficient to provide real infrastructure whilst there is poor local hospital provision. The local community will not benefit from new development but suffer increased crime, including for the gypsy site, property devaluation, limited services and facilities, inappropriate scale and loss of open countryside. The disused airfield should be used for new housing and industrial units as a new village separate from Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Fletcher) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to loss of rural environment by converting a small village community into a town larger than Eccleshall. Concerned about the public exhibition and consultation material with out of date maps and lack of specific information including existing problems such as traffic congestion not to mention increased volumes from Heavy Good Vehicles and construction traffic impacting on the local school without any traffic calming measures. Object to the lack of information regarding the new gypsy site proposed in the village, lack of infrastructure, services and facilities including provision for education and other amenities as well as the impact of the village being surrounded by industrial estates despite empty premises in Hixon and at Rugeley and Stafford. New development should be directed to other villages rather than further increasing the provision in Hixon and undermining the rural environment and quiet countryside.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Kirby) – Concern about the misleading and out of date maps presented for the proposed new housing development at Hixon showing the locations as infill rather than Greenfield areas, lack of detail compared to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment consultation and the poor level of detail presented through the public exhibition. Major infrastructure investment is required in the larger villages for such a scale of development, which is unlikely to be provided through Growth Point funds, but only Eccleshall and Gnosall have proposed new roads suggested. Object to the proposed scale of housing and employment development with new residential areas directed to Hixon airfield as opposed to Locations HA-a and HA-b for employment rather than higher land surrounding the villages requiring significant infrastructure. Hixon has seen significant growth in recent years which is an unnecessary requirement through the Regional Spatial Strategy.

**ACTION:** Note objections and suggest of residential development on the Hixon airfield area to be considered through the preferred development locations.

1 response (Mrs Haynes) – Object to proposed new housing development in Hixon at Locations HI-4 and HI-5 due to the Sustainability Appraisal process, rural setting of the Church, unsuitable vehicular access on narrow local roads, loss of village character through urbanisation, high landscape and historic character including a World War II RAF Airfield hospital, trees and habitats.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations HI-4 and HI-5 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Roberts) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon due to lack of road infrastructure including proposed new roads, increased traffic congestion and heavy good vehicles as well as Hixon being the only village to be targeted for employment development compared to other settlements. Concerned about the public exhibition and consultation material due to flawed information and out of date maps. Object to a new 5 hectare gypsy site and the impact on residential development at 40% social and 60% private housing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Roberts) – Object to proposed new developments at Hixon and poor quality planning information being flawed, difficulty of using the web-site, misleading maps, inaccurate to achieve minimum consultation standards as well as political focus of new residential and industrial development to Hixon to minimise the impact on other settlements. Hixon has already received significant development and population increases in recent years, there was lack of consultation on Growth Point funding being received, Hixon's major traffic problems being exacerbated, limited numbers of local people working locally, lack of justification for housing and employment development being linked together, inadequate focus on other villages for new development, increased commuting and heavy good vehicles, lack of public transport, no safe cycle routes and limited pavements as well as access problems. There is a lack of sustainable investment in Hixon with new plans increasing the village to larger than Eccleshall, lack of capacity for a new village centre, environmental and social impact without any compensation, increased noise and pollution with limited utilities infrastructure and education provision, lack of detail concerning social housing, increased crime and no information about a new gypsy site. Suggest that the consultation process is suspended subject to independent investigation.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Sant) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to recent expansion of the village and the threat to rural character. Other local areas should take further development and support the consultation process being stopped until more accurate information is provided.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (S Sant) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to recent expansion of the village, limited increase in facilities and the threat to rural character. Other local areas should take further development. Support the consultation process being stopped until more accurate information is provided.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Lewis) – Object to proposed scale of new development at Hixon and question the need for more housing despite no facilities to accommodate increased population, lack of information regarding new roads, shops, schools and medical provision, limited public transport and increased congestion including heavy good vehicles as well as the need to replace the village hall. Listen to the local residents of Hixon before progressing with the proposals.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Williams) – Object to proposed new housing development at Locations HI-2, HI-3 and HI-4 (Puddle Hill & Egg Lane) and HI-1 (Stowe Lane) due to increased village congestion and hazards, a lack of pavements, increased sewerage capacity, flooding problems as well as a lack of medical provision.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations HI-1, HI-2, HI-3 and HI-4 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (A & J Brew) – Object to proposed new developments at Hixon due to lack of existing utilities infrastructure, foul and storm water drainage / flooding problems, limited services and facilities with new shops, schools, doctors, leisure and bus provision required, increased carbon emissions, pollution and noise, weakness in the economy and empty houses in the village. Object to loss of rural and village character due to significant industrial development, property devaluation, current empty industrial units and increased traffic congestion impacting narrow local roads whilst there are poor levels of public transport.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (G Dunmore) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon including Locations HI-2 and HI-3 due to recent growth in the village, loss of character and adverse impact on listed building properties. New development should take place on Hixon airfield.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations HI-2 and HI-3 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Puc) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to impact on rural character, pressure on village lanes, impact on the local school and medical services, problems with drains / sewers as well as objecting to gypsies.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (R Wonnacott) – Object to the public exhibition and consultation process as not engaging with the local community and therefore not being legal due to inaccurate plans and lack of information. The process should be stopped and repeated. No evaluation has taken place concerning the impact on the local road network despite other settlements with proposed new roads identified. Acknowledge local employment growth to support local communities but this is not replicated for Eccleshall, Gnosall or the Haywoods.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Puc) – Object to proposed new employment development in Hixon due to the rural character, construction disruption caused by new development, problems with narrow local roads, accessibility, sewage and amenities.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Deakin) – Promoting half an acre of land at Hixon for proposed new development facing New Road between Ash House and Barons Way being of limited agricultural use compared to new housing, close to the village amenities with utilities infrastructure and located on the local road network.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Horwill) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon with employment development undermining the rural character, loss of countryside, lack of infrastructure, increasing noise and pollution levels as well as traffic volumes creating safety issues on the local road network whilst existing industry is causing problems. Object to Location HI-4 due to visual impact on the landscape character and from the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Walker) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to lack of local facilities. Suggest that Location HI-6 is the most acceptable for new housing development in scale for Hixon due to flat land, lack of drainage and flooding issues, close to the village centre and access onto the local road network as well as containing brownfield land. Support new employment development off Pasturefields Lane at Location HI-a due to existing access, away from residential areas and not detract from the village character but should not be for heavy industry creating further pollution problems. Avoid new development with flooding issues, poor local access and undermining the village character.

ACTION: Note comments for Locations HI-6 and HI-a to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Main) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to impact on the small rural village, narrow local road infrastructure with increased traffic volumes, loss of open countryside, a new village centre undermining the character whilst new employment development is not required when existing units are empty. Object to proposed new housing at Locations HI-2, HI-3 and HI-4 with the village in place before the airfield and its industrial activities.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Miss Main) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to loss of rural countryside and tranquillity, increased housing leading to increased traffic, noise, pollution, loss of wildlife and countryside whilst the country is trying to retain the environment through carbon neutral initiatives. Strongly object to Locations HI-2, HI-3 and HI-4 due to access problems.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Main) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to increased traffic volumes on narrow local roads through the village centre, particularly Locations HI-2, HI-3 and HI-4, increased accident potential to local residents, loss of open countryside, unused brownfield land elsewhere, loss of village identity, increased commuting and emission levels due to lack of local infrastructure, services and facilities including education and health provision. Object to new employment development due to already empty units, increased heavy good vehicles through the village and ignorance of local weight restrictions.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Tummey) – Proposed new housing and employment development must be based on demonstrated need rather than aspirational Government targets and such information is currently not presented. Furthermore there are no specific detailed plans in order to properly assess the proposed developments and no detailed infrastructure investment information to explain how education, medical, retail, public transport and recreation will be provided. Therefore no new development can be supported. Due to lack of community support the plans should be withdrawn and represented by maintaining the village and rural character.

**ACTION:** Note comments and objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Higginson) – Object to proposed new developments in Hixon due to the narrow local road network, lack of pavements, limited recreational provision and play areas, lack of medical facilities, limited parking for local services and facilities, poor quality bus service, loss of Greenfield land when brownfield sites are available elsewhere, restricted weight and road access to Hixon and the local school at capacity. Object to the gypsy site.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Barton) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to loss of village and rural character, lack of local infrastructure, services and facilities such as no pavements, no health provision, problems with existing industrial pollution, no shops, limited public transport, poor quality road surfaces, local school at capacity and traffic congestion as well as flooding and sewage problems due to the clay soil. Object to the new gypsy site

being 5 hectares in size as well as changes to the Residential Development Boundary. Object to new development of housing and industry at Hixon which has previously had significant development rather than to other villages creating a small town larger than Eccleshall. Concern about the public exhibition and consultation material with inaccurate information and maps with limited detail.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Hodgkins) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to the scale leading to a small town, impact on property devaluation and the rural location, lack of facilities and services, no pavements causing a danger to pedestrians from increased traffic on narrow local roads, lack of sewage and drainage provision with flooding issues. New development will require medical facilities, schools and leisure facilities. Existing developments should be shown and the proposals should be reviewed.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Barton) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to the scale leading to a small town, impact on property devaluation and the rural location, lack of facilities and services, no pavements causing a danger to pedestrians from increased traffic on narrow local roads, lack of sewage and drainage provision with flooding issues. New development will require medical facilities, schools and leisure facilities. Existing developments should be shown and the proposals should be reviewed.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (P Clayton) – Object to proposed new employment development in Hixon due to lack of use of brownfield sites, development scale similar to Stafford and Stone, lack of need as the employment types are changing, limited local people working in Hixon and thus increased commuting patterns created, lack of development proposed to other villages, limited education provision, object to construction disruption, the scale of housing development similar to Stone with affordable housing and care scheme implications, impact on ecology and poor quality, soulless design. Concern about the inadequate consultation process and lack of democratic engagement from Borough Councillors to explain decision-making.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (M Aberley) – Object to the public exhibition and consultation material presented to the local community at Hixon due to out of date maps, misleading responses and lack of detailed information making it difficult to respond to the proposed developments. Object to the new gypsy site and asking for clarification about its status with property and Council Tax compensation.



**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Ms Poxton) – Object to proposed new developments in Hixon due to loss of village character and identity, limited local people working in Hixon, lack of infrastructure, limited services and facilities, increased traffic on narrow local roads with no traffic calming measures despite the local school and increased accidents as well as a lack of play and recreation provision. Question the value of the Residential Development Boundary if it can be amended and lack of information on the new gypsy site. No further development should occur at Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (T F & J C Martin) – Question whether new development should occur at Egg Lane due to need, type and style of housing. Suggest their owned land for new housing development at reduced cost, self build plots, social and local young people housing, allotment and recreational provision, enable road access, children's footpath and improvements to the Memorial Hall.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Walford) – Object to proposed new development due to loss of village character, retargeting of Hixon for further development whilst other village receive none, impact on the local school, wildlife and countryside, limited numbers of local people working in Hixon. Object to gypsy community moving to Hixon due to crime and lack of respect for the environment and local residents.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Mitchell) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development due to increased traffic on unsuitable local roads, limited numbers of local people working in Hixon, lack of pavements with dangers to local school children, no traffic calming, object to lack of information regarding the gypsy site, lack of local school capacity, concern about the type of new industry, lack of health and amenities as well as heavy goods vehicles.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Ochiltree) – Object to proposed new development at Hixon due to lack of consideration of existing empty factories for new housing, lack of specific details for Hixon, increased housing leading to reduction in industry whilst only light industry is supported if at all.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (A Metcalfe) – Object to proposed new employment development in Hixon due to lack of use of brownfield sites, development scale similar to Stafford and Stone, lack of need as the employment types are changing, limited local people working in Hixon and thus increased commuting patterns created, lack of development proposed to other villages, limited education provision, object to construction disruption, the scale of housing development similar to Stone with affordable housing and care scheme implications, impact on ecology and poor quality, soulless design. Concern about the inadequate consultation process and lack of democratic engagement from Borough Councillors to explain decision-making.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (L Wilson) – Support Location HI-b due to access not through the village, not agricultural land, existing bus route established and no housing nearby. Support Location HI-a due to natural infill, access not through the village, not agricultural land and no housing nearby but a distance from the bus route. Support Location HA-c due to expansion of existing industrial estate, access not through the village, not agricultural land and no housing nearby but a distance from the bus route. Object to Location HA-b due to northern extension of existing industrial estate, is agricultural land, limited public transport access, increased congestion and commercial traffic through the village. Object to Location HA-a due to limited and narrow access, agricultural land, lack of public transport, loss of public footpaths, next to residential development, increased heavy good vehicles, increased noise and light pollution, and commercial traffic through the village.

**ACTION:** Note support and objections for employment locations to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (Palmer & Beddington) – Object to proposed new employment development at Hixon airfield due to impact on rural character and views from Stowe by Chartley, existing traffic problems from current developments including heavy good vehicles, increased pollution and congestion as well as weight restrictions and narrow local roads such as Stowe Lane.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (T P & S J Lyons) – Support Location HI-b due to access not through the village, not agricultural land and no housing nearby. Support Location HI-a due to natural infill, access not through the village, not agricultural land and no housing nearby. Support Location HA-c due to expansion of existing industrial estate, access not through the village, not agricultural land and no housing nearby but a distance from the bus route. Object to Location HA-b due to northern extension of existing industrial estate but is agricultural land, limited public transport access, increased congestion and commercial traffic through the village. Object to Location HA-a due to limited access, agricultural land, lack of public transport, loss of public footpaths, next to residential development and commercial traffic through the village.

**ACTION:** Note support and objections for employment locations to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Mitchell) – Object to proposed new housing development with new roads, health services, road safety and policing problems. Limited infrastructure needs to be improved due to existing development let alone new growth.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon

1 response (Mrs Whitehurst) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon due to limited local services and facilities, lack of medical provision, no pavements causing risks to pedestrians, increased traffic generated whilst new facilities should be provided before new housing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Whittaker) – Concern about the lack of accurate information and out of date maps at the public exhibition including wrong titles, locations and some existing housing development was missing. The consultation process is therefore invalidated and not legitimate with a legal opinion being asked for.

**ACTION:** Note objections.

1 response (Crafts & Richardson) – Object to proposed new development due to previous housing schemes, infrastructure issues including roads and drains, more people, cars and pollution, impact on village character, increased crime, repeated targeting of Hixon for growth whilst other areas have no development so a more even distribution is required, increased pollution and lack of political accountability. The open countryside and rural area to be protected.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Walker) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development in Hixon due to loss of village character and identity, the local school is at capacity, lack of footpaths and pavements leading the child safety concerns, increased parking problems, increased traffic volumes, congestion and pollution including heavy good vehicles, increased shopping trips, impact of further industrial traffic on narrow local roads with pollution and disruption, lack of facilities for young people leading to greater problems yet a lack of policing, scale of past development whilst other villages receive no further housing and employment schemes. Brownfield sites should be used and empty properties rather than open countryside. Proposed housing developments have surface water run off / flooding and drainage problems with loss of wildlife and habitats. Object to new development proposals due to lack of services and facilities when compared to other settlements such as Eccleshall.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Roberts) – Object to proposed large scale developments at Hixon due to loss of rural character and identity, peace and tranquillity, problems of increased traffic on narrow local roads including heavy good vehicles with noise and pollution as well as loss of open countryside.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (S Williams) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon with no consideration of local resident's views for peace and quiet, village life and retaining open space and countryside. Listen to the local people who elect you.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

#### Spatial Options 5 11 responses received

1 response (Mrs Hytch) – Concern about the scale of proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon with significant new infrastructure, services and facilities required. Concern about the local road network which may have capacity to the south west of Hixon but narrow roads and limited pavements and footpaths to the north east of the village are not capable of sustaining increased traffic volumes without verges and having poor visibility. Further employment will not necessarily support local people and therefore shift patterns and types of employment must be considered in the context of traffic flows and congestion. Concern about the impact on the rural character of Hixon due to the scale of development proposed although appreciate some level of new housing is needed to support the community. However new employment and housing should also be considered in other outlying settlements to reduce the impact on traffic and rural character.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Support new housing on client's land, former skid pad in Hixon to be integrated with the existing employment area and the village service centre.

ACTION: Note support for client's land to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (N Gill) – Object to proposed new housing development at Hixon due to increased traffic congestion and children's safety, inadequate infrastructure, services and facilities including schools, medical provision, open space and play equipment. Concern about the existing employment areas increasing commuting patterns, pollution and not providing local jobs as well as loss of open countryside and pressure on the existing drainage system.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Sinkins) – Object to proposed scale of new housing development in Hixon and dispute the reason being existing employment areas due to the lack of residents employed locally, the narrow local road network and highway safety, lack of services and facilities including schools and medical provision. Oppose development at the Police skid pad and steady increase in development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (D & E Setterfield) – Object to proposed new housing and employment development at Hixon due to impact on rural character, the scale of existing development with noise and pollution impacts, lack of local road infrastructure including pavements, limited shops and medical services and limited local residents working in Hixon. Concern about the lack of detail including site layouts at the consultation events.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Miss Baker) – Object to proposed new development in Hixon due to loss of rural character, highway safety concerns and lack of pavements as well as the scale of new housing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Dale) – Object to proposed new housing development north and east of Hixon which are only accessible by roads that only allow 2 cars to pass at all times and often have no footpaths.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (J Hunt) – Support Location HI-b due to access not through the village, not agricultural land and no housing nearby. Support Location HI-a due to natural infill, access not through the village, not agricultural land and no housing nearby. Support Location HA-c due to expansion of existing industrial estate, access not through the village, not agricultural land and no housing nearby but a distance from the bus route. Object to Location HA-b due to northern extension of existing industrial estate but is agricultural land, limited public transport access, increased congestion and commercial traffic through the village. Object to Location HA-a due to limited access, agricultural land, lack of public transport, loss of public footpaths, next to residential development and commercial traffic through the village.

**ACTION:** Note support and objections for employment locations to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Lameris) – Object to proposed new employment development at Hixon due to lack of access, distance from the motorway network, narrow local roads and commercial traffic and loss of recreational amenity. Object to northern direction of growth for housing and employment due to loss of open countryside.

**ACTION:** Note objections for housing and employment locations to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Hawkins) – Support Location HI-b due to access from the A51 and not through the village, not agricultural land, on a bus route and no existing housing nearby. Support Location HI-a due to natural infill, access from the A51 and not through the village, not agricultural land, on a bus route and no existing housing nearby. Support Location HA-c due to expansion of existing industrial estate, access from the A51 and not through the village, western extension with New Road access and reduced congestion, not agricultural land and no housing nearby but a distance from the bus route. Object to Location HA-b due to northern extension of existing industrial estate but is agricultural land, limited public transport access, increased congestion and commercial traffic through the village. Object to Location HA-a due to limited access, agricultural land, lack of public transport, loss of public footpaths, next to residential development and commercial traffic through the village.

**ACTION:** Note support and objections for employment locations to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (L & S Brown) – Object to proposed new employment development at Hixon due to current number of empty units. Support Locations HA-a & HA-b provided access is improved. Object to Locations HA-c and HI-b on high ground and loss of rural character. Concern about the growth of employment locations at Hixon in a rural residential environment due to increased pollution and congestion as well as undermining character, increased traffic volumes, commuting and congestion with safety conflicts for the local school, increased pollution undermining wildlife and habitats with increased emissions. There will be implications for existing infrastructure, devaluation of property values and lack of local need for new developments.

**ACTION:** Note objections to housing and employment locations to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

Table 8.6 No responses received

Table 8.7 2 responses received

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Support new employment development at Locations HI-a and HA-c due to integration with the existing community and access to the A51.

**ACTION:** Note comments on employment locations to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Gill) – Object to new employment development at Hixon, to be directed to other settlements for local employment and particularly object to Location HI-a due to proximity to the local school with noise disturbance and airborne pollutants linked to an existing industrial unit.

ACTION: Note objections to Location HI-a to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

Table 8.2 1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Support new employment development at Locations HI-a and HA-c due to integration with the existing community and access to the A51.

ACTION: Note support for Locations HI-a and HA-c to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

8.32 2 response received

1 response (Mr Dale) – Concern about access dangers to proposed new housing and employment locations.

ACTION: Note comments to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs Roberts) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location HI-6 due to increased traffic and noise, limited range of services and facilities, loss of rural character and quality of life

ACTION: Note objection to new housing at Location HI-6 to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

8.33 3 responses received

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey Ltd) – Support proposed new housing development at Location HI-5 due to proximity to the village centre, local school and nearby employment areas. Support new employment development at Locations HI-a and HA-c due to integration with the existing community and access to the A51.

ACTION: Note support for Locations HI-6 HI-a and HA-c to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mr Lameris) – Proposed new housing development is unlikely to deliver high quality public transport to the area and provide for more than local needs, thus being unsustainable.

ACTION: Note objections to new housing development to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

1 response (Mrs J Roberts) – Concern about the scale of proposed new housing development in Hixon due to inadequate infrastructure, increased traffic volumes, lack of traffic calming and loss of character.

ACTION: Note objections to new housing development to be considered through preferred development locations for Hixon.

---

## Haywoods – Housing Location Options

125 responses received of which 68 are PDF responses.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Mynors, Mr & Mrs Deakin) - Landowners for location GH-1 are putting forward the site and consider this is a suitable location for housing development because it is flat and bordered by Main Road, has housing on two sides and a brook meaning it is well drained. The site forms a natural boundary to the north of the village and is low lying so would have minimal impact. There is good access onto Main Road for vehicles and pedestrians. There is a balancing pond for storm waters but the site is not subject to flooding and has limited evidence of ecological value and no agricultural purposes. All utilities are available to the site including foul drainage. There are a good range of local services in Great Haywood with employment opportunities nearby at Hixon and Pasturefields industrial estates.

ACTION: Note the landowner's willingness to bring forward housing development at GH-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Great Haywood.

1 response (Mrs Phillips) – Object to the housing proposals for the Haywoods due to the scale of development, loss of greenfields and village character, increased traffic along narrow village roads with limited pavements causing a danger to pedestrians particularly at Coley Lane, increased drainage and sewage problems, poor public transport provision at capacity, a lack of services and facilities including burial spaces and loss of species and habitats.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Phillips) – Object to the housing locations for the Haywoods due to the scale of development, impact on village character, loss of greenfields, disruption during construction and increased traffic impacting on the existing road network, particularly Coley Lane and Little Tixall Lane causing pedestrian dangers. Further expansion would damage community spirit and increase crime, there is lack of capacity at existing schools and doctors with extra population undermining services as well as a loss of natural habitats for wildlife.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Richards) – Totally oppose any housing development in the Haywoods due to loss of village character, lack of infrastructure, services and facilities, and expansion of the village towards Stafford. The thousands of empty houses in Staffordshire should be redeveloped to accommodate the requirements.



**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (M & G Simpson) – Object to the proposed housing development in the Haywoods due to its scale being in excess of local requirements leading to a significant increase in the village's population, destruction of green open space, loss of character and separation between the villages with no desire from existing residents for a new centre, increased traffic within the villages and onto the A51, capacity of local services such as the sewage system and doctors surgery to cope with more development and lack of local employment leading to increased commuting.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Butler) – Great and Little Haywood have an inadequate sewage system, overcrowded road system, full capacity of medical facilities, flooding problems and limited services and facilities together with visitor pressures from the Trent & Mersey canal and Shugborough Estate. Access to site GH-2 via Little Tixall Lane is a narrow lane unable to cope with construction nor new residential traffic, loss of village character, joining the villages together and creating a new town centre is wholly inappropriate.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Jones) – Object to new housing development at Great and Little Haywood with misleading maps not reflecting the scale of development proposed. The local community object to these developments, which are contrary to the Sustainable Community Strategy due to loss of green open space and environment, increase in car use, an inadequate local road network, lack of local employment and public transport provision. More sustainable locations for development where regeneration can occur, such as Stafford, should be selected rather than Greenfield sites with flooding impacts. No development beyond the capacity of brownfield sites should be accepted as any increase is detrimental to the character, identity, environment and biodiversity of the village. Narrow roads lead to locations LH-1, LH-2 and LH-3 which are unsuitable for widening with large volumes of traffic created due to commuting for employment which would increase the number of accidents. Development of Little Haywood and Great Haywood is not sustainable and would be extremely detrimental to the character of the villages, the environment and to the safety and well-being of the local community with a lack of education provision and public transport, risk to pedestrians and increase in car use contrary to Government policy

**ACTION:** Note objections including related to LH-1, LH-2 & LH-3 for consideration through the preferred development locations for Great and Little Haywoods.

1 response (M S Rob) – Object strongly to the housing and commercial proposals in Great Haywood, which has insufficient infrastructure and facilities to cope with such large-scale expansion.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (P Nevins & J Walton) – Object to the proposed housing development in the Haywoods when, in the current economic climate, brownfield land and vacant properties are available. There is insufficient infrastructure for new housing with the existing sewage system under pressure, the current health service provision overstretched and the two primary schools at capacity. The villagers will not benefit from these developments.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Billingsley) – Object to the new housing proposals for the Haywoods which would destroy the character and friendliness of the village already subject to recent developments. New development will further increase the traffic congestion on narrow local roads, the medical services are overstretched, the environment will be damaged and flooding will increase with more housing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (J Daly & R Edgington) – Object to the large scale housing developments on greenfield locations at Great & Little Haywood being destructive to the environment and contrary to sustainable development due to loss of agricultural land, wildlife habitats and open spaces, loss of distinctive character to urban sprawl in the context of other recent proposals, increased traffic and accidents on narrow local roads thus requiring significant new schemes including for pedestrians. More sustainable locations should be considered with access to public transport provision rather than areas with a lack of local employment, threats of carbon emissions and danger to cyclists, inability for young people to travel and inadequate parking at local facilities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Deakin) – Landowners for part of location GH-1 putting forward the site and consider this is a suitable location for 35-40 new houses with an access agreement with the adjacent landowner including an affordable element. The site is on the northern edge of Great Haywood rounding off the village with a tree lined brook to agricultural land beyond, is bordered by Main Road and has housing on two sides. The largely Greenfield site includes Greenacres as a brownfield element, is outside the Conservation Area, has no environmental designations, would not impact on Green Belt and is outside the flood plain. Great Haywood has a good range of services and facilities as well as access to tourism focused activities, public transport provision and local employment opportunities. Utilities infrastructure exists for the village with further consultation on sewage and access arrangements. Sustainable drainage systems would complement the existing balancing pond to address surface run off.

**ACTION:** Note the landowner's willingness to bring forward housing development at GH-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Great Haywood.

1 response (Mrs Milne) – Totally oppose further new development on higher ground to the south of Great Haywood until surface water drainage has been improved for existing and future requirements due to significant flooding issues experienced at the Hazeldine property.

**ACTION:** Note flooding issues to be addressed through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (J E Makin) – Objects to new housing proposals which would degrade the natural environment and heritage for future generations.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Jarrett) – Object to large-scale development due to loss of village character and atmosphere whilst not satisfying existing or new residents. Existing amenities and roads will not meet future population needs. Other areas of Staffordshire should be considered for a 'green' model village to meet the demand for housing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr K Jones) – Object to the proposed development at Great and Little Haywood due to the loss of greenfields and agricultural production, flooding problems exacerbated by climate change and urbanisation not solved by a 20% efficiency over Greenfield locations, increased population with no local employment, loss of natural habitats and species, loss of character and identity, limited infrastructure provision, brownfield sites being overlooked for the less expensive alternative and joining together the two villages will undermine the local tourism economy and leisure uses. Ministry of Defence land should be used to accommodate the new population and employment requirements as a sustainable solution rather than development at the Haywoods, which will increase pressure on the local road network causing accidents and hazards to school children as well as car use dependency contrary to Government policy. There is no local employment and the public transport system is poor with inadequate bus capacity which will not be addressed by new developments. There is a lack of health care, secondary schooling, youth groups, shopping and leisure facilities in the locality so car use will increase.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (E F Robinson) – Strongly object to significant new housing and commercial development in the Haywoods with existing infrastructure and facilities not being able to cope, loss of village character and its nature.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Milne) – Concern about the absence of facilities for young people with the only meeting places being car parks. Query whether new development will be accompanied by more services and facilities as previous developments have failed to deliver. There is a lack of access to existing services and facilities for the elderly so new development should be avoided at the Haywoods.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (M J & A M Powner) – Excessive planning, the density and location of new housing development will have serious implications for the local community with serious flooding and sewage problems in the village. Both Little Tixall Lane and Coley Lane are narrow local roads being inadequate for increased traffic, medical facilities are insufficient and there will be loss of village character. The Borough Council and Government should listen to the local community.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (L Jarrett) – Object to the scale of new development proposed due to loss of village character, the strain on amenities and services, need to construct new roads and loss of existing characterful lanes. Local employment is limited leading to increased commuting and undermining community lifestyles. New development should take note of the Village Design Plan.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (R A Ives) – Object to new housing and light industry development at the Haywoods due to current lack of adequate infrastructure particularly sewage system and flooding from storm drains, the need for new access roads to the A51, the primary schools and secondary school catchment is at capacity, medical services are strained, loss of environment and greenfields when brownfield sites are available, loss of character and identity with inadequate leisure facilities and affordable housing being delivered from new development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (W G Ives & Mrs D M Ives) - Object to new development at the Haywoods leading to village joining due to the existing scale of development, the requirement to amend the Residential Development Boundary, loss of village and rural character / ambience, impact on the environment and the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, lack of services and facilities, increased traffic density on narrow local roads with new access route required, loss of greenfields rather than brownfield use, serious existing sewage and surface water drainage issues, lack of services and facilities including medical and education provision, and limited finance for property. The local community and its views should be considered.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (C Kilkenny) – Object to proposed major housing development in the Haywoods due to loss of rural character, greenfields, and open space for informal recreation leading to urban sprawl, increased congestion and pollution, pressure on local schools and medical services as well as increased crime. Brownfield land in Stafford and Stoke-on-Trent should be used for city overspill where work exists rather than disturb rural areas.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Cooper) – Object to the major development proposals leading to the effective joining of the Haywoods thus destroying village character, current infrastructure is inadequate including sewage problems, loss of arable land, medical and dentist services are near capacity, over stretched local road network and education provision as well as impacts on Cannock Chase and Shugborough Hall.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Bedford) – Concern about the exact scale of development and inability to respond due to a lack of information on site boundaries and road frontages concerning the highway network, traffic and pedestrian impacts.

**ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Mrs Lawrence) – Object to proposed new developments due to the impact on the surface water drainage system causing flooding and overloading the current sewage system as well as implications for water, gas and electricity supplies. There is severe pressure on the existing road network from increased traffic and speeds. Avoid joining the two villages through these proposals.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Phillips) – Object to the proposed developments at the Haywoods due to the impact of building on greenbelt land, the Conservation Area, habitat protection, rights of way bridle paths, historical and archaeological sites, loss of village identity, recreation areas, better medical and education services needed, flooding and sewage problems, traffic congestion, noise and pollution, lack of jobs, anti-social behaviour, parking problems, village policing and better public transport required.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (A G Cooper) – Object to the major development proposals leading to the effective joining of the Haywoods thus destroying village character, current infrastructure is inadequate including sewage problems, loss of arable land, medical

and dentist services are near capacity, over stretched local road network and education provision as well as impacts on Cannock Chase and Shugborough Hall. Query why a Conservative Borough Council volunteered for more housing growth when such development is opposed by national Conservatives. In the current climate people want jobs not new homes with the property market subject to market forces. Brownfield sites should be used.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods

1 response (Mr Lawrence) – Object to proposed new developments due to the impact on the surface water drainage system causing flooding and overloading the current sewage system as well as implications for water, gas and electricity supplies. There is severe pressure on the existing road network from increased traffic and speeds. Avoid joining the two villages through these proposals.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods

1 response (Mrs Morris) – Object to proposed developments at the Haywoods due to inadequate drainage and flooding, the sewage system at capacity, electricity power outages, impact on the local road network, maintaining separation between the villages and the rural character. There is over provision of affordable housing in Stafford, and the community in the Haywoods wish to retain the environment and its heritage. The views across Cannock Chase should be preserved.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Rayson) – New housing in the Haywoods should consider traffic impacts, flooding problems, sewage disposal, level of services and facilities as well as impact on the local community.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Professor and Mrs Randall) – Object to the proposed new developments at the Haywoods, particularly locations LH-1 and LH-2 which will have a serious impact on rural character, access problems and drainage issues especially for Coley Lane residents. Development at location LH-1 will increase flooding particularly along Main Road, Back Lane and Meadow Road with the sewage problems exacerbated. Such large-scale housing would have a series impact on village character and infrastructure of Little Haywood. Road infrastructure is currently overstretched particularly along Coley Lane and Main Road. Development at location LH-2 will create major accessibility problems for an already congested road infrastructure. Overall the scale of development proposed will have a detrimental impact on the rural character of the villages, would merge both villages, lead to loss of significant open space, increase traffic and implications for infrastructure whilst brownfield capacity should be fully utilised in more sustainable locations.

**ACTION:** Note objections particularly related to LH-1 and LH-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (S R & M Richards) – Concerned about new developments in the Haywoods which have few services and facilities such as schools, a health centre and shops, would destroy the rural character and village community, increase traffic along narrow roads particularly Coley Lane would give rise to significant traffic / pedestrian hazards.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Clowe & Miss Attfield) - Object to new development due to the loss of agricultural and Greenfield land, impacts on local wildlife, flooding, lack of brownfield development in other areas, lack of local need for such housing in the Haywoods, affordable housing to be located in more sustainable areas, pollution and carbon emissions, inadequate infrastructure, lack of services and facilities with loss of character and traffic increases. The tourism industry should be supported rather than threatened.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (B F Lockyer) – No new development should occur in the Haywood because of its village character, community and the natural surroundings. The concept of affordable housing is flawed as it causes anti-social behaviour and unrest.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Bignell) – Object to the proposed new developments in the Haywoods because of the detrimental effect on the villagers quality of life being a good, honest place to live. Brownfield sites should be used whilst Greenfield areas should be undisturbed and the Council should not agree to further housing growth. Listen to the community.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (K Forrester) – Object to proposed new housing leading to a loss of amenity, open space, wildlife, habitats, tranquillity, rural identity, history and heritage whilst flooding will increase. Limited local jobs, services and facilities will lead to increased car use, congestion at Stafford, accidents and carbon emissions as well as strained health and education facilities whilst crime and anti-social behaviour would increase. Other Stafford Borough villages are of equal value so should not be targeted either. The Council should have more regard to the electorate rather than Government directives and seeking Growth Point status. There is no significant housing shortage or need in the Borough area based on current residents.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Whitehouse) – Expresses concern about new residential development with a loss of character, lack of employment, causing sewage and flooding problems due to inadequate drainage systems being exacerbated as well as traffic increases. More infrastructure is required with new development. There is a lack of parking facilities as well as medical, schools and shops in the Haywoods. Account should be taken of the Village Design Statement.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (CS & JA Pearce) – Object to the proposed new housing development leading to town creation of the Haywoods and subsequent loss of its unique character and village life, increased traffic and accidents, sewage and surface water problems, loss of farmland, inadequate schools and medical centres and increased parking pressures. The general public should be listened to and the Haywoods should not have any more development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Emberton) – Object to the proposed new development in the Haywoods due to flooding implications which have been mitigated against by even small developments. Development on high ground at locations GH-2, GH-3, LH-1 & LH-2 will only make this problem worse together with access issues and joining up the Haywoods thus destroying their character and impacting on tourism related to Cannock Chase and Shugborough. There are limited parking facilities in the village centre. If development were to take place GH-1 would be preferable being low lying, flat and with easy access.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (L J Coleman) – Object to the proposed development in the Haywoods as there is no legal requirement, a lack of infrastructure, lead to increased traffic, congestion and safety problems on a number of poor quality roads, sewage and flooding issues, lack of services and facilities including education and medical provision, lack of public transport and destruction of wildlife and habitats. An increase in affordable housing would increase crime and the two villages should remain separated by green fields.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Coleman) – Object to the proposed development in the Haywoods as there is no legal requirement, a lack of infrastructure, lead to increased traffic, congestion and safety problems on a number of poor quality roads, sewage and flooding issues, lack of services and facilities including education and medical provision, lack of public transport and destruction of wildlife and habitats. An increase in affordable housing would increase crime and the two villages should remain separated by green fields.



**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Mynors) - Landowners for location GH-1 are putting forward the Greenfield site and consider this is a suitable location for 25-30 houses because it is has housing on two sides and a brook meaning it is well drained including a balancing pond. The site forms a natural boundary to the north of the village and is low lying so would have minimal impact and would avoid merging the villages. The site does not impact on Green Belt, floodplain or cultural / built heritage. There is necessary infrastructure, services and facilities within the locality. There is good access onto Main Road for vehicles and pedestrians. There are employment opportunities nearby at Hixon and Pasturefields industrial estates as well as commuting opportunities to other areas.

**ACTION:** Note the landowner's willingness to bring forward housing development at GH-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Great Haywood.

1 response (Mr Woodward) – Strongly object to major new housing or commercial development in the Haywoods due to the serious detrimental impact on the village character, local community, amenities and countryside. Locations GH-2 and GH-3 previously had a planning application refused due to inadequate access. Local people strongly opposed the development.

**ACTION:** Note objections including locations GH-2 and GH-3 to be considered through the preferred locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (E Fitzpatrick) – Object to the proposed housing development in the Haywoods due to loss of village character and has significant concerns about the Council accepting Growth Point status. The local community should be listened to regarding this development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (D Edward) – Concerned about more housing development in the Haywoods due to access issues along narrow and dangerous roads with increased congestion, flooding and surface water run off problems as well as an inadequate drainage system. The medical services are currently working at capacity so there is no ability to increase patient numbers.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Bottom) – Objects to proposed new development due to lack of adequate infrastructure, narrow access roads, inadequate sewage and drainage systems, flooding problems, traffic congestion, lack of local employment leading to commuting, already stretched medical services and potential loss of the green space and village identity. Little Haywood has already experienced significant growth.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Robbie) – Strongly object to proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to loss of good quality agricultural land considered by an Inspector in 1981, increased traffic on narrow rural roads with emergency vehicle implications, inadequate parking for local services and facilities, increased demand on sewage and drainage systems with recent flooding problems, destruction of rural character with account needed of the Village Design Statement, loss of wildlife and habitats, loss of heritage and historic open space, and loss of individual identities and character if the greenfields between the two villages are built upon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (J Maingay) – Strongly object to current housing proposals due to serious implications for the local community, flooding and sewage issues, increased traffic volumes and parking problems on the narrow local road network, increased commuting, loss of rural character and property devaluation and loss of open space between the villages. Greenfield development on agricultural land should not occur to protect food production as well as other environmental constraints such as the Cannock Chase AONB, nature conservation interests and the Shugborough Estate.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (County Cllr Bloomer) – Support the local community in rejecting the proposed development due to lack of infrastructure, drainage and sewerage problems, limited local employment, health care and services as well as the locality of Cannock Chase and the Shugborough Estate. Drainage and sewerage problems need to be addressed for existing development whilst there is inadequate highway infrastructure for new housing development. Local people's views must be given more weight against strategic objectives.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (RR & PM Dodd) – Object to proposed new development in the Haywoods as the existing infrastructure is inadequate, Greenfield land should be protected and the local agricultural economy should be supported.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Cllr Mrs Tabernor) – Object to any new housing development until the sewage problems are resolved.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (J E Mosley) – No further housing development should occur in the Haywoods until the local road network to Stafford and Hixon has been significantly improved which is currently very busy including being a bus route, is in a bad state of repair and is very dangerous.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (T & P Great Haywood) – Object to new housing development and comments by Richard Gough about no impact on the Green Belt. Account should be made to Cannock Chase.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (J Featonby) – Object to the planning proposals for the Haywoods with no real attempt at local consultation or democratic debate and a poor quality public exhibition concerning future urban encroachment. The proposals would destroy the village character, cause loss of productive agricultural land, wildlife and habitats, there is a lack of local employment and adequate infrastructure, the area is close to Cannock Chase and the Shugborough Estate and the road network is congested. The Council should not have accepted Growth Point status without public consultation. Clearly there is a need nationally for additional low cost housing. Brownfield land should be used rather than destroy the countryside.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Blacklock) – Object to proposed new housing development at Little Haywood due to no clear access roads. Development at Location LH-1 would increase traffic volumes on narrow local roads, cause further parking problems, be difficult to access, erode character and lead to habitat and wildlife loss. Development at Location LH-2 would lead to loss of farmland and local wildlife, has no safe road access point for vehicles or pedestrians and cause problems for the local network. There is inadequate drainage and sewage provision as well as other services and facilities. The loss of village character should be avoided.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Grant) – Object to new housing development in the Haywoods due to the narrow local road network, flooding problems, there is inadequate sewage facilities and local services will be overstretched. Other more sustainable locations should be used.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Ives) – Object to new housing development in the Haywoods due to insufficient local infrastructure with the sewers experiencing blockages, village character would be lost, merging of towns and increased emissions causing health problems.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Knight) – Concern about the new housing development at Location LH-1 due to the topography and surface run off / flooding problems, the local road network is narrow and dangerous for construction and residential traffic, loss of rich wildlife and habitats, loss of local farming employment, the services and facilities including health and schools are at capacity. Brownfield sites should be used rather than Greenfield areas.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Haubus) – Concern about new housing development at Little Haywood at Locations LH-1 and LH-2 due to the current infrastructure being overloaded, local access roads are narrow and dangerous not least from parked cars and the sewage facilities are inadequate. Access to GH-2 and GH-3 are also difficult although a new route from the A51 could avoid construction and residential traffic passing through the villages. New infrastructure could also occur.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (M & F McAuley) – Concerned that the scale of development is not required, housing in rural areas will increase carbon emissions and traffic movements, village character will be lost, flooding, drainage and lack of infrastructure, services and facilities exist for the current population let alone increased numbers of residents.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr P Smith) – Object to the new housing proposals in the Haywoods due to the scale in relation to the existing community, there is a lack of services and facilities, medical and education provision, flooding and sewage problems, inadequate recreational facilities and parking issues. The individual identities of the villages should be maintained and the Greenfields protected.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (L Grainger) – With regards to new housing development at the Haywoods both villages suffer an inadequate sewage system, overcrowded local roads, medical facilities at capacity, limited local services and facilities, flooding issues and pressure from tourism visitors. Location GH-2 has poor access for

construction and residential traffic. The Haywoods would lose their character and identity from this inappropriate scale of development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Owen) – Strongly object to new development in the Haywoods due to inadequate sewage and flooding infrastructure, limited local employment causing increased commuting, an inadequate bus service, loss of village character and identity, lack of parking for medical services and significant opposition from the local community.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Bowers) – Concerned about new housing development in the Haywoods due to loss of character and identity, stress on existing services and facilities, narrow local roads and dangers for local children from increased traffic, drainage and flooding problems.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (A & M Bennett) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods whilst concerned about recent infill housing because of inadequate sewage and water supplies, lack of services and facilities, flooding problems with such areas to be avoided, lack of medical and education provision, pressure on the local road network, concern about increased crime and lack of village identity. The Haywoods should not be destroyed by new development and the Council should stop these plans.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (P Grant) – Strongly object to proposed new housing development due to increased traffic volumes on narrow local roads, loss of local heritage and character, impacts on local services and amenities including health and school provision, parking and flooding problems with inadequate drainage. Local communities should be listened to by the Council and Government concerning new housing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Dewsnap) – Location GH-1 would lead to significant surface water run off and flooding problems in the village whilst access to the site is poor and would require major road infrastructure. Location GH-2 would require major road infrastructure as the local roads are single track and would create flooding problems from surface run off. Location GH-3 would lead to a loss of green open space. All the Great Haywood developments would have foul sewage problems. Location LH-1 would have access and flooding impacts. Location LH-2 would have surface water run off problems. Both areas have foul sewage problems. There is a lack of existing

services and facilities including medical provision to cope with an increase in population whilst utilities infrastructure upgrades would be required. New infrastructure should be in place before any new housing development takes place through detailed discussions with utility providers and other key parties.

**ACTION:** Note objections for the various locations to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Theresa & Paul) – Oppose the Greenfield development at the Haywoods. Brownfield sites should be used instead, there are drainage and sewage problems, village identity would be lost, existing properties should be used, commuting would increase, developer profits should not be the only consideration. The elected Council should not destroy the village but preserve rural areas.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Smalley) – Object to the Council gaining financially from Growth Point status with impacts on local communities such as the Haywoods, development should be spread across all villages and more detailed proposals put forward for consultation. Strongly oppose new housing development at GH-2 and LH-2 due to inadequate existing infrastructure, poor local road networks, loss of greenfields between the villages and increased traffic. Support GH-1 for new housing to meet development requirements with good access onto the A51 road and limit traffic effects.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Nicholls) – Object to the proposed new housing and commercial developments in the rural areas due to loss of greenfield sites, lack of consultation, impact on Cannock Chase, the existing level of housing in the Haywoods and lack of local services and facilities. Listen to the local people rather than destroy communities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Anon) – Listen to the local people and reconsider these major development proposals. Retain the village character and identity, prevent increased traffic volumes, protect Cannock Chase and the Shugborough Estate area, avoid local services and facilities being over stretched by major new housing development, there are already flooding and sewage problems. The local community oppose these developments and wish to retain the rural character of the area.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Fitzpatrick) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods which will destroy village character with brownfield sites to be used rather than greenfields. New development will increase traffic volumes, inadequate infrastructure will not be improved as existing sewage and drainage systems do not work, there are flooding and policing problems. Local communities should be considered and village identities maintained. Less housing is required due to overseas residents returning home. Small scale developments of 2 bedroomed houses for first time buyers would be acceptable.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (A & S Margetson & Woodward) – Object to proposed new development at Little Haywood due to inadequate infrastructure, traffic problems on the local road network with an increased risk of accidents, impact on the rural setting and local community. Other areas of land should be considered.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Baggott) X2 – Concern about the scale of new development proposed at the Haywood with particular reference to the narrow local road network including parked cars, the loss of village character and identity caused by greenfield development, significant additional traffic volumes, lack of infrastructure and highway provision.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (S & S Ward) – Object to proposed new development in the Haywoods which will destroy Greenfield and the village character, be reckless in the current economic climate, increase the carbon footprint with car use and significantly undermine many of the reasons local people wish to remain living in the Haywoods and work hard to afford the property prices.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (H Forrester) – Object to proposed new housing development at the Haywoods because there is adequate brownfield land in the Stafford area, it would destroy the village character, there has been a complete lack of local consultation and no democratic representation from elected Councillors for the local community.

**ACTION:** Note objections.

1 response (Mrs Probyn) – Strongly object to proposed new development in the Haywoods due to lack of infrastructure provision, local services and facilities including medical provision and shops causing parking problems, flooding problems increasing through greenfield development, air pollution and emissions from increased traffic movements with health issues, impact on the local tourism industry,

school provision regarding translation problems and lack of regard for using brownfield sites due to Government incentives.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (H & S Corban) – Object to the proposed new housing development because it will destroy the village and community life, there is a lack of land to increase local services and facilities, pressure on the local primary school, loss of Greenfield land, increased traffic movements, empty properties already within the village including on new developments, other locations should have housing growth to meet local needs. Listen to the local people and consider a new village if housing growth is required.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Pyatt) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development at 30% in the Haywoods because the local community oppose the plans, there is a lack of infrastructure, services and facilities, as well as loss of character and identity.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Featonby) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to its scale, lack of open space, increase in crime and other more appropriate locations beyond the A51

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Felton) – Object to large scale housing development in the Haywoods due to impact on the local road network and loss of character. Better quality housing should be built in more sustainable locations, such as Rugeley, rather than affordable housing which leads to social problems. Alternatively a new village should be built without affecting existing communities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Save Haywood's Idyllic Rural Environment - SHIRE) – Support the objections submitted by the local community in the Haywoods to new large scale housing development due to blighting of the area. In relation to location GH-2 (SHLAA sites 75 and 174) this will have negative impact on natural resources, travel, soil, biodiversity, water resources, historic and natural landscape. The location is identified as highly sensitive with archaeological interest in historic environment evidence. Furthermore there would be significant loss of protected species and habitats which should be subject to detailed surveys. There are other less environmentally sensitive sites across Stafford Borough for development.



**ACTION:** Note objections to location GH-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (R & W Miller) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to lack of services and facilities including schools and medical provision, limited infrastructure, strain on the local road network, impact of flooding, lack of police and loss of village character.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Mathams) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to over stretched services and facilities, public health problems for an inadequate sewage system needing substantial upgrading, existing flooding problems, lack of pedestrian footpaths and road safety concerns, narrow local road access, significant demand on existing medical services, poor quality recreational areas and facilities as well as the impact on character of the local area's countryside.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Robson) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to over stretched services and facilities, public health problems for an inadequate sewage system needing substantial upgrading, existing flooding problems, lack of pedestrian footpaths and road safety concerns, narrow local road access, significant demand on existing medical services, poor quality recreational areas and facilities as well as the impact on character of the local area's countryside.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (P & J Pymm) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing in the Haywoods as there is no local need for such development, the rural village environment would be damaged, traffic increased and over stretch local medical services.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr McArdle) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods which is not wanted by local residents.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Proctor) – Concerned about the quality of the public exhibition and lack of information about the proposed new housing developments which would lead to urban sprawl, impact on the quality of life and lack of democratic accountability in relation to market led forces with local politicians.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (V Powell) – Object to further building development in the Haywoods undermining the preservation and uniqueness of rural villages leading to increased road traffic on narrow and dangerous local roads, further sewage and water distribution problems, surface water flooding, over stretched primary schools, loss of quality of life, extra pressure on local health care services as well as a further lack of parking for services and facilities.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Cook) – Object to proposed new housing development in the Haywoods on location LH-2 due to lack of green fields, undermining property values, limited public information about proposed development from the Council previously, breaking of the Moores Family Trust covenant as well as the impact on people seeking a rural environment from the conurbations. For the Haywoods this will lead to a loss of rural character and place, other brownfield land should be used before greenfields and property prices in the villages are low enough for local people to purchase housing but movement occurs due to the lack of local employment opportunities. Avoid social engineering.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (S & M Tyrie) – The proposed new housing development is unacceptable because of drainage problems, sewage, overwhelming medical services, significant increase in local traffic created and loss of character. Affordable small scale housing to support local schools.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (R & J Fletcher) – Object to further building development in the Haywoods undermining the preservation and uniqueness of rural villages leading to increased road traffic on narrow and dangerous local roads, further sewage and water distribution problems, surface water flooding, over stretched primary schools, loss of quality of life, extra pressure on local health care services as well as a further lack of parking for services and facilities.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods

1 response (Mrs Shenton) – Objects to proposed new housing development in the Haywoods as this would lead to town creation from two villages, poor drains and unsuitable water supply, lack of infrastructure, inadequate playing fields, narrow local roads and increased traffic. The villages should remain rural with retention of greenfields. Stafford Borough Council can't find land for a village cemetery so why should this housing development take place.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Risbey) – Locations GH-2 and 3 are not acceptable for new housing development due to the impact on the local road network, increased traffic movements, increased flooding and surface run off, waste water and sewage problems. Location GH-1 is an acceptable location for new housing as this would have limited impact on the Haywoods, would provide access to the A51 road and solve an accident blackspot. New development could provide new sewage facilities, an enlarged medical service, youth club and play area.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (K Bignell) – Object to the scale of proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to the lack of infrastructure, impact on the local road network with increased traffic, over stretched medical services, drainage problems in the local area, joining of the two villages together destroying character and impacts on the surrounding countryside, Cannock Chase and Shugborough Estate areas. Such development is financially unviable due to the need for new access roads from the A51.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (J Hands) – Support the proposed new housing development at Roseacre Nursery (Location GH-1) which has good access, well related to the existing built up area and not significantly affect the Haywoods.

**ACTION:** Note landowner support for location GH-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (A & L Smith) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to the loss of local character and identity, destruction of greenfields and loss of people's financial capital.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (J E Mosley) – Object to proposed new housing development at GH-1 because previous developments have required a large balancing pond to be constructed due to flooding and environmental issues and therefore no more development should occur

**ACTION:** Note objections to location GH-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Lear) – Object to the scale of proposed new development in the Haywoods due to loss of quality of life, character and identity of the individual villages, loss of valuable Greenfield open space for recreation, increased air pollution from more traffic and the lack of consideration for smaller scale developments with less impact on Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (T & D Atkinson) – Deep concern about the future of the Haywoods because of proposed new development undermining the quality of life for existing residents leading to a loss of professional people who will move away. There is a lack of medical services.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Dr & Mrs Cross) – Object to the new housing proposals for the Haywoods with reference to the Regional Spatial Strategy providing a figure of 8,000 but the Council accepting 10,500 new homes to be built on greenfield land. The household demand figures are out of date and unreliable with demand based on family breakdown which should not be supported by the Council. The West Midlands North Housing Market Assessment identifies over supply of housing, brownfield priority, promotes environmental quality rather than high density, Stafford Borough has a low demand for new housing, limited homeless households and specific needs in rural areas. Location GH-1 has protected species present, historic interest, sewerage and drainage problems including local flooding, increased traffic and noise with the danger of narrow pavements. Location GH-2, LH-1 and LH-2 would cause loss of greenfields, environment, wildlife impacts, noise and pollution with narrow local roads not able to cope with increased housing and pedestrians. Location GH-3 also would cause loss of greenfields, environment, wildlife impacts, noise and pollution. The Haywoods would have a loss of character and identity from these proposals and should not progress.

**ACTION:** Note objections for particular locations to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (I H James) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to loss of village atmosphere, disruption, extra traffic generated with pollution and drainage problems. Brownfield land should be used instead of Greenfield sites.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (L & D Edge) – Strongly object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods with recent developments leading to flooding and sewerage problems. The new proposals would be of detriment to the immediate local environment, the area is one of natural outstanding beauty including Shugborough Estate with wildlife including some endangered species, has very poor infrastructure, there are narrow country lanes, a lack of pavements, inadequate lighting, increased noise pollution, increased volume of 'speeding' traffic, further increased risk of flooding, further depressed house prices and loss of amenity and village character. The public consultation exercise has been poor whilst the Council seeks to impose Government housing targets for financial gain without any mandate or public support. The open countryside should be protected for future generations.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (P Wilson) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywood which has experienced significant development in the recent. New development would undermine the village character, lead to loss of countryside, there is a very poor sewage system and local flooding issues which have not been resolved, the danger of local narrow pavements, increased traffic volumes and pollution and the health services would be overstretched. Questions the Government's motives for such development, the Council's approach and the lack of democracy.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Guilfoyle) – Object to the proposed new development in the Haywoods due to loss of local character and lack of local need.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr R J Harvey) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods with poor public consultation exercise, loss of village character and identity, Council's intentions already decided and lack of consideration for other areas such as Stowe by Chartley. New development would be on Greenfield land previously rejected for garden extensions, increase flooding and drainage problems, narrow local road networks have dangerous access and would lead to increased accidents, heritage interest, significant protected species and wildlife habitats, increased pressure on local services and facilities, length of construction time and empty homes should be used as affordable homes. Rather than use the land between the Haywoods location GH-1 would be more appropriate with easy access onto the A51, has better drainage and less flooding risk, is flatter and closer to employment areas, the location could support improved services and facilities including health care. There are other Borough areas more suited for new housing development rather than overstressing local services and facilities, better access and fewer problems. There should be no further development in the Haywoods to protect the village character and identity, affordable housing is non-existent in the current financial climate.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (M Harvey) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods which will profit the development industry but undermine the local community and its quality of life with brownfield sites to be used before Greenfield land. The existing housing stock should be utilised including empty and unsold properties.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (P & J Richards) – Strongly object to proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to impact on the local infrastructure, increased problems for sewage systems, lack of education provision, more sustainable locations in other areas including the use of brownfield sites rather than destroying the countryside. The Council should support and listen to the local community rather than other motivations.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Turner) – Object to the proposed new housing development at Location LH-1 in the Haywoods due to increased flooding problems, narrow local roads being more dangerous with increased traffic and speeding vehicles. The Greenfield land between the Haywoods should be protected and would have limited impact on the housing supply problems with empty properties nearby and other more sustainable locations such as Stafford, Rugeley and Birmingham rather than destroying rural areas. There is a lack of medical services and no plans to expand Stafford hospital to cope with more people.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (C-A Clemson) – Object to proposed new housing development in the Haywoods at locations GH-2, GH-3, LH-1 and LH-2 due to the impact on the village character, narrow local roads and increased traffic. Location GH-1 would be the most suitable housing area due to direct access onto the A51 although concerned about drainage and sewage problems with the existing system.

**ACTION:** Note objections and support for GH-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Y Munro) – Concern about proposed new housing development at Location LH-1 and LH-2 due to the existing sewage problems and flooding issues which must be resolved before building.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Pinder) – Object to the scale of new housing development in the Haywoods which will lead to a total loss of village character, many years of construction noise, mess and traffic, the current infrastructure cannot sustain this development, increased traffic volumes, depressed house prices, affordable housing increasing crime and anti-social behaviour, and a lack of burial space in the village.  
**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (A Clendon) – Object to the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to loss of character, the poor sewage system and lack of bus services.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (J Smalley) – Object to proposed new housing development in Little Haywood due to loss of village character and charm, loss of beautiful countryside and greenfields, increased traffic, disruption from the construction phase, loss of recreational open space and impact on local amenities including Cannock Chase. Question the economic value of house buildings against the environment impacts.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Little Haywood.

1 response (G H Cook) – Object to the proposed new housing developments at Little Haywood because of limited infrastructure support, environmental impact with climate change implications, adverse implications for wildlife, habitats and village life. Object to the capital investment required to provide the necessary infrastructure for utilities, highways, education and medical services, shopping facilities and new employment requirements.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Bedford) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location LH-2 and GH-2 due to inadequate access and narrow local roads with pedestrian dangers, loss of rural character, flooding problems, impact on the Conservation Area and trees, footpath and sewage implications.

**ACTION:** Note objections to Locations LH-2 and GH-2 to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Pickstock) – Concern about the proposed new housing development in the Haywoods as existing development has over stretched the local services and facilities. New development would have sewage drainage, storm drains, road safety, electrical supply, access, medical and education service implications. The over stretched sewage system causes health problems, flooding occurs leading to significant costs, narrow local roads have safety implications for residents, electricity power supplies have had problems, increased demand for medical, police and education provision. The local area has significant environmental and heritage tourism assets including the Shugborough Estate and Cannock Chase with tourism effected.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Gray) – Object to proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to the narrow local road system and increased traffic and parked cars causing a danger to pedestrians, existing drainage and sewage problems, limited education and medical facilities, limited local employment leading to increased commuting and a poor bus service. With regards to Location LH-1 access to the site is steep and dangerous for traffic along narrow local roads.

**ACTION:** Note general objections and objections to Location LH-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Mellenchip) – Concern about the cost and limited content of the public consultation exercise for proposed new housing development at the Haywoods and object to the plans due to increased flooding and surface water drainage problems created, increased traffic on unsuitable local roads, lack of capacity in local schools and medical services including parking problems, no provision of increased open space, sport and recreation facilities, existing water supply and power utility issues, lack of information provided on housing types and density, traffic problems in Stafford need to be resolved before new development in the Haywoods, impact on local tourism along the Trent and Mersey canal as well as a lack of police facilities.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Smith) – Object to the proposed new development in the Haywoods and its impact on an attractive community despite a lack of local need and the Council accepting a 20% increase in housing. Questions the use of plain English in the documentation, supporting evidence being projections without account of the decline young population, lack of finance for the property industry in the current economic climate, greater use of up-to-date evidence and impact on the social cohesion for the Haywoods. The rural area should be maintained for attractiveness rather than increased traffic, pollution and social problems. Sensitive development should occur with regard to the local infrastructure.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr English) – Object to the doubling in size of the Haywoods and loss of greenfields between the villages whilst questioning the Council's motives for promoting this development. Concern about the traffic situation in Stafford town and the inability of Council planners. There are surface water run off and flooding problems in the Haywoods as well as sewage system issues, there is a lack of village facilities including education and medical provision, narrow local road infrastructure is poor with increased problems from more traffic and accidents.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Morris) – Provided a photograph but no text. Objects to development as new housing development will exacerbate the flooding problems along Coley lane and Meadow Lane. The sewage system is at maximum capacity at times of heavy



rain. There are significant problems with power supply outages in winter. The road system could not adequately cope with further traffic increases. More housing would destroy the individual character and rural ambiance of the villages to create a small town by joining them, which nobody wants. The plans seem to have been hastily drawn up as there are an number of errors. Adequate affordable housing is available in Stafford Town. The views across Cannock Chase should be preserved.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

1 response (J & J Slater) – Object to the large scale proposed new housing development in the Haywoods due to loss of character and identity, overcrowding, impact on the natural environment, lack of infrastructure and undermining this beautiful area.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for the Haywoods.

- 8.34 1 response (Moyes) – Object to new housing development in the Haywoods as this will undermine the village character, there are flooding issues, safety of the local school with no traffic management and traffic congestion which will be exacerbated. The level of commuting will increase due to little local employment causing increased air pollution, global warming, urban sprawl and traffic congestion.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

#### Spatial Options 6 11 responses received

1 response (Fisher German for The Inglewood Investment Company) – Object to all the housing development locations in The Haywoods based on coalescence and disproportionate size. Land at Little Tixall Lane should be identified as a logical rounding off of the existing area, proportionate to scale, suitable for existing infrastructure whilst providing affordable housing and community open space.

**ACTION:** Note objections and support for client owned land to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Harper) – Strongly object to new housing development at The Haywoods due to loss of countryside and rural village character, inadequate sewage and drainage in the village as well as the impact of increased traffic on narrow village roads causing accidents. Stafford and Stone should be considered for more housing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (Moore Family Trust & Partners) – Support new housing development on land owned at GH-2, GH-3, LH-1 and LH-2. Sewage / waste disposal issues will be addressed before housing development occurs using Sustainable Urban Drainage

Systems which will also reduce flooding and infiltration rates improved 20% over Greenfield land. Affordable housing will be delivered together with a retirement village to reflect demographic change. Access to LH-1 will be from London Road and LH-2 from the A518?? to reduce impact on the local road network with access junctions meeting all current highway standards whilst public rights of way, cycleways and footpaths will be retained. Surveys on flora and fauna are being considered to minimise environmental impacts whilst green infrastructure will be included in the scheme. The development could include a new health centre, school, retail and leisure facilities with green infrastructure to reduce the impact of coalescence. Developers will not be involved in the scheme in order to maintain control and deliver the new services and facilities.

**ACTION:** Note support for use of land to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – New housing development at the Haywoods should be appropriate to the size and character of the villages, improve public transport provision, provide adequate infrastructure, with consideration given to Rugeley's employment and existing facilities. Limited provision of employment could reduce traffic congestion but should be relative.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Harvey) – Concern about the public consultation exercise, vagueness of maps, reasons for not considering Stowe by Chartley due to political influence and Council's intention to combine Great Haywood and Little Haywood. Object to previous Greenfield reason given not to extend gardens, drainage and flooding issues, restricted and dangerous access, loss of historic character and wildlife, detrimental impact on village character, lack of infrastructure, services and facilities, length of time to develop the site. Empty properties should be used for affordable housing with the old race course used for new housing north of Great Haywood with access onto the A51 and Hixon employment areas as well as being able to accommodate new infrastructure requirements. Other areas of the Borough are more suitable for new housing development not least due to access to services and facilities. Great Haywood is unsuitable for new housing development, the credit crunch will restrict new housing which is questionably affordable.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GH-2 and support for GH-1 to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (G E Collier) – Concern about the public consultation exercise and presentation of The Haywoods to provide a dormitory town with no adequate appreciation of the infrastructure, services and facilities needs as evident from past development, undermining the community, increasing commuting to Stafford.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Haswell) – Concern about The Haywoods becoming a small town without any facilities with tranquillity destroyed by increased traffic and noise. Object to GH-3 due to impact on existing properties including privacy and price as well as flooding from surface run-off.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GH-3 to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Kelsey) – Object to scale of new housing development at The Haywoods causing a blight on the village character and natural environment, increased climate change issues, lack of infrastructure, services, facilities and employment as well as flooding issues.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (T Amos & N Collins) – Object to new housing development at Back Lane and Coley Lane due to lack of capacity on the local road network, inadequate footpaths affecting the local school, traffic congestion and commuting, joining the two villages together is not appropriate, impact on education provision, lack of local employment, loss of greenfields and agricultural land, impact on wildlife and scale of new investment needed.

**ACTION:** Note objections to LH-1 & LH2 to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (Mrs Pitt) Object to new housing development at Back Lane and Coley Lane due to lack of capacity on the local road network, inadequate footpaths affecting the local school, traffic congestion and commuting, joining the two villages together is not appropriate, impact on education provision, lack of local employment, loss of greenfields and agricultural land, impact on wildlife and scale of new investment needed.

**ACTION:** Note objections to LH-1 & LH2 to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (J E Mosley) – Problems at the Haywoods have been ignored including dangerous local road network, flooding, access to the A51, education, doctors and police provision, the Stafford eastern bypass and dual carriageways.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

Table 8.8 & Table 8.9 No responses received

8.36 5 responses received

1 response (Mr Hobbs) – Object to new housing development at LH-1 and LH-2 due to inadequate access on narrow and dangerous local roads as well as to properties, loss of wildlife, habitat, heritage, character and environmental quality, flooding and surface run off and drainage issues, loss of recreational open space with footpaths linking the two villages of Great and Little Haywood. Questions whether a biodiversity assessment has been carried out for this area.

**ACTION:** Note objections to LH-1 & LH2 to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (National Trust) – Significant concern about new housing development at the Haywoods having a detrimental impact on the setting of Shugborough Estate and Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as well as the loss of open land between Great and Little Haywood which should be fully assessed in terms of impact on Shugborough parkland. GH-1 may have less impact but more details are required.

**ACTION:** Note objections with potential acceptance for GH-1 to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support development at GH-1 to the north of Great Haywood whilst object to the villages coalescence to maintain character. At Little Haywood LH-2 is considered as suitable.

**ACTION:** Note objections with support for GH-1 and LH-2 to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Harvey) – Concern about the public consultation exercise, vagueness of maps, reasons for not considering Stowe by Chartley due to political influence and Council's intention to combine Great Haywood and Little Haywood. Object to previous Greenfield reason given not to extend gardens, drainage and flooding issues, restricted and dangerous access, loss of historic character and wildlife, detrimental impact on village character, lack of infrastructure, services and facilities, length of time to develop the site. Empty properties should be used for affordable housing with the old race course used for new housing north of Great Haywood with access onto the A51 and Hixon employment areas as well as being able to accommodate new infrastructure requirements. Other areas of the Borough are more suitable for new housing development not least due to access to services and facilities. Great Haywood is unsuitable for new housing development, the credit crunch will restrict new housing which is questionably affordable.

**ACTION:** Note objections to GH-2 and support for GH-1 to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

1 response (Mr Coles) – Concern that the Haywoods would need a new village centre despite document stating not requiring major infrastructure provision as well as problems with flooding and sewage, lack of employment, services and facilities. Development of sites LH-1, LH-2 and GH-2 would have traffic access problems

particularly on Coley Lane and Little Tixall Lane which are narrow with limited parking, pavements and are poorly lit. GH-2 would have less disruption regarding construction but still impact on services and facilities. Detrimental to the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, village character and the setting of Shugborough.

**ACTION:** Note objections to LH-1, LH-2 & GH-2 and support for GH-2 to be considered through the preferred development approach for The Haywoods.

## **Haughton (HN) – Housing Location Options**

9 responses received

1 response (TJ Hurst) - Specific comments on various paragraphs throughout the consultation document, to be considered as part of the General Comments. There has been a number of housing developments in Haughton whilst a loss of shop and employment since 2001. There is limited rural employment and limited facilities with traffic and parking problems hence most of the residents commute to work and to access services and facilities. Increased development would exacerbate these issues with wildlife and leisure impacts. New development should include new open space, limit Haughton's linear form and environmental impacts, provide elderly sheltered housing following a local needs assessment, and have energy and design controls. HN-4, HN-5 and HN-6 are the most appropriate locations but should include recreation space.

**ACTION:** Noted comments regarding Haughton with preferred development locations at HN-4, HN-5 and HN-6.

1 response (B Copley) – Housing options should be limited to HN-3, HN-4 and HN-5 to the east of Haughton enabling direct access onto the A518 and Bradley Lane, which would ease congestion through the village especially if traffic increases due to the Donnington rail freight terminal becoming fully operational. Avoid increased traffic onto Station Road due to past accidents. When considering the type of housing for Haughton, preference should be given to bungalows for the elderly so that larger houses can be released for family use.

**ACTION:** Noted comments regarding Haughton with preferred development locations at HN-3, HN-4 and HN-5.

1 response (M Billett) – Question the need for housing in villages due to brownfield sites but appreciate some development can sustain villages. 30-40 houses would be appropriate provided setting and safety is adequate such as for Haughton at HN-3 which would prevent school children needing to cross the main road. In addition this would reduce traffic pressures on narrow lanes and impact on the elderly population.

**ACTION:** Noted comments regarding Haughton and support for HN-3 as part of preferred development locations.

1 response (D Hutt) – Consider a maximum allocation of 300 houses between Haughton, Weston & Woodseaves is appropriate, with 100 houses for Haughton on one site. Account should be taken of the existing residential road network avoiding over-capacity, minimise impact on existing residents so be away from existing residential areas and balanced to south of Haughton. HN-5 would be the best site for housing development, failing this decision sites HN-6 or HN-3 should be considered. Sites HN1 and HN-2 are unsuitable due to poor access.

**ACTION:** Noted comments regarding Haughton and support for HN-5 as part of preferred development locations.

1 response (Mr Price) – Queries the increase in housing provision in context of current population and demographic change as well as future employment provision. There is no employment and limited local facilities in Haughton hence most of the residents commute to work and to access services and facilities. The primary school can cater for the existing village. Locations HN-1, HN-2, and HN-3 are vulnerable to flooding, being below the level of Station Road and Brazenhill Lane, which have flooded. The road to access Location HN-4 does not flood. A small development such as HN-4 would be acceptable as it would not change the village character or overload the current facilities in the village. The numbers proposed for HN-5 and 6 are unrealistic. Queries why affordable housing in the village are empty.

**ACTION:** Noted comments regarding Haughton and support for HN-4 as part of preferred development locations.

1 response (M & P Dowle) – Due to imbalance of existing residential development any new housing should be south of A518 road at Haughton.

**ACTION:** Noted comments regarding support for HN-5 and HN-6 south of Haughton as part of preferred development locations.

1 response (J Amos) – Object to the scale of development options at Haughton due to impact on local character. Several smaller housing schemes have taken place which may be appropriate for HN-1, HN-5 and HN-6 as this would have least impact

**ACTION:** Noted comments regarding Haughton for consideration as part of preferred development locations.

1 response (Miss G Anslow) – Object to any new housing in Haughton but if development occurs it should be proportionate to the village's size to maintain character and identify, interconnected with green space and multiple entry points, maintain existing green areas, new housing sympathetic to the village environment including 3 bedroomed houses and bungalows accommodating the demographic cycle. HN-3 and HN-6 are the most appropriate with HN-1 least appropriate whilst HN-4 to be retained as green space.

**ACTION:** Noted comments regarding support for HN-3 and HN-6 south of Haughton as part of preferred development locations.

1 response (L and J Hender) – Concern to preserve Haughton village due to scale and inappropriate style of new development. Haughton currently has 300 houses and details of increased services and facilities is needed to accommodate development suggested. Challenge the non-specific diagrams due to vagueness.

ACTION: Noted comments regarding Haughton to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.

8.37 1 response (Mrs B Toovey) – Object to scale of new housing development at Haughton but suggest HN-1 and HN-5 to minimise impact and loss of character. Need to consider capacity of local school and Gnosall surgery together with traffic implications at Stafford.

ACTION: Noted and consider Haughton preferred development as part of the Development Strategy approach.

Spatial Options 7 1 response (Mr M Cooksley) – New housing development should minimise impact rather than all north or south of the main road.

ACTION: Noted and consider through preferred development locations at Haughton.

Table 8.10 1 response (Mr M Cooksley) – Stated that HN-6 would need a new access road. HN-5 is east of Joul Lane but query mapping regarding old Red Lion Farm area. HN-3 on existing sport field and detached from village if developed further out.

ACTION: Noted and consider through preferred development locations at Haughton.

8.39 – 8.40 No responses received

8.41 1 response (Cllr G I Sunley) – Most appropriate development of Haughton would be to the north, extending 1970s estates but would need improved traffic management on A518.

ACTION: Noted and consider through preferred development locations at Haughton.

### **Weston (WN) – Housing Location Option**

1 PDF response (Berry's on behalf of Mr G Travenor) – A number of specific comments made in representation throughout the consultation document with support for use of land south of Weston included.

ACTION: Noted support for client's land at Weston. Specific comments to be considered with other general correspondence received.

Spatial Options 8      1 response (Inland Waterways Association) – Concern raised about the impact of existing new development at Saltworks Lane, Weston on the character of the canal and Conservation Area which should be protected. Support use of land at WT-1 provided this is near to the A51 and away from the canal

ACTION:      Note support for WT-1 but take into account sensitivity of the Trent & Mersey canal location.

Table 8.11      No responses received

8.42      No responses received

8.42      2 responses received

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Southern direction of growth at Weston is the only realistic option.

ACTION:      Noted.

1 response (British Waterways Wales & Border Counties) – Southern direction of growth will impact on canal corridor Conservation Area. Request for involvement in pre-application discussions to enhance the area.

ACTION:      Sensitivity required for new development regarding the Trent & Mersey Canal Conservation Area.

### **Woodseaves (WN) – Housing Location Options**

100 responses received

1 response (Anonymous) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to lack of local infrastructure, limited need with existing empty properties, loss of arable land and environmental impacts.

ACTION:      Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (G & B Harold) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to existing empty properties, previous residential developments not leading to affordable houses, water pressure issues, lack of sewerage capacity, increased heavy goods vehicles from Donnington with safety and congestion on the existing local road network without provision of a bypass.

ACTION:      Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.



1 response (Mr & Mrs Kirwan) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to increased commuting and traffic, lack of local employment provision, leisure and shopping facilities, loss of rural character and tranquillity as well as previous developments.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs D Smith) – Object to proposed new housing developments at Woodseaves due to increased commuting with a lack of local employment and impact on the local road network, lack of services and facilities including shops, inadequate sewage system with current problems linked to Locations WO-1 to WO-5, inadequate drainage and redirected surface water run off with recent developments leading to property flooding. Development should be restricted to the capacity of the existing infrastructure.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr D Allen) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves, particularly Location WO-6, with limited consultation due to impact on the local road network and limited parking facilities using High Offley Road for access, limited infrastructure and no gas provision, poor public transport services, an over subscribed primary school, lack of medical provision, increased commuting and loss of village character.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (J R Brown) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to current stock of empty properties, lack of local employment, impact of heavy goods vehicles on narrow local roads, increased congestion undermining access by medical and emergency services as well as loss of wildlife.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Miss Joules) – Proposed new housing development should be based on local need rather than Government targets with greater public consultation in the process. Any new development should be small scale to preserve the village character and consider the busy A519 road through the village, safe access as a priority, adequate parking facilities, deliver smaller properties for younger families and priority for existing local residents.

ACTION: Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves

1 response (Mr Evans) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to loss of Greenfield and wildlife, inappropriate scale, existing residential development sufficient for the village, insufficient local amenities, increased commuting on already busy and dangerous local roads to access services

and facilities, limited public transport, lack of sewage system capacity with health implications and impact on the Site of Special Scientific Interest.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Miss Evans) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to loss of Greenfield and wildlife, inappropriate scale, existing residential development sufficient for the village, insufficient local amenities, increased commuting on already busy and dangerous local roads to access services and facilities, limited public transport, lack of sewage system capacity with health implications and impact on the Site of Special Scientific Interest.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs J Brown) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to existing housing stock and empty properties, loss of open countryside and wildlife including a Nature Reserve, lack of local employment, traffic pressures on existing narrow local roads with implications for medical and emergency services.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Dentith) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to loss of village and rural character, busy local roads, limited infrastructure with investment needed for drainage and utilities, lack of gas provision as well as objecting to new gypsy sites in the village and surrounding area.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Souter) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to existing residential growth in the village, the scale, lack of local services and facilities such as shops and the local school, lack of local employment leading to increased commuting and pollution, impact on wildlife and loss of green space.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Baldry) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves with low key public consultation due to affordable homes at Location WO-6, property devaluation, limited local amenities and services leading to cheaper properties with shops under pressure in the current economic climate leading to increased commuting, empty properties in the village, an over subscribed primary school, loss of village character and community, lack of investment for new infrastructure, inadequate road infrastructure with significant impact from heavy goods vehicle movements and limited local employment. Locations WO-6 and WO-7

will require access from the busy High Offley Road including parked cars. New development should include significant public transport increases.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Evans) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to loss of Greenfield and wildlife, inappropriate scale, existing residential development sufficient for the village, insufficient local amenities, increased commuting on already busy and dangerous local roads to access services and facilities, limited public transport, lack of sewage system capacity with health implications and impact on the Site of Special Scientific Interest.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Mackillican) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to loss of tranquillity and rural quality of life, traffic volumes and congestion increased on busy local roads, impact on wildlife, currently empty properties for sale and rent indicating a lack of market demand and imposition by the Government.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Sargent) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to inadequate road infrastructure for increased traffic, capacity of the sewerage and existing water systems, no gas supply, inadequate bus services leading to greater commuting with increased emissions, impact on wildlife and sufficient housing provision already in the village.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (H W Thompson) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves, particularly Location WO-4 due to limited sewage capacity, access from the busy A519, new housing close to a sewage works with traffic and pollution affecting property values, out of character with the open countryside rural location with pressure on existing limited infrastructure, services and facilities whilst near to Loynton Moss SSSI.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr M Jones) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to existing permissions providing for local needs, lack of local employment, increased commuting and emissions, capacity of the sewage and water supply systems. Location WO-1 should be used for future school expansion, a recreation and play area with further development retained within the existing Residential Development Boundary to sustain local services and facilities. Locations WO-2 and WO-3 most appropriate for new housing development as infill, less

visually intrusive and capable of sewage discharge. Location WO-1 has previously been a major landfill overlying deep peat, ground stability issues and flooding problems. Locations WO-4 is suitable but access problems. Location WO-5 is visually intrusive with access problems and unsympathetic to the rural character. Locations WO-6 and WO-7 will require sewage pumping infrastructure to the High Offley Road. Layout and design should be sympathetic with reduced densities for the village environment.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (D Vernal) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to lack of infrastructure, the busy main road and increased traffic volumes combined with heavy good vehicles from the Telford freight terminal.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (A Wagstaff) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves as being undemocratic.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Dentith) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to lack of infrastructure, increased traffic on the busy A519 road including vehicles from the new freight terminal at Telford as well as surrounding villages.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs J M Jones) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to being outside the Residential Development Boundary with loss of character, limited facilities and local employment with increased commuting, Location WO-1 is an old landfill site with flooding and visual impact issues, lack of infrastructure, object to new gypsy site and existing loss of services in the village.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Miss J Jones) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to inadequate road infrastructure for increased traffic, capacity of the sewerage and existing water systems, no gas supply, inadequate bus services leading to greater commuting with increased emissions, impact on wildlife and sufficient housing provision already in the village.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Pearce) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to inadequate road infrastructure for increased traffic, capacity of the sewerage and existing water systems, no gas supply, inadequate bus services leading to greater commuting with increased emissions, impact on wildlife and sufficient housing provision already in the village.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Pearce) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to inadequate road infrastructure for increased traffic, capacity of the sewerage and existing water systems, no gas supply, inadequate bus services leading to greater commuting with increased emissions, impact on wildlife and sufficient housing provision already in the village.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (H Gulliver) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to increased traffic problems through the village, inadequate sewerage system requiring complete reconstruction and loss of rural community due to more commuting.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Gulliver) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to increased traffic problems through the village, inadequate sewerage system requiring complete reconstruction and loss of rural community due to more commuting.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Holt) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to impact on local services, existing empty and vacant houses elsewhere, previous development in Woodseaves with increased population and loss of open countryside.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Spencer) – Object to proposed new housing development in Woodseaves due to limited infrastructure, services and facilities, limited local employment increasing commuting, traffic volumes on already busy roads leading to pollution and noise, lack of effective public transport, inadequate sewage system, infill development land is available rather than loss of open countryside and wildlife.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Biggs) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to the rural community, limited amenities, lack of local work, secondary education and leisure activities leading to commuting, lack of public transport with significant investment required together with other community facilities, recent housing development providing for local needs but have increased pressure on the local school, roads and parking facilities. Object to Location WO-1 as beyond the Residential Development Boundary, impact on infrastructure and facilities, difficult access and flooding problems.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (S Shaw) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to scale, unsustainable for local infrastructure, the over-used A519 road including freight traffic, increased commuting and traffic, the local school is at capacity, loss of green fields and village character, object to new gypsy site but support small scale affordable housing developments of 50 houses over 20 year period.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr P Brown) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to existing range of properties to meet local needs, loss of Greenfield land, lack of local employment lead to increased commuting and pollution which would increase if local services closed, loss of rural character and wildlife in the high quality environmental landscape, impact on the Loynton Moss SSSI, lack of local infrastructure, pressure on the local road network with increased accidents, lack of sewage and water system capacity, no gas provision and limited internet broadband coverage, limited public transport, distance to travel for emergency vehicles and the local school at capacity. Brownfield site should be used before Greenfields.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (A Brown) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to existing range of properties to meet local needs, loss of Greenfield land, lack of local employment lead to increased commuting and pollution which would increase if local services closed, loss of rural character and wildlife in the high quality environmental landscape, impact on the Loynton Moss SSSI, lack of local infrastructure, pressure on the local road network with increased accidents, lack of sewage and water system capacity, no gas provision and limited internet broadband coverage, limited public transport, distance to travel for emergency vehicles and the local school at capacity. Brownfield site should be used before Greenfields.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Swan) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to scale destroying village character, no infrastructure and limited local services and facilities, very busy A519 road with heavy goods vehicles, lack of local employment leading to increased commuting, recent housing developments in the village is sufficient to meet local needs. Object to Location WO-1 due to visual impact on agricultural land and access difficulties in terms of safety, high water table and the old landfill site. Restrict new housing development to within the existing village boundary.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr White) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to lack of local infrastructure including gas provision, sewage treatment and water supply, loss of wildlife, increased traffic volumes and commuting due to lack of local employment causing dangers on the local road network and increased pollution, limited public transport, retail and community facilities, the local school at capacity, drainage problems and increased anti social behaviour due to limited recreation provision. Object to Location WO-1 due to loss of open countryside, devaluation of property values, loss of wildlife, increased traffic and concern over the old landfill development.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Miss Woods) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves and the new gypsy site including Location WO-1 due to new infrastructure provision impacting on the private drainage system and limited road access, increased traffic, pollution and commuting as there is a lack of local employment, pressure on the local school, sufficient new housing already providing for local needs, loss of open countryside and wildlife as well as the site being an old landfill site.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Snoding) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves and the new gypsy site including Location WO-1 due to new infrastructure provision impacting on the private drainage system and limited road access, increased traffic, pollution and commuting as there is a lack of local employment, pressure on the local school, sufficient new housing already providing for local needs, loss of open countryside and wildlife as well as the site being an old landfill site.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (J Moore) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to sewerage system at full capacity, negative impact visually and on the open countryside including Loynton Moss SSSI undermining tourism, increased traffic on already congested and busy local roads with accident problems.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Timmins) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to local school at capacity, limited local infrastructure requiring investment, impact on wildlife and rural areas. Object to Location WO-1 due to difficult access from existing congested local roads, lack of gas supply to the village meaning expensive alternatives required, limited bus services and landscape impact. Limited new housing is needed but not significant estates.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Timmins) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to lack of consultation material and detailed plans, change of village character, lack of services and facilities, loss of open countryside and impact on rural areas. Object to Location WO-1 due to past illegal landfill, access difficulties from the existing local road network, no gas supply and water pressure problems, poor public transport provision and increased traffic congestion due to limited local employment.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Miss A Moore) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to full capacity of the existing sewerage system, the negative impact on open countryside and visual amenity for visitors and local residents, the impact of additional traffic and pollution on the already congested A518 and A519 roads whilst understanding the need for future growth.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves

1 response (A Wetton) – Object to proposed scale of new housing development at Woodseaves despite being shared with Haughton and Weston due to dangerous and unsuitable local roads for increased traffic, a lack of local employment leading to commuting with noise, emissions and pollution, limited local utilities infrastructure, pressure on health provision and loss of village character.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Woodseaves resident) – Concern about the level of traffic on the A519, when compared to previous decades, being a danger to pedestrians and cyclists with a new crossing needed. Support the local school and its level of education. Accept that more housing is needed but concerned about impact on village character,



increased pressure on the local school requiring more land and question the need for more shops to provide for the local community.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Dentith) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves leading to destruction of the village and its views, negative impact on wildlife, lack of local infrastructure to support more housing thus requiring investment in amenities, pressure on the busy A519 road, increased commuting to work, increased noise and light pollution. Oppose a gypsy site in or around Woodseaves.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Dentith) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves leading to destruction of the village and its views, negative impact on wildlife, lack of local infrastructure to support more housing thus requiring investment in amenities, pressure on the busy A519 road, increased commuting to work, increased noise and light pollution. Oppose a gypsy site in or around Woodseaves.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Moore) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to full capacity of the existing sewerage system, the negative impact on open countryside and visual amenity for visitors and local residents, the impact of additional traffic and pollution on the already congested A518 and A519 roads whilst understanding the need for future growth.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (E Swan) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to scale of impact on the village fabric, lack of infrastructure including shops, recreation facilities and amenities to support increased growth, busy local roads including A519 and B5405 with heavy good vehicles, lack of local employment leading to increased commuting and growth opposed by the local community when compared to the managed development of mixed properties to date and existing planning permission available for 40 new homes. Object to Location WO-1 due to loss of agricultural land and access difficulties from Woodhaven or the main road for the site, increased traffic volumes near to the local school, the high water table and previous illegal landfill materials affecting the location.

**ACTION:** Note objections and Location WO-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (B Dorset) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to lack of local infrastructure, the scale of growth, impact on the Loynton Moss SSSI, loss of countryside and the level of planning permissions

already granted in the village to meet future local needs. Concern about the lack of public consultation and engagement.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Dorset) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to lack of local infrastructure, the scale of growth, impact on the Loynton Moss SSSI, loss of countryside and the level of planning permissions already granted in the village to meet future local needs. Concern about the lack of public consultation and engagement.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Stansby) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves being out of keeping with the rural setting and character, impact of Locations WO-3 and WO-4 on the natural environment including Loynton Moss SSSI, increased congestion and anti-social behaviour, devaluation of neighbouring properties, traffic speeds on the A519, significant changes to the local road infrastructure for Locations WO-3 and WO-4 as well as destruction of village community to a small town from the scale of growth proposed.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Miss Williamson) – Object to proposed new housing development due to lack of current infrastructure requiring major upgrade, the sewerage system under pressure, no gas supply, narrow local road network, hazardous main roads for children and pedestrians through the village due to topography, heavy good vehicles and traffic speeds, limited local employment leading to increased commuting, insufficient public transport including for high school children, lack of amenities leading to increased anti social activity and lack of policing, loss of agricultural land, changes to natural drainage channels and increased flooding, scale of construction disruption and infrastructure improvements required, loss of community spirit and recreational space. Object to Location WO-1 due to impact on wildlife, loss of visual amenity, property devaluation and previous landfill concerns.

**ACTION:** Note objections and Location WO-1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Clews) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves and a new gypsy site due to capacity of the sewerage system, increased traffic on the local narrow road network including heavy good vehicles from Telford affecting property structures, increased noise and pollution, loss of village character and identity as well as limited local infrastructure. Appreciate the requirement for new housing with planning permission already providing natural progression in Woodseaves and suggests sites in and around town with existing infrastructure capacity.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (D Silvester) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to impact on the village's nature and infrastructure, sewage and storm water facilities at maximum capacity leading to flooding, busy and fast section of local road network including heavy good vehicles causing access difficulties with dangers for pedestrians and local school children, dangerous footpaths on the A519 with increased use, pressure on existing telecommunications, limited local employment, lack of public transport, increased commuting and detrimental impacts on health and emergency services.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Miss Silvester) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to impact on the village's nature and infrastructure, sewage and storm water facilities at maximum capacity leading to flooding, busy and fast section of local road network including heavy good vehicles causing access difficulties with dangers for pedestrians and local school children, dangerous footpaths on the A519 with increased use, pressure on existing telecommunications, limited local employment, lack of public transport, increased commuting and detrimental impacts on health and emergency services.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (L Allen) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to steady growth in the village through small developments over a 30 year period, the current scale of growth proposed is excessive, lack of local employment, increased commuting, lack of public transport provision, pressure of increased traffic volumes on the local main road network, increased heavy goods traffic, lack of local shops, medical and library facilities, an over-subscribed village school, significant level of improvement for the sewage facility and loss of community to commuting. Object to Locations WO-6 and WO-7 due to property devaluation from new affordable housing, access problems to High Offley Road and parking issues on the local road network.

ACTION: Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr O'Grady) – Object to proposed scale of new housing development at Woodseaves with 100 rather than 350 new homes to maintain the village community and support local services. The housing mix in Woodseaves to be diversified by providing homes for an increase for young adults and first time buyers to support the local school, there is limited local employment so traffic volumes will increase unless bus services are provided, environmental impacts with loss of rural landscape, pollution, wildlife effects and impact on local drainage. Significant concern raised about pressure on the local road network from increased traffic through commuting, heavy good vehicles accessing the Donnington rail terminal, structural property

problems and lack of speed enforcement. Suggest a bypass from A41 to Junction 15 of M6. Future development should be sympathetic through consultations and provided local road infrastructure improves.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (P Moore) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves to support local landowners in the current economic climate due to lack of village infrastructure with significant improvements required. Infrastructure and development should be focused on the urban areas and Woodseaves allowed to develop slowly without significant new housing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (J-P Parsons) – Substantial investment will be required to deliver the proposed new housing developments including drainage, roads and schools without which growth should be restricted. Support Locations WO-3 and WO-4 due to previously developed land but oppose extending the village envelope, there is a lack of local employment and only short term construction jobs created.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (H Parsons) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves being out of all character and proportion to the village. Support Locations WO-3 and WO-4 due to previously developed land and fail to enhance the village but oppose extending the village envelope into agricultural land unless for infill at existing highways with limited employment in the local area except agriculture.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Betts) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves as expansion is beyond natural progression, over capacity of local main road network splitting the village with increased traffic volumes, lack of local community benefit from development except to landowners, the requirement to upgrade the sewerage system, lack of gas supply, increased heavy good vehicles and parking problems, limited local services and facilities as well as impact on wildlife. Acknowledge that some growth which enhances the village may be appropriate above the 40 dwellings currently with planning permission as infill around Locations WO-2 and WO-3.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (J & G Watson) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to lack of democratic accountability and increased bureaucracy, sufficient planning permissions to enable the village to expand appropriately, impact

on sewerage system and the local road network. Any new development to expand the main village centre near to existing facilities rather than on Greenfield sites.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Warrilow) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location WO-7 in Woodseaves due to the narrow and dangerous local road network, high traffic volumes including heavy good vehicles, lack of local employment, shops and medical provision creating commuting, pollution and noise. Object to Locations WO-2, WO-4 and WO-5 due to access difficulties, congestion onto the main Newport and Stafford roads & dangers to pedestrians due to footpaths.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs C Spencer) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to impact on the village, increased traffic and emissions, lack of local employment leading to commuting, limited public transport, the busy local main road network splitting the village with increased heavy good vehicles and the lack of education provision with the local school at capacity, existing drains and sewerage system being unable to cope with more housing, surface water flooding, increased anti-social behaviour and limited policing, lack of recreational facilities as well as the detrimental impact on wildlife. Object to Location WO-1 due to impact on the local school and parking capacity, the requirement for a new access point at Dicky's Lane being a narrow residential lane, problems of existing congestion, nesting buzzards and previous use of the location as a landfill site with toxic materials questioned. Although some development is healthy to provide for local needs and existing local amenities, strongly object to housing outside Residential Development Boundaries due to existing planning permission within the village boundary for 30-40 new homes.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs J M Silvester) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to impact on the village's nature and infrastructure, sewage and storm water facilities at maximum capacity leading to flooding, busy and fast section of local road network including heavy good vehicles causing access difficulties with dangers for pedestrians and local school children, dangerous footpaths on the A519 with increased use, pressure on existing telecommunications, limited local employment, lack of public transport, increased commuting and detrimental impacts on health and emergency services.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr T Mackillican) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves with the village having a tranquil quality of life and strong community spirit compared to town life. The main road through Woodseaves is busy and congested currently without new housing and increased pollution. New development

will have an impact on wildlife, particularly Location WO-4, there is existing unsold housing stock for buy and rent in the village. Object to the Government's undemocratic approach to build housing in Woodseaves which are not required. Further village growth should be made through local decision making by local people.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs J Thomas) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to traffic volumes on the local road network and sewerage system capacity, lack of shops, medical facilities and policing. Object to Location WO-2 due to increased traffic onto Main Road.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr A J Brown) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to increased traffic volumes on the main roads and upgrading of the sewerage pumping station to avoid overflows. Object to Locations WO-6, and WO-7 to be kept as green.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Parker) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to lack of existing sewerage infrastructure, limited local employment, wildlife and increased traffic on country lanes. Starter homes and small houses to rent are needed.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Barrett) – Development should not be placed outside the existing Residential Development Boundary, which should remain.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (M Phillips) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves beyond the existing Residential Development Boundary due to existing provision within the village, increased traffic volumes combined with heavy good vehicles from Donnington new freight depot, increased noise and pollution, capacity of the sewerage system without an upgrade, impact on property values, loss of village character and open countryside with loss of wildlife and protected species. Limited growth of 30-40 homes over the next 20 years with affordable housing for local residents is acceptable.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (C Coupland) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to scale of growth, loss of character on the small rural community, lack of infrastructure, previous housing development of unsympathetic design with no children’s open space provision. Acknowledge that some affordable housing is required in keeping with the village character. Support Location WO-1 with appropriate number and types of housing to be accessed from outside the village but object to the other locations due to access problems, capacity of the local road network and undulating landform.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (D Evans) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves beyond the existing Residential Development Boundary due to existing provision within the village, increased traffic volumes combined with heavy good vehicles from Donnington new freight depot, increased noise and pollution, capacity of the sewerage system without an upgrade, impact on property values, loss of village character and open countryside with loss of wildlife and protected species. Limited growth of 30-40 homes over the next 20 years with affordable housing for local residents is acceptable.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Messrs Whittall & Mrs Whittall) – Object to proposed new development at Location WO-1 due to previous toxic waste landfill, negative impacts on the local school due to proximity, increased noise and traffic. Oppose new development at Woodseaves due to lack of local services and amenities including recreational and medical provision leading to increased commuting, limited public transport, loss of village character and identity as well as further pressure on the busy local road networks causing dangers.

**ACTION:** Note objections including Location WO1 to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (J & M Millward) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to loss of village character and community, increased traffic and pollution with dangers for young children, water pressure and sewage capacity problems, limited public transport, loss of open countryside, lack of need due to current financial pressures as well as Location WO-1 previously being a toxic landfill site with health concerns.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (J & M Poulteney) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to its scale and intensity beyond local needs, problems with existing utilities infrastructure including erratic electricity and water supplies, no gas, capacity of sewage facilities and inadequate phone lines for internet use with upgrading at significant cost. Woodseaves has a lack of local services and facilities,

limited public transport and employment with development leading to increased commuting, pollution and noise from the busy narrow local road network. Object to new housing development as being contrary to the Regional Spatial Strategy's focus on major urban areas and oppose the use of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment evidence being misleading in terms of site suitability and selection as well as being contrary to community engagement. Support limited growth for local needs with appropriate design to the surroundings but no major development until existing infrastructure is upgraded.

**ACTION:** Note objections and comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr D Turner) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves with concern about property devaluation, the lack of public consultation leading to local divisiveness. Object to housing figures being imposed by an unelected regional body with political motives yet lack of such reference in the consultation material whilst there are significant numbers of empty properties in the area as well as outstanding planning permissions. Woodseaves has limited services and facilities with no medical provision, no local employment, a poor bus service and increased commuting levels with loss of rural character so although limited social housing would be acceptable this should be restricted to local residents. Object to new gypsy sites in the area and new housing for migrant workers / problem families.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (E Turner) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves with concern about property devaluation, the lack of public consultation leading to local divisiveness. Object to housing figures being imposed by an unelected regional body with political motives yet lack of such reference in the consultation material whilst there are significant numbers of empty properties in the area as well as outstanding planning permissions. Woodseaves has limited services and facilities with no medical provision, no local employment, a poor bus service and increased commuting levels with loss of rural character so although limited social housing would be acceptable this should be restricted to local residents. Object to new gypsy sites in the area and new housing for migrant workers / problem families.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr P Mason) – Concerned about the proposed scale of new housing development at Woodseaves with some previous schemes of limited growth being unsympathetic to the village's linear character, which should be taken into account. Object to Locations WO-1, WO-2 and WO-3 due to visual impact, implications for the A519 road and undermining the existing linear village form. Support Locations WO-4, WO-6, WO-7 and particularly WO-5 being suitable for new development with limited visual impact on surrounding countryside, existing properties and traffic on the A519. Limited future development will support existing local service, facilities and village life.



**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr G Evans) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves beyond the existing Residential Development Boundary due to existing provision within the village, increased traffic volumes combined with heavy good vehicles from Donnington new freight depot, increased noise and pollution, capacity of the sewerage system without an upgrade, impact on property values, loss of village character and open countryside with loss of wildlife and protected species. Limited growth of 30-40 homes over the next 20 years with affordable housing for local residents is acceptable.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr A Simmonds) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to impact on the local road network with increased congestion, limited pavement capacity, sewerage system at over capacity and lack of local employment.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (M Mitchell) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to past residential growth, lack of local employment leading to increased commuting, lack of bus services and increased traffic volumes including Heavy Good Vehicles on poor quality road surfaces, impact on wildlife no gas provision with increased pressure on electricity and oil deliveries.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr R Mitchell) – Object to proposed new housing development in Woodseaves due to past residential growth of unsympathetic design, the undemocratic approach from an unelected body, poor public transport, congestion problems, overstretched local infrastructure of sewerage and electricity with no gas provision thus increased traffic volumes on crumbling roads.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs R Smith) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to limited capacity of existing infrastructure, poor water pressure, electricity power cuts and lack of gas provision, increased traffic volumes and commuting on narrow local roads, impact on wildlife and carbon dioxide emissions, pressure on medical services and Stafford hospital as well as loss of rural character. Whilst appreciating new housing is required this will need significant new infrastructure if it occurs in Woodseaves.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (A L Smith) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to growth being imposed by central Government rather than organic, limited local infrastructure with no gas provision, poor water pressure, capacity of the sewerage pumping station and limited local road network. Concerned about the lack of public consultation with the local community as opposed to developers.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Richardson) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location WO-1 due to the disused toxic landfill site, impact on the local school from increased noise as well as flooding issues. Object to new development at Woodseaves due to limited amenities and lack of medical provision leading to increased travel, lack of public transport, busy and dangerous A519 local road network with no crossings, local school at capacity, loss of village character, lack of affordable housing provided and impact on the countryside.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Lycett-Smith) – Any new housing development at Woodseaves would spoil the village appearance, undermine the community, stretch the road, sewerage and water infrastructure, lead to a dormitory village, put wildlife at risk, lead to school expansion and loose irreplaceable open countryside. Central Government should not impose housing targets on local authorities being aware of capacities within local areas.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (M Lycett-Smith) – Any new housing development at Woodseaves would spoil the village appearance, undermine the community, stretch the road, sewerage and water infrastructure, lead to a dormitory village, put wildlife at risk, lead to school expansion and loose irreplaceable open countryside. Central Government should not impose housing targets on local authorities being aware of capacities within local areas.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Treadwell) – Object to proposed new housing developments at Woodseaves and significant concerns about the public consultation process being inadequate to engage with the local community through local media channels and lack of publicity making the process flawed based on the impact for the village and not complying with the Statement of Community Involvement. Object to the new development due to visual impact on the rural environment, impact on wildlife through noise, light pollution and litter particularly Locations WO-1, WO-5 and WO-6 including ponds and marshlands, increased demand for public transport, traffic volumes and commuting leading to emission and noise pollution, property

devaluation as well as being contrary to the Development Plan's vision for rural areas and role of the planning system.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Turvey) – Object to large scale proposed new housing development at Woodseaves, whilst supporting limited affordable housing on small plots, due to flooding issues and limited capacity of surface water drains particularly Location WO-6, limited sewerage system capacity, electricity power supply problems, narrow country lanes not able to cope with increased traffic volumes, safety issues including for the local school due to traffic speed and volumes on the A519, lack of school capacity, infrequent bus service, lack of local amenities needing to be provided and object to a new gypsy or employment site in the village undermining its character.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Lunn) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to lack of local services, facilities and employment, increased commuting movements and traffic problems on dangerous roads. A comparison between Woodseaves, Derrington and Great Bridgeford identifies only proposed new development at Woodseaves despite having a balanced housing mix, the least number of properties and furthest from basic services. This approach is contrary to the Principles of Settlement Development document previously circulated.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (J & G Watson) – Accept housing growth if necessary, appropriate to the rural village and carefully sited with minimal environmental and community impact. Currently there are empty properties in Woodseaves due to agricultural ties which could be used by housing associations, scale and density of housing undermining village character, significant infrastructure upgrading required for roads, sewage, surface water, utilities, school and community facilities. Object to Location WO-4 due to access problems, increased traffic flows and speeding vehicles, loss of wildlife, protected species and impact on the Loynton Moss SSSI as well as other habitats.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Irwin) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves being imposed by external organisations on rural communities despite existing natural growth, impact on the rural landscape, causing social disruption between villagers, limited public transport in the area leading to increased commuting, no gas provision and community interference.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Davies) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to unsuitable and dangerous local road networks for traffic volumes including trucks on the A519, lack of amenities, no gas provision, capacity of the local school, loss of open countryside and property devaluation.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mrs Johnson) – Object to proposed new housing development at Location WO-1 due to current traffic volumes and heavy good vehicles on the A519 being dangerous to pedestrians, parked cars during school times, previous landfill activity and flooding problems. Suggest Location WO-3 as being on elevated land and separate from busy areas of the village.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Loadwick) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to previous residential schemes with pressure on the community, increased commuting and traffic volumes including Heavy Good Vehicles dividing the village community and causing dangers for pedestrians, lack of public transport, poor quality water supply, telecommunications and postal services. If new development is necessary Location WO-1 should be used due to its location with the school, post office and children's play area.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr Prosser) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to loss of rural character, problems with sewage, power supplies and existing drainage facilities, pressure on the local school which it at capacity and no medical or emergency service provision. Object to Locations WO-6 and WO-7 due to loss of wildlife, habitats, impact on conservation areas and woodland walks.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (B Kelly-Bush) – Object to the impact of proposed new housing development at Woodseaves with regards to traffic volumes including Heavy Goods Vehicles affecting property structures and dangerous narrow pavements, blocked main sewage system and flooding problems exacerbated by recent developments which will require a replacement system should new housing be provided. Query whether a new bypass will be provided to alleviate traffic problems.

**ACTION:** Note comments to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Gray) – Object to proposed new housing development at Woodseaves due to existing residential properties, loss of character and natural beauty, overcapacity of the local road network and A519, insufficient retail, education and community facilities, lack of gas supply, impact on village life, lack of local

employment leading to increased commuting and environmental damage as well as a lack of bus services. Woodseaves should not be singled out for increased housing whilst villages such as Weston have better transport and community facilities but less proposed development. Stafford should be the main focus for more housing.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the preferred development locations for Woodseaves.

8.44 No responses received

Spatial Options 9 No responses received

Table 8.12 1 response (Mr Pert) – Questions the scale of new development at Woodseaves as the current village has few facilities, no employment thus leading to commuting, a fast A road running through it although acknowledges available land. Some level of development would, however, be healthy to maintain existing services & facilities

**ACTION:** Noted general comments regarding Woodseaves.

8.46 2 responses received

1 response (Mr P Thompson) – Concern about a further retail unit being developed at Woodseaves alongside new housing development which could have a significant impact on the existing business. The existing shop provides a full range of services & facilities to meet current & future needs.

**ACTION:** Noted commercial implications for Woodseaves.

1 response (Cllr R M Smith) – Existing land within the Residential Development Boundary should be used before greenfield areas – suggest part but not all of WO-2. Question to suggestion of new services & facilities next to the school as opposed to any other location, although may not be viable in the context of the actual number of houses built. Woodseaves school is currently full due to parental choice but additional homes may require a new classroom. Sustainable commuting patterns and workplaces will change over the Plan period so do not accept new employment needed at Woodseaves.

**ACTION:** Note general comments regarding Woodseaves.

## Yarnfield (YN) and Tittensor (TT) – Housing Location Option

8 responses received of which 2 PDF responses and 6 responses

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – Concern about the sustainability of Yarnfield site due to Regional Spatial Strategy focus on Stafford.

**ACTION:** Noted and consider as part of the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mrs S Hughes for Yarnfield Village Forum) – Relates to the BT site and disappointment about no public exhibition in the village. Prefer BT site development than wider Green Belt incursions but require clarity about the scale and nature of development – including just the redundant buildings or more? Concern about social interactions with greater number of people in the village, particularly due to lack of services & facilities which would need to be enhanced including for sport & recreation. There is particular concern about the fact that car ownership will increase exponentially with further new development and existing road infrastructure is narrow with a lack of footpaths and implications for safety near the school. Additional housing will only reinforce the dormitory aspect of the village, as there is little or no local employment and long distance commuting takes place. Existing flooding problems have been alleviated by balancing ponds but could be exacerbated by new housing development. Furthermore poor sewage infrastructure and over-capacity is causing problems in parts of the village which requires action.

**ACTION:** Noted with sewerage and road infrastructure to be considered as part of the Yarnfield preferred development location.

1 response (K & M Round) – Concern about the new housing development at Yarnfield due to adverse impact on the village. There are more sustainable and accessible locations with better services & facilities. Concern about impact on wildlife and local environment, as well as construction traffic and conflict with school safety. Significant education & transport infrastructure would be needed including for public transport alongside other services & facilities.

**ACTION:** Noted general comments about new development at Yarnfield to be considered with preferred development location.

1 response (P & C Brosnan) – Concern about access road to Yarnfield based on existing and potential increase in users. Infrastructure improvements including for the school should be put in place first. Conflict with Government policy on reducing carbon emissions due to unsustainable location and need to travel for work. Concern about lack of public involvement in the process and no exhibition in Yarnfield.

**ACTION:** Noted general comments to be considered as part of the preferred development approach for Yarnfield.

1 response (Malcolm Payne Group for Hackberry Developments) – Support for development at client's land BT training centre of existing uses and derelict areas for mixed use development. Investigations and public consultation already carried out for

a phased residential development starting 2011 to sustain and improve existing training and recreational facilities.

**ACTION:** Note support for client's land at Yarnfield.

1 response (G & G Jones) – Concern about new development at Yarnfield with impact on the local road network and conflict with a full school and its safety, lack of services & facilities being exacerbated by new housing. Lack of public transport and pavements. No exhibition held in Yarnfield.

**ACTION:** Noted general comments to be considered as part of the preferred development approach for Yarnfield.

1 response (Mr N Peak) – Strong objection to new housing development and Dominos sport centre site at Yarnfield with lack of public exhibition and involvement. Lack of services & facilities, transport infrastructure including lighting and pavements out of the village, flooding problems and anti-social behaviour. A new access road directly to the BT training site would be needed from A34.

**ACTION:** Noted general comments regarding Yarnfield preferred development location with transport and service provision considered.

1 response (P and G Walter) – Concern about lack of public exhibition at Yarnfield, Yarnfield Lane is unsafe despite recent improvements for a variety of different users due to a lack of footpaths, the road has poor visibility and floods frequently.

**ACTION:** Investigate local road infrastructure as part of Yarnfield preferred development location.

Spatial Options 10      1 response (Malcolm Payne Group for Hackberry Developments) – Support for development at client's land BT training centre of existing uses and derelict areas for mixed use development. Investigations and public consultation already carried out for a phased residential development starting 2011 to sustain and improve existing training and recreational facilities.  
**ACTION:** Note support for client's land at Yarnfield.

Table 8.13      1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford) – Residential development at Yarnfield should be considered between Yarnfield Lane and the BT training centre through a modest Green Belt amendment to support integration and new facilities.  
**ACTION:** Note support for new development on client's land.

Spatial Options 11      2 responses received

1 response (Fisher German for Mr Thomas) – Concern about new housing development at Tittensor as not reflecting sustainable locations being promoted through the Regional Spatial Strategy.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration at Development Strategy approach.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Bassett Group Holdings Ltd) – Support use of client’s site for new housing development at Tittensor, already served by infrastructure including public transport as a better use of the site to support existing services & facilities. Question number of dwellings for existing building footprints in the Green Belt rising from 9 to 72 by reduced need for gardens and ancillary infrastructure. Promoting Green Belt element of site for residential at 3.3 hectares but accepts the existing Residential Development Boundary element. Suggest an amendment to the Green Belt boundary to facilitate residential development.

ACTION: Noted for consideration of preferred development location at Tittensor.

Table 8.14 No responses received

8.47 – 8.49 No responses received

8.50 1 response (McDyre & Co for Bassett Group Holdings Ltd) – Concern about over-estimating implications on the North Staffordshire conurbation. RENEW Areas of Intervention are mainly north of Hanley and along A50 corridor so some distance from Tittensor site which is a regeneration initiative to bring housing to support the area. There is no evidence to support the effect of new development on the RENEW areas and in terms of competition this would be limited between market housing in the North Staffordshire conurbation and middle – upper market homes at Tittensor.

ACTION: Noted for consideration at Development Strategy approach.

## **Employment Outside Stafford and Stone**

---

8.51 No responses received

8.52 1 response (Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd) – Support further employment allocation at Ladfordfields Recognised Industrial Estate (RIE) and 10 hectares of company owned land in a northerly direction to enable expansion of this significant Borough employer whilst not on best & most versatile agricultural land, not requiring a new access onto the B5405 and having limited landscape visual implications. Support the long term consideration of employment areas outside of Stafford and Stone in line with emerging PPS4. Oppose western development option of Ladfordfields RIE due to requirement for new access onto the B5405 road.

ACTION: Note support for company’s land at Ladfordfields RIE.

Spatial Options 12 No responses received

Table 8.15 No responses received



8.53 1 response (Mr J Allen) – Traffic accessing the Raleigh Hall Recognised Industrial Estate (RIE) causes problems in the centre of Eccleshall.

ACTION: Noted and consider with preferred development locations at Raleigh Hall RIE with reference to SCC Transport Department.

Spatial Options 13 No responses received

8.54 3 responses received

1 response (Mr J Pert) – Concern about increased employment development at Raleigh Hall and Cold Meece due to lack of facilities, creation of sub-centres outside of existing villages, reducing local employment, impact on local road network and more sustainable locations at Stafford thus reducing road miles for freight, air and noise pollution & congestion.

ACTION: Noted and consider through Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mrs Von Elbing) – Objects to traffic generated through Eccleshall town centre and opposes residential development at Raleigh Hall to avoid a new settlement.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd) – Supports future employment on client's land RH-b with suggestion of residential or mixed use development next to biomass unit. Part of the land is previously developed and would be deliverable in line with PPS3 paragraph 54.

ACTION: Noted and consider through the Development Strategy and preferred development at Raleigh Hall.

8.55 No responses received

## CHAPTER 9 – DELIVERING A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE

---

### 9. Delivering a Sustainable Future

2 responses

1 response (Stone Town Council) – A number of specific comments to particular paragraph numbers as set out below.

There should be no encroachment on Green Belt land between Stone and Barlaston (para 9.2). ACTION: Agreed.

All services and facilities to be in place before any development starts (para 9.3)

ACTION: Noted but unrealistic for most schemes.

Object to use of hydrocarbon energy resources due to landscape impacts (para 9.12)

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Energy policy.

Support 10 year timescale for zero carbon standards using Building Regulations (para 9.18). ACTION: Noted.

Major Developed Sites and Tittensor sites to be considered prior to Greenfield land but concern about loss of employment (para 9.24 – 9.26).

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Development Strategy approach.

Prefer brownfield development provided there is no loss of employment land and job opportunities. Object to infill / garden land development (para 9.36)

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Development Strategy approach.

More affordable starter homes are needed in Stone alongside job opportunities to support and attract young people. Careful consideration of shared ownership housing is needed (para 9.40-9.41).

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Stone delivery approach.

Support proportion of lifetime homes for the older population (para 9. 46).

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stone development discussions.

Housing development over 12 houses to include affordable homes and support threshold figures for settlements of under 3,000 in population (para 9.63).

ACTION: Noted support for policy approach.

Support the natural environment (para 9.104) ACTION: Noted.

Support continued protection of open space and green networks to include Tilling Drive, Walton Heath, Westbridge Park, the Common Plot, the north and south meadows (para 9.113).

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stone development discussions.

Object to new telecommunication masts in Stone due to possible effects of non-ionising radiation (para 9.120). ACTION: Noted.

Consider that infrastructure and facility improvements to be installed prior to development and support smaller scale facilities closer to communities, ensuring deliverability (para 9.135).

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stone development discussions.

People of Stone object to any new development in the future as well as substantial increase in housing. There have been 2,190 completions and committed developments in Stone. Object to any development without detailed consultation between Stafford Borough Council and Stone Town Council. Use unoccupied properties. Future development to be small scale and spread across multiple locations. Green space to be included in new and between existing housing. Object to potential housing locations in Stone and Eccleshall due to impact on local road network particularly Lichfield Road, Walton area and Eccleshall Road from increased volumes of traffic. Object to new development without new roads, footpaths and cycle access including new link road across the railway at SN-1 to avoid traffic congestion.

New roundabout needed on the A51 with B5027. Object to employment development at SN-a with new development at SN-b on the west side of A34.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stone development discussions.

Support a new health centre in Stone on a brownfield site or extension of current facilities (para 9.181). ACTION: Noted.

Agree with no new housing and employment development in floodplain areas (para 9.182) ACTION: Noted.

Support improved biodiversity, increased accessibility, improved recreation and leisure facilities particularly for young and older people at Westbridge Park but object to commercial or residential uses. Support community and leisure facilities between access road and canal as well as football pitches retained for public open space (para 9.183).

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stone development discussions.

Support Sustainable Drainage Systems and water resource capacity. Support small and medium sized enterprises (para 9.190 & 9.195). ACTION: Noted.

Support town centre expansion of appropriate scale when necessary. Boundary extended to centre of Christchurch Way and north to Stonefield Square, extended pedestrianised area and link road from Margaret Street to Radford Street. Support new retail development (para 9.198).

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stone development discussions and Town Centre boundary changes.

1 response (Hine) - Climate change must be at the heart of Stafford Borough's LDF, must set targets for reductions in carbon emissions and establish a system of effective monitoring and compliance to meet 80% reduction in emissions by 2050 required by law.

ACTION: Noted with Preferred Strategy to include a policy on Climate Change.

9.1 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Support the use of 'local evidence' which is to be referenced.

ACTION: Noted with Preferred Strategy to include local evidence information.

9.2 2 responses

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Support brownfield urban regeneration of North Staffordshire and the phased approach for development in the north of Stafford Borough.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred development strategy.

1 response (Mr D'Arcy) - The Borough should insist on built-in sustainability factors in housing design.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred approach Design policy.

9.3 1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) – Agrees with the fact that the scale of new development will have significant resource, service and facilities implications. Highlighting that concentrating development on the land north of Stafford town would support and expand upon the extensive range of existing services and facilities, and transport links this would make funds and deliverability more viable.

Development on the northern side of Stafford town is sufficiently far away from the North Staffordshire conurbation to minimise effects on the RENEW urban regeneration programme as well as reducing the need to extend to the south of Stafford town which would have implications on the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, neighbouring Districts and require a new distributor road.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development discussions.

9.4 3 responses

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Queries the knowledge of local issues and ability of public to react without the scale of development in individual areas being available.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr D'Arcy) – Query vagueness of statement concerning new development provision affecting local issues.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Dale) – Query the scale of development at Hixon despite having no "good range of services".

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Hixon development discussions.

9.5 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Consideration to be given to transport routes and links between locations rather than individual areas in isolation.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred development strategy approach and specific settlements.

9.6 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Greater level of information required to show the evidence base.

ACTION: Noted to be provided through the preferred approach.

## **Stafford Borough area**

---

### **Climate change**

9.7 No responses

9.8 1 response (Jones) – Object to new development in Little & Great Haywood due to the additional cars journeys created, lack of public transport and employment with other more sustainable transport accessible areas.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Haywoods development discussions.

## Energy

9.9 1 response (McDyre and Co for Raleigh Hall Properties) – Supports commitments to promoting sources of renewable energy. Promoting the client's land for residential as well as employment development at Raleigh Hall being supported by the biomass unit providing renewable energy.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred development strategy and Raleigh Hall development discussions.

9.10 No responses received.

9.11 2 responses

1 response (Mrs Von Ebling) – Considers that renewable energy sources should be expanded beyond biomass to application in new housing and employment developments, through grant funding where applicable.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Renewable Energy preferred policy approach.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Considers that greater use should be made of renewable energy resources including biomass from Cannock Chase, more small-scale wind and solar projects in Stafford, home energy generation using tariffs and energy efficiency / conservation initiatives.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Renewable Energy preferred policy approach.

9.12 1 response (Dr Oliver) - Support methane burning from landfill or old workings to reduce the effects of greenhouse gas emissions. ACTION: Noted

## On site renewable energy

9.13 4 Responses

1 response (Mrs Von Ebling) – Support a policy for on-site renewable energy with new development to offset environmental costs. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England) – Climate change is a significant threat and therefore support a policy using the Merton rule for on site renewable energy.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Renewable Energy preferred policy approach

1 response (William Davis Ltd) – Concerned that a requirement to provide a proportion of development site's energy through on-site renewable energy sources could highly constrain delivery. Any requirement for renewable energy within residential development sites must be based on a robust and credible evidence base which proves that such a requirement would not result in sites becoming unviable.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Renewable Energy preferred policy approach

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Support application of on-site renewable energy policy so address climate change. ACTION: Noted.

---

## Code for sustainable homes

### 9.14 3 responses

1 response (Mrs Von Ebling) – Strongly support adopting the Code for Sustainable Homes. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (McCarthy and Stone Ltd) – Concern about the cost of on site renewable energy generation affecting development viability with consideration needed in terms of increased cost of building developments and provision of other planning policy objectives i.e. affordable housing and other planning contributions which will need to be reduced to achieve these levels of sustainable construction.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Design preferred policy approach

1 response (William Davis Ltd) – Concern about the current economic climate and locally specific requirements to provide the Code for Sustainable Homes increasing development costs leading to less viable development sites being available thus impacting on the delivery of housing requirements. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Design preferred policy approach.

### 9.15 – 9.17 No responses

### 9.18 4 responses

1 response (Mr Clegg) – All new development to achieve at least code 4 star rating Code for Sustainable Homes. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs Von Ebling) – All new housing development before 2016 to be carbon neutral due to scale of growth. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England) – Due to global warming issues the highest possible sustainable homes standard should be achieved. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Deliver the highest environmental and energy status for new homes. ACTION: Noted.

## Green Belt areas

9.19 – 9.20 No responses

9.21 3 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates – Residential development at Yarnfield should not be confined to the Major Developed Site (YN-1) but provide for a modest amendment to the Green Belt boundary off Yarnfield Lane enabling better development integration with the village.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy.

1 response (Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company Ltd) – Object to no alteration of Green Belt boundary with an amendment suggested at Barlaston for housing development within easy access of the new employment opportunities at the former Meaford Power site.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Bassett Group Holdings Ltd) – Supports Green Belt alterations at Bassetts Transport site, Tittensor to encompass the whole site as it does not perform Green Belt functions.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy.

9.22 – 9.24 No responses

9.25 1 response (Mr Clegg) – Object to development in the Green Belt but support limited use of brownfield development within the Green Belt.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy.

9.26 No responses

9.27 2 responses

1 response (Jones) - Brownfield should be developed over Greenfield.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy.

1 response (Councillor RM Smith) – Support the use of Major Developed Sites at Tittensor and Yarnfield for housing due to existing infrastructure and would reduce the need for Greenfield sites at other locations.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy

## Housing

### Design

9.28 No responses

9.29 1 response (Jones) - Development should be directed to sustainable transport locations rather than rural areas increasing car use, apart from minor in-fill development. ACTION: Noted.

9.30 7 responses

1 response (British Waterways Wales and Border Counties) – Good urban design is critical for canalside development sites to optimise the physical, social and economic benefits, utilise the water resource asset and apply positive measures.  
ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Clegg) – Critical for a clear design standard for high quality development to be adopted to achieve the Council's vision. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey Ltd) – Support high quality residential design but considers it is too simplistic to seek CABI Silver and Gold standards as rigid requirements due to the other housing requirements for design, price and need as well as integration which may require alternative design approaches. Masterplans are valued but should include flexibility to account for changes in housing types, standards, infrastructure, other requirements and opportunities.

ACTION: Noted to be considered in the context of Regional Spatial Strategy policies.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) – Support high quality residential design but considers it is too simplistic to seek CABI Silver and Gold standards as rigid requirements due to the other housing requirements for design, price and need as well as integration which may require alternative design approaches. Masterplans are valued but should include flexibility to account for changes in housing types, standards, infrastructure, other requirements and opportunities.

ACTION: Noted to be considered in the context of Regional Spatial Strategy policies.

1 response (Mr Dale) – Hixon fails to meet the factors listed and therefore the scale of development should be reduced.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Hixon development discussions.

1 response (Sports England) – Design policy to refer to 'active design' for increasing opportunities for outdoor play, walking, cycling, signage etc. and contributes to the vision to improve health.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred option Design policy.

1 response (William Davis Ltd) - Supports the requirement of CABI's Building for Life Silver Standard to achieve high quality design with monitoring leading to the Gold Standard if justified. Support comprehensive master planning on large strategic developments. ACTION: Noted.



## Residential Density

### 9.31 4 Responses

1 response (Mr Pert) – Supports a locally based housing density policy for specific sites to avoid over-development. ACTION: Noted

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey Ltd) – Density should be considered at the site specific level to take account of characteristics, constraints, housing types, opportunities and viability. Appreciate the need to deliver at higher site density to reduce the Greenfield land take. ACTION: Noted

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) – Density should be considered at the site specific level to take account of characteristics, constraints, housing types, opportunities and viability. Appreciate the need to deliver at higher site density to reduce the Greenfield land take. ACTION: Noted

1 response (William Davis Ltd) – Support site specific housing density approach to provide for surroundings and high quality development supported by robust and credible local evidence for such flexibility. ACTION: Noted.

9.32 1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) – Recognise the priority of brownfield over Greenfield development but the setting of simple targets or site phasing is too simplistic an approach which may inhibit delivering the required quantum of housing. A more sophisticated method would be to prioritise housing development, with previously developed land in sustainable locations first and Greenfield locations taking account of infrastructure requirements and lead-in times. This would provide a more robust phasing approach to ensure delivery of brownfield and Greenfield sites. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy as well as reference to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy work.

9.33 – 9.35 No responses

### 9.36 7 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Recognise the priority of brownfield over Greenfield development but the setting of simple targets or site phasing is too simplistic an approach which may inhibit delivering the required quantum of housing. A more sophisticated method would be to prioritise housing development, with previously developed land in sustainable locations first and Greenfield locations taking account of infrastructure requirements and lead-in times. This would provide a more robust phasing approach to ensure delivery of brownfield and Greenfield sites.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy as well as reference to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy work.

1 response (Jones) - Brownfield must be given priority over Greenfield to preserve the rural environment. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - Brownfield must be given priority over Greenfield despite market forces to develop cheaper land.

ACTION: Noted

1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) - Priority should be given to housing development on brownfield land in line with PPS3, but a locally specific brownfield land target should not be set due to the scale of development proposed in Stafford Borough, lack of account for windfalls in the first 10 years and uncertainty over delivery. Large scale Greenfield land releases will be required to meet RSS requirements.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy.

1 response (Natural England) - Previously developed land to follow a sequential approach to exclude areas / sites that have significant biodiversity and geological interest of recognised local importance, in line with PPS9 and UK Biodiversity Action Plan. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates) – The sequential approach for brownfield land is not included in PPS3 and therefore should not apply through local planning policy with the emphasis now focused on delivery not to be constrained by this theoretical approach.

ACTION: Noted with PPS3 considered when preparing the Housing preferred policy approach.

1 response (Dr Oliver) - Supports the continued use of brownfield over Greenfield development. ACTION: Noted.

## Housing Mix

9.37 – 9.39 No responses

9.40 1 response (Mr Clegg) - Supports the mixed communities approach.  
ACTION: Noted.

9.41 5 Responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey Ltd) – Recognise mixed and inclusive communities will require additions to the housing stock through a mix of tenure, sizes and types but should be considered alongside existing housing stock to ensure a balance of smaller and larger houses in localities. Larger houses may be required to meet modern living standards and flexibility on household sizes. Therefore it is considered wholly inappropriate that a policy should be advanced to specify the mix of housing to be delivered on any site.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred option Housing policy.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) – Recognise mixed and inclusive communities will require additions to the housing stock through a mix of tenure, sizes and types but should be considered alongside existing housing stock to ensure a balance of smaller and larger houses in localities. Larger houses may be required to meet modern living standards and flexibility on household sizes. Therefore it is considered wholly inappropriate that a policy should be advanced to specify the mix of housing to be delivered on any site.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred option Housing policy.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Object to the market and development industry delivering larger houses and small gardens which do not meet local need for smaller homes for first time buyers and older people wishing to downsize, particularly in Eccleshall.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through Preferred option Housing policy and Eccleshall development discussions.

1 response (Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates) – PPS3 states that developers (not the local planning authority) should determine the mix for market housing whilst local authorities should ensure that affordable housing reflects the size and type of affordable housing required.

ACTION: Noted with reference to PPS3 when preparing the Housing preferred policy approach.

1 response (William Davis Ltd)- Object to any policy which seeks to establish a prescriptive requirement on the range and mix of housing types expected in new housing developments with PPS3 stating local authorities to identify the likely profile of household types only. ACTION: Noted with reference to PPS3 when preparing the Housing preferred policy approach.

9.42 - 9.45 No responses

9.46 3 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey Ltd) – The principle of providing lifetime homes that can be adapted to meet changing household requirement over time is not considered a wholly effective approach. An alternative approach is to promote the delivery of larger homes, which have more scope and space for whatever adaptations are necessary to meet the needs of any particular household.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred Housing policy.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) – The principle of providing lifetime homes that can be adapted to meet changing household requirement over time is not considered a wholly effective approach. An alternative approach is to promote the delivery of larger homes, which have more scope and space for whatever adaptations are necessary to meet the needs of any particular household.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Housing policy.

1 response (William Davis Ltd) - Object to Lifetime Homes requirement in the Core Strategy for new housing schemes before 2013 and national guidance which would add additional costs to residential development and could constrain housing delivery in the current economic climate. ACTION: Noted.

## **Specialist Housing**

### 9.47 2 Responses

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – The elderly should be supported to remain in their own home / community rather than moving to a retirement village. Consultation with Age Concern and other groups required. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (William Davis Ltd) - Specialist elderly housing should be created on sites specifically designed for the elderly's specialist needs rather than providing housing within major housing schemes. ACTION: Noted for consideration through the preferred development strategy.

9.48 1 response (McCarthy & Stone Ltd) – The Core Strategy should include policies to encourage the development of specialist accommodation for older people by allocating specific sites as well as larger housing allocations specifically stipulate a percentage of units that should be provided for sheltered or extra care housing, due to the anticipated increase in the elderly population over the Plan period. ACTION: Noted.

9.49 No responses

## **Neighbourhood Policing**

9.50 1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Support the provision and funding of Neighbourhood Policing Units to serve new developments. ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Preferred development Section 106 / Community Infrastructure Levy policy.

## **Location of Housing Development**

9.51 No responses

## **Rural Areas and Conversions to Residential Use**

9.52 2 responses

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Greater mitigation measures are required on conversion of rural buildings to residential use to protect biodiversity and species with strict oversight on planning permission to preserve the rural living environment. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Dale) – The scale of development in Hixon since 1991 should be taken into account.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Hixon development locations discussion.

9.53 No responses

9.54 3 responses

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Support the rural economic development of small business units in the countryside close to people's homes but must take account of additional noise and pollution. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Dr Oliver) - Supports sensitive rural economic conversions to the existing developments and culture but object to conversions increasing pollution or heavy goods vehicle movements. ACTION: Noted

1 response (Councillor R M Smith) – Agree with sensitive rural economic conversions but consider it is wrong to be prescriptive that buildings should be converted preferably for commercial use. Each case should be considered on its merits with modern technology enabling more people to work from home in 'office' type jobs and therefore a conversion to residential use may be entirely appropriate.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Housing / Employment preferred policy approach.

### **Affordable Housing**

9.55 No responses

9.56 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – There should be a mix of housing in areas to supported mixed communities with increased smaller starter homes / downsizing properties in Eccleshall. ACTION: Noted.

9.57 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – A clear definition of affordable homes is required.

ACTION: Noted for inclusion in the Preferred development strategy and make reference to Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs).

9.58 – 9.60 No responses

9.61 1 response (South Staffordshire Housing Association) – The provision of affordable housing can not be delivered by grant funding from the Homes & Communities Agency alone but will require other measures. ACTION: Noted.

9.62 No responses

9.63 1 response (South Staffordshire Housing Association) – Supports the principle of thresholds but further evidence should be carried out analysing development site sizes across Stafford Borough in last 3 years to compare threshold delivery. Threshold size should be capable of generating maximum affordable housing and should be seen as a tool for this, not an absolute. Consideration should be given to

altering the rural settlement limit of 3,000 population due to Government definitions or urban and rural areas at 10,000 population.

Point (c) of this section is confusing. It can be read that all sites of 4 - 7 units in settlements of under 3,000 population do not have to make on site affordable housing provision and can only make a commuted sum payment. There is also no mention of arrangements for sites of 1 - 3 units. Given the 40% affordable housing target (i.e. a 3 unit site would produce 1.2 affordable homes) it would be clearer to say that all sites of 3 and over should have to make on site provision for affordable housing with sites of 1 and 2 units having to either pay a commuted sum or having a different threshold (for example, 1: 1 provision of affordable housing).

It also needs to be clear that commuted sums should be used for meeting the need for affordable housing across the Borough, not just limited to exception need housing, thus providing maximum flexibility for providing affordable housing.

**ACTION:** Noted with changes to be made through the preferred Affordable Housing policy and Supplementary Planning Documents.

#### 9.64 2 responses

1 response (South Staffordshire Housing Association) - Affordable housing should be distributed across a site not concentrated in one area. However, to assist with effective management small clusters across the site and not "peppercotted" is preferred. Support design, layout and appearance being tenure blind.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Affordable Housing preferred policy.

1 response (Mrs Wright) – Object to the development of affordable housing together with market housing because of the impact on land values and lack of respect for the area by social rented occupants including frequently vacated rented houses.

**ACTION:** Noted.

#### 9.65 2 responses

1 response (McCarthy & Stone Ltd) – Suggest that proportion of affordable housing based on total units will encourage larger properties on schemes seeking to be below the thresholds. Affordable housing should be based on the percentage of bedspaces being fairer to apartment developers.

**ACTION:** Noted with changes through the preferred Affordable Housing policy and SPD work.

1 response (South Staffordshire Housing Association) - Support the approach of preventing phasing and / or separate applications being used to circumvent the policy for providing affordable housing with regard to layout and density.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the preferred Affordable Housing policy.

9.66 2 responses

1 response (South Staffordshire Housing Association) – Supports the approach of considering housing schemes on abutting sites as one site to prevent circumvention of affordable housing by splitting sites.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Affordable Housing policy.

1 response (Councillor R M Smith) - Deliberately splitting sites is clearly a means of circumventing policy and should be avoided. ACTION: Noted.

9.67 No responses

9.68 1 response (South Staffordshire Housing Association) - Commuted sums need to be tightly controlled to prevent developers and others using them to "get out" of making on site provision of affordable housing. Thresholds must be rigorous.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Affordable Housing policy.

9.69 1 response (McCarthy & Stone Ltd) – Thresholds can affect development viability and delivery of affordable housing with sites to be considered on individual merits. Reference should be made to economies of provision for residential development. ACTION: Noted with reference to economic viability assessment through the preferred Affordable Housing policy.

9.70 5 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) – Object to threshold levels which should be related to sustainable settlements selected to accommodate growth. Elsewhere the threshold should be one dwelling with 100% affordable housing provision, unless the dwelling is essential for agricultural or forestry workers. Affordable housing to be based on development viability with no greater amount of affordable housing being sought than can be purchased from the developer by appropriate Registered Social Landlord, at a minimum of dwelling construction cost. Percentage of affordable housing based on up to date needs assessments. Sub division of sites to avoid affordable housing thresholds is no accepted.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Affordable Housing policy.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Object to threshold levels which should be related to sustainable settlements selected to accommodate growth. Elsewhere the threshold should be one dwelling with 100% affordable housing provision, unless the dwelling is essential for agricultural or forestry workers. Affordable housing to be based on development viability with no greater amount of affordable housing being sought than can be purchased from the developer by appropriate Registered Social Landlord, at a minimum of dwelling construction cost. Percentage of affordable housing based on up to date needs assessments. Sub division of sites to avoid affordable housing thresholds is no accepted.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Affordable Housing policy.

1 response (South Staffordshire Housing Association) - The wording of the Practice Note and / or Supplementary Planning Document needs to be clear, specific, robust and enforceable with cross references to other similar Council documents, such as an Affordable Housing Guide. All documents need to support one another and there should be no gaps or contradictions.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Affordable Housing policy and SPD work.

1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) – Object to the 40% affordable housing contribution with the policy to be based on a 'financial viability' test to balance requirements against abnormal and other infrastructure costs involved in bringing forward development sites. Current economic climate and falling house prices means less affordable homes are required. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (William Davis Ltd) - Consider the 40% affordable housing target is too high and would constrain the economic viability of housing developments in the Borough. An economic viability assessment should be carried out on proposed proportions and thresholds.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through evidence based work.

9.71 – 9.72 No responses

9.73 1 response (South Staffordshire Housing Association) – Support for the rural exception policy to meeting local housing need in rural areas.  
ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Affordable Housing / Rural Exception policy.

9.74 No responses

9.75 2 responses

1 response (South Staffordshire Housing Association) - Support a Rural Lettings Policy but should not conflict with any Section 106 Agreement requirements. Need should be a key consideration rather than desire for downsizing.  
ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Affordable Housing policy.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Policy requires better explanation.  
ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Affordable Housing / Rural Exception policy.

9.76 No responses

9.77 3 responses

2 responses (South Staffordshire Housing Association) - A needs based approach to exceptions site is preferred to a specific allocation approach as it is more flexible and can avoid the inflation of land costs, problems of "hope value" and lack of engagement with Parish Councils being dictated to with a specific site allocation. Rural Housing Enabler can act as an "honest broker" to deliver local housing need. Links between documents and policy is necessary.



ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Affordable Housing / Rural Exception policy.

1 response (Councillor R M Smith) – Proving the need for ‘affordable homes’ at a Parish level can be very difficult. Affordable housing should be prescribed to particular areas as a proportion based on the size of existing settlements.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Affordable Housing / Rural Exception policy, based on need rather than settlement assessment.

## **Travelling Families**

2 responses

1 response (Friends, Families and Travellers) - The need requirements for the Borough should be translated into site-specific allocations with the Core Strategy setting criteria for sites and meeting unexpected demand. Site allocations should be identified in advance of the RSS Phase 3 Revision, anticipated for adoption in Autumn 2011.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through preferred Gypsy & Traveller policy.

1 response (Mr T Smith) – Land suggested for new gypsy and traveller site at Wadden Lane and A518 Uttoxetter Road, Gayton. ACTION: Noted.

9.78-9.84 No responses

9.85 1 response (Mrs Vaughan) – Object to any more traveller's sites in the Borough but if more sites are allowed it would be better to have one large site with its own facilities or extension of existing sites. ACTION: Noted.

9.86 No responses.

9.87 1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Welcome section on Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs, an important RSS theme. ACTION: Noted.

## **Employment**

1 response (Jones) – Object to development proposals for Little Haywood and Great Haywood due to lack of employment provision.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through The Haywoods development locations discussion.

9.88 – 9.89 No responses

9.90 1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) – In line with PPS4 the designation of employment sites should be unrestricted where possible except if specific employment types are suited to particular sites through locational requirements or constraints at a particular location. Land north of ProLogis / Primepoint could be

allocated for B8 uses due to motorway access and noisy industries kept away for new housing development.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the preferred Employment policy.

9.91 No responses

9.92 1 response (Mrs Wright) - Employment land should be reused for employment rather than housing. ACTION: Noted.

## **Transport**

### **Car Parking**

9.93 No responses

### **Cycling**

9.94 1 response (Natural England) - New walking and cycling routes to be integrated with green infrastructure to optimise the benefits.

ACTION: Noted and agree with approach.

## **Green Infrastructure**

9.95 2 responses

1 response (Woodland Trust) – Support reference to woodland's beneficial role in contributing to the delivery of multi-functional green infrastructure and support the production of a Green Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document as part of the LDF process. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England) - Stafford and Stone have green space and surrounding rural areas to be improved and enhanced to create a strong green infrastructure and support biodiversity throughout the Borough which bring many benefits both in quality of life and economic terms. The importance of Cannock Chase as a designated AONB, SSSI and SAC should be recognised and its future management and enhancement built in to ensure the area is protected, enhanced and amenity use is sustainable. Accessible green links between Stafford and Cannock Chase should be encouraged. Green infrastructure is a key element of the new Development Plan. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Green Infrastructure preferred policy.

9.96 No responses

9.97 1 response (Dr Oliver) – Support adoption of standards.  
ACTION: Noted.

9.98 3 Responses

1 response (Woodland Trust) – The LDF to lead in promoting policies for robust protection of ancient woodland and ancient trees. The biodiversity section should

contain a specific reference to climate change, both in terms of the direct threats to biodiversity through an inability to adapt to changing conditions, and also the potential for biodiversity to contribute towards mitigation and adaptation strategies to combat climate change effects. Landscape conservation measures should be promoted for biodiversity, climate change, reduce habitat fragmentation and improve land management. Green infrastructure policy to deliver Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan and biodiversity enhancement. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Environment / Green Infrastructure preferred policy and include a section identifying biodiversity enhancement areas.

1 response (Mr D'Arcy) – All new development to meet Woodland Trust's five points.  
ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Sport England) – Green infrastructure includes outdoor sport and recreation which should be linked through the Green Infrastructure SPD. A comprehensive sport and recreation SPD which encapsulates both outdoor and indoor sport to ensure policy is properly informed by the needs and opportunities assessments recommended in PPG17 is required.

ACTION: Noted with links between Green Infrastructure and PPG17 Assessment / Open Space, Sport & Recreation Strategy.

## **Natural Environment**

9.99– 9.100 No responses

9.101 2 responses

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Identifying specific development sites to consider habitat loss in recent years. ACTION: Noted

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Avoid further losses of wetlands to ensure areas around and within Stafford are available for water storage and natural flood protection as climate change and extreme weather events increase. ACTION: Noted

9.102 1 response (Dr Oliver) – Welcome a renewal of coppicing and sustainable woodland management to support rural income from firewood sales as the sale of wood burners expands. ACTION: Noted.

9.103 No responses

9.104 3 responses

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Agree that new development should avoid flood risk areas and potential climate change impacts.  
ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England) - Support the principle of a green infrastructure policy contributing to the delivery of the Biodiversity Action Plan and biodiversity enhancement. However it may be challenging to ensure the detailed requirements of PPS 9 will be adequately covered through a broad Green Infrastructure policy.

ACTION: Noted for consideration in the context of PPS9 to establish requirements at the local level through the Environment / Green Infrastructure preferred policy.

1 response (Dr Oliver) - Agree that new development should avoid flood risk areas and potential climate change impacts.

ACTION: Noted.

## **Flood Risk**

9.105 No responses

9.106 3 Responses

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Support reference to Sustainable Drainage Systems to improve infiltration rates and new development to be 20% more efficient than greenfield locations. Hope that measures such as using porous material for driveways can be included in new developments to facilitate 'natural' drainage.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Kirby) - Possible developments in Hixon may cause developments in the valley either side of Egg Lane to flood due to problems with culvert under Church Lane.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Hixon development locations discussion.

1 response (Dr Oliver) - Support reference to Sustainable Drainage Systems to improve infiltration rates and new development to be 20% more efficient than greenfield locations. ACTION: Noted.

## **Landscape Character**

9.107 2 responses

1 response (Mr D'Arcy) - Limitations to the height of warehouses to the north of Stafford remains crucial to retain the present landscape.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - As above

9.108 No responses

9.109 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Support the use of Historic Landscape Characterisation Assessment but would have wished greater local consultation. The aesthetics of landscapes around Eccleshall should be taken into account.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Eccleshall development locations discussion.

9.110 No responses

### **Open Space Sports and Recreation**

1 response (Mr Prior) - There is an urgent need to provide adequate sports & leisure facilities in Stafford due to scale of new development. Many of the existing facilities are inadequate or the services are being rationalised.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

9.111 2 responses

1 response (Woodland Trust) support access to open green space to improve quality of life and local amenity provision. Woodland Access Standard, to be adopted into the new Plan, states that no person should live more than 500 metres from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2 hectares in size; there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20 hectares within 4 kilometres. Stafford Borough exhibits significantly below average accessibility to all wood types which should be addressed through the Green Infrastructure policy and SPD. Support identification and protection of open space and green networks.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) - Protected Open Space and Green Network designations should be subject to review. Sports requirements and facilities provision change over time and the delivery of significant levels of new development can be expected to fund additional provision, which may make some existing areas redundant.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach.

9.112 No responses

9.113 5 responses

1 response (British Waterways Wales and Border Counties) - Green routes along canal corridors should not prejudice the potential for the regeneration and development of the land adjacent to the canal itself, nor sterilise or limit activity along the corridor. Canals have a social, economic and environmental role to play of which the green aspect is one element.

ACTION: Noted although the canal network is not identified as protected open space or Green Network presently.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Protected Open Space and Green Network designations should be subject to review. Sports requirements and facilities provision change over time and the delivery of significant levels of new development can be expected to fund additional provision, which may make some existing areas redundant.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - Protected Open Space and Green Network designations should be subject to review. Sports requirements and facilities provision change over time and the delivery of significant levels of new development can be expected to fund additional provision, which may make some existing areas redundant.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach.

1 response (Natural England) - Open space, sport and recreation are aligned with green infrastructure as it forms part of multi-functional green space.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Sport England) – PPG17 protects all forms of open space but specific assets valued by Stafford residents could be protected for their specific provisions or because they are particularly threatened. Growth pressure in Stafford Borough may mean that some open space might be under pressure from housing development. Sports assets should be protected from development or apply a compensation role through the PPG17 Strategy prepared.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach.

## **Tourism**

### 9.114 2 responses

1 response (Mr Thorpe) - British Waterways need to create 12,000 new moorings over the next 10 years, offline, to free up capacity on the network to be delivered through small basins and marinas supporting the leisure industry.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Hughes) - The reopening of the Shrewsbury to Newport canal will create more tourism in the local area and boat movements will increase. The Plan should state that small-scale marinas and moorings with limited services will be acceptable, providing they meet certain conditions. ACTION: Noted.

### 9.115 5 responses

1 response (Mr Coventry) – Small marinas and basins should be allowed on the canal network to reduce the number of online moored boats which restrict travel speeds and drives away tourism due to time pressures created rather than a relaxed holiday experience. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (M Huscoe-James) - The plan should look positively at new canal / leisure developments within the Borough which brings valuable revenue, employment and visitors to the area. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gogerty) - Small scale basins and mooring with limited services are acceptable, outside existing settlements, and should be reflected in the Plan.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (British Waterways Wales and Border Counties) – Support the restoration and expansion with links to the Shropshire Union canal link and Norbury Junction scheme.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England)- Implications for the nearby Aqualate Mere RAMSAR site must be considered as part of the Plans' sustainability appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) including the proposal to restore the canal. It should be noted that canal water at Norbury Junction currently feeds Aqualate Mere Site of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserve and RAMSAR site.

ACTION: Noted to consider continued support due to HRA.

9.116 No responses

9.117 2 responses

1 response (British Waterways Wales and Border Counties) – Support a positive policy promoting appropriate development in the countryside to stimulate the rural economy building on the stated aims in the vision to promote 'green tourism'.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - Low cost chain hotels built at junction 14 are mostly used by business commuters stopping off from the M6 rather than supporting tourism. Difficult to see how Stafford Borough could sustain more tourism. Regarding new attractions these should be in keeping with the Borough's character and should meet sustainable principles.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Tourism preferred policy.

## **Telecommunications**

9.118 1 response (Mobile Operators Association) - The plan to include a generic policy facilitating telecommunications development whilst safeguarding the environment.

ACTION: Noted.

9.118-9.220 No responses

## **The County Town of Stafford**

---

2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - The objectives identified should properly recognise that a loss of agricultural land will be required to enable development requirements to be accommodated.

ACTION: The comments contained in the box are from previous consultations. Stafford's future development approach will require Greenfield development as noted elsewhere.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - The objectives identified should properly recognise that a loss of agricultural land will be required to enable development requirements to be accommodated.

ACTION: The comments contained in the box are from previous consultations. Stafford's future development approach will require Greenfield development as noted elsewhere.

## Housing

9.121-9.123 No responses

### A Changing Population

1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) – New housing development to provide for mix of housing types, tenures and affordability including for elderly people. An approach to create a large urban extension on the northern side of Stafford town would allow for a wide mix of housing types to be provided on a phased basis to respond to a changing population over a 15 year period, more deliverable than through small infill development.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Stafford development locations discussion.

9.124 1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - Any split in housing provision must respond to demands rather than expectations. The actual expressed demand will depend upon the desires of particular individual households, their financial position, and the ability of appropriate institutions and organisations to fund and manage such housing. It is submitted that whilst the provision of lifetime homes, specialist housing, extra care schemes should be encouraged, it would be wholly inappropriate to specify particular proportion of additional housing to specific types.

ACTION: Noted and consider through the Housing preferred policy approach in the context of significant elderly population increase over the Plan period.

9.125 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Any split in housing provision must respond to demands rather than expectations. The actual expressed demand will depend upon the desires of particular individual households, their financial position, and the ability of appropriate institutions and organisations to fund and manage such housing. It is submitted that whilst the provision of lifetime homes, specialist housing, extra care schemes should be encouraged, it would be wholly inappropriate to specify particular proportion of additional housing to specific types.

ACTION: Noted and consider through the Housing preferred policy approach in the context of significant elderly population increase over the Plan period.

9.126 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Redundant pubs should be converted for residential purposes to meet homelessness needs.

ACTION: Noted.

### Education provision

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - The need for development to fund additional schools or school places must be assessed on a case by case basis.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Planning Obligations policy and preferred development locations.



9.127 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – The Building for Schools programme is under threat due to the credit crunch. ACTION: Noted.

9.128 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - The need for development to fund additional schools or school places must be assessed on a case by case basis.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Planning Obligations policy and preferred development locations.

1 response (Sport England) – Joint services and facilities should be considered on school sites such as community facilities, libraries and police stations supported by joint funds and improving delivery.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Planning Obligations policy and preferred development locations.

## Health Care

2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - New health centres should be provided where they are required and the location for such facilities should be identified, at least in part, in the areas selected for expansion.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - New health centres should be provided where they are required and the location for such facilities should be identified, at least in part, in the areas selected for expansion.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

## Flood Risk

9.130 3 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Areas of flood risk should be protected from development, unless appropriate mitigation measures can be delivered. Areas of floodplain have an important role in the provision of green infrastructure. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - Areas of flood risk should be protected from development, unless appropriate mitigation measures can be delivered. Areas of floodplain have an important role in the provision of green infrastructure. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England) - Support the general principle of protecting floodplains but the location and quantity of floodplain provided for public access needs to be carefully considered and informed by potential and existing biodiversity interests such as ground nesting waders, through the Green Infrastructure strategy. ACTION: Noted.

## Green Infrastructure

1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) – Support extension of Stafford Common northwards along Marston Brook to create a linear park as part of a sustainable urban extension in the area. ACTION: Noted.

### 9.131 5 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Supports the positive recreational and leisure use of accessible green space, green networks and the river corridors through Stafford. Creation of sports hubs to serve various areas of Stafford would support flexibility and enable less utilised facilities to be released for other beneficial uses. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Cannock Chase Council) – Support a new country park at Stafford to reduce pressure on the Cannock Chase in light of the scale of new development.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Natural England) – Supports accessible green space close to existing and new housing development for quality of life and could avoid harmful effects on Cannock Chase SAC arising from development. Account should be taken of the Appropriate Assessment mitigation measures findings.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (D W Wright) – A new country park would be a longer term initiative in current economic climate with greater provision of smaller car parks to facilitate increased access to the existing network of footpaths, bridleways and cycle tracks should be delivered. ACTION: Noted

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Support a new country park in Stafford. ACTION: Noted

### 9.132 3 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support natural greenspace and green routes in Stafford including provision in the western direction of growth along the M6 corridor, connecting green routes to the town centre and restructuring existing facilities to provide a hub.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

2 responses as 1 response (Sport England) Support the PPG17 Assessment to be delivered through the LDF as policy or SPD as local standards for quantity, quality and accessibility.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy approach.

### 9.133 – 9.134 No responses

9.135 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support natural greenspace and green routes in Stafford including provision in the western direction of growth along the M6 corridor, connecting green routes to the town centre and restructuring existing facilities to provide a hub.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Natural England) – Support new facilities alongside new developments.

ACTION: Noted.

### **Provision of Utilities**

9.136 – 9.137 No responses

9.138 4 responses

1 response (British Waterways Wales and Border Counties) – Support Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) in principle but have concerns about lack of long term maintenance and performance for the canal network of increased flood risk should SUDS schemes not be delivered.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Water preferred policy approach.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support all new developments providing Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) and the separation of foul and surface water drainage run-off. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - Support all new developments providing Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) and the separation of foul and surface water drainage run-off. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England) – Support separation of water drainage and Sustainable Drainage Systems. ACTION: Noted.

9.139 – 9.140 No responses

### **Employment**

9.141 - 9.143 No responses

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Use Greenfield sites only when brownfield land has been exhausted with appropriate landscaping and hedging to reduce light pollution impacts. ACTION: Noted.

9.144 No responses

9.145 3 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Future employment needs of Stafford town would best be served by reinforcing the range and diversity of employment opportunities in the town centre and by providing new greenfield land for industrial and warehousing development in the northern direction of growth.  
ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - Future employment needs of Stafford town would best be served by reinforcing the range and diversity of employment opportunities in the town centre and by providing new greenfield land for industrial and warehousing development in the northern direction of growth.  
ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - Agree that different types of employment and scales of industry should be developed. However design features should also be considered so that the ubiquitous square flat roofed sheds do not pepper the landscape.

ACTION: Noted.

## **Ministry of Defence**

9.146 No response

## **Town and District Centres**

9.148 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Query the need for more retail space due to empty units, shop duplication and use of the internet. ACTION: Noted.

9.149 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - Taller buildings are acceptable as long as the upper storeys are actually used i.e. for residential. ACTION: Noted.

9.150 2 response

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - The Town Centre boundary should be amended to incorporate recent edge of centre retail development which has taken place:- (Sainsbury's at Chell Road / Doxey; Asda at Queensway; Tesco at Newport Road).

ACTION: Noted but no change to Stafford town centre boundary.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - The Town Centre boundary should be amended to incorporate recent edge of centre retail development which has taken place:- (Sainsbury's at Chell Road / Doxey; Asda at Queensway; Tesco at Newport Road).

ACTION: Noted but no change to Stafford town centre boundary.

9.151 No response

9.152 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Concern about the Stafford traffic implications of recent developments in the town centre, particularly at Tesco's on Newport Road and the business parks on Beaconside. ACTION: Noted

9.153 & 9.154 No responses

9.155 1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) - A new District or Local Centre should be created as part of a sustainable urban extension on the north side of Stafford town, based on the quantum of development.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

## Historic Environment

9.156 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) – Support the retaining of sight lines to historic buildings, particularly in the town centre, to reduce the impact of new development on historic assets. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support the retaining of sight lines to historic buildings, particularly in the town centre, to reduce the impact of new development on historic assets. ACTION: Noted.

## Transport

### Roads

9.157 No response

9.158 2 responses

1 response (Batchelor) – Concern about development of the eastern and southern distributor roads attracting more Heavy Good Vehicles to Stafford from the Rugeley direction rather than north on A51 with particular impacts on the A513 to access the M6 through existing and proposed residential areas without the southern distributor road. Development of the southern distributor road will exacerbate congestion on many other routes, impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and cause noise and loss of amenity.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Natural England) - Any decision to protect any of the distributor road routes in the Core Strategy should be informed by the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Core Strategy including a range of alternative solutions. Due to the proximity of the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) both proposals will need to be subject to a Habitats Directive 'appropriate assessment' including implications both alone and in combination with other plans.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

9.159 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support the proposed western access route. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) – Support the proposed western access route. ACTION: Noted.

9.160 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Park and Ride schemes should be provided if new development takes place on the north or south side of Stafford.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - Park and Ride schemes should be provided if new development takes place on the north or south side of Stafford.

ACTION: Noted.

## **Rail**

9.161 - 9.164 No responses

9.165 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Welcome potential improvements to rail facilities and services. These initiatives further support the Western Direction of Growth for Stafford.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) – Welcome potential improvements to rail facilities and services. These initiatives further support the Western Direction of Growth for Stafford.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

## **Bus**

9.166 No responses

9.167 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Support a bus interchange at the railway station. Whilst welcoming bus lanes there should be adequate road capacity to ensure other traffic flows are not interrupted. ACTION: Noted.

9.168 1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - Support a bus interchange at the railway station. Whilst welcoming bus lanes there should be adequate road capacity to ensure other traffic flows are not interrupted. ACTION: Noted.

9.169 - 9.170 No responses

9.171 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – The SUATMS is accepted by the development industry and should continue until it is replaced by the Community Infrastructure Levy. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – The SUATMS is accepted by the development industry and should continue until it is replaced by the Community Infrastructure Levy. ACTION: Noted.

9.172 3 responses

1 response (British Waterways Wales and Border Counties) – Support the protection and enhancement of walking and cycling routes integrated into new developments. British Waterways consider that the towpaths have significant potential for community provision, achieving better access to green space and active travel (walking, jogging, cycling) with quality of life and health benefits. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Support the provision and extension of existing pedestrian and cycle routes as an integral part of new development. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - Support the provision and extension of existing pedestrian and cycle routes as an integral part of new development. ACTION: Noted.

### **Sustainable Communities Strategy**

9.173 - 9.174 No responses

### **The Market Town of Stone**

---

1 response (I H Leadley) – Stone has poorly maintained roads, inadequate for today's traffic. How will the proposed new development be accommodated? There is insufficient sewage disposal for new housing. Extra housing means extra traffic. Lichfield Road and Eccleshall Road in Stone are barely adequate now.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stone development locations discussion.

### **Housing**

1 response (I H Leadley) – Query the ability of developers to sell houses due to number of unsold apartments and housing in Stone being exacerbated by new build. Anti-social behaviour is an issue in Stone. ACTION Noted.

9.175 3 responses

1 response (British Waterways Wales and Border Counties) – Acknowledge phased development in Stone to reduce impacts on the North Staffordshire urban regeneration initiatives. Release of sites in Stone to be prioritised to those within the residential development boundary, identified as deliverable in the Strategic

Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stone development strategy approach and locations discussion.

1 response (Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates) - Disagree with phasing development in Stone due to urban regeneration initiatives as Stone is not located beyond the North Staffordshire Green Belt which has the function to focus regeneration. This would be undiminished by development at Stone which should be supported to meet the Borough's housing requirements through the Regional Spatial Strategy. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs Wright) - Residents of Stone do not wish to be "urbanised". Stone is valued as a rural town. ACTION: Noted.

9.176 No responses

9.177 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – New housing development in Stone should not be phased due to the North Staffordshire conurbation's urban regeneration initiatives. Housing delivery should be phased to meet the needs of Stone for the plan period with a total of 1,500 required although 749 completions and commitments exist. Support SN-4 as the most suitable location.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stone development strategy approach and locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs Wright) - As few houses of Stafford Borough's requirement as possible in Stone. ACTION: Noted.

## **A Changing Population**

9.178 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – It is inappropriate to set out a locally specific housing mix for Stone because household sizes can be forecast but not demand.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Housing preferred policy and the Stone development strategy approach.

## **Education Provision**

9.179 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - The need for development to fund additional schools or school places must be assessed on a case by case basis. ACTION: Noted.

9.180 No responses

## **Healthcare**

1 response (I H Leadley) - There are insufficient doctors in Stone. Questions the closure of Trent Hospital and the ambulance station being short sighted due to scale of development now proposed for Stone. ACTION: Noted.



- 9.181 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - New health centres and enhanced facilities should be provided where required such as at areas selected for expansion. ACTION: Noted.

### **Flood Risk**

- 9.182 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Areas of flood risk should be protected from development, unless appropriate mitigation measures can be delivered. Such areas have an important role in the provision of sports and recreation facilities. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs Wright) - Building on flood risk areas will increase risk of people being unable to get insurance. ACTION: Noted.

### **Open space, sport and recreation**

- 9.183 – 9.185 No responses

- 9.186 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – The provision of one multi purpose sports and leisure facility will provide the most flexibility to meet the needs of the town, with local facilities to meet the needs of local areas. ACTION: Noted.

- 9.187 No responses

### **North Staffordshire Green Belt**

- 9.188 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - There is no need for land release from the Green Belt to meet development needs. ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Borough's preferred development strategy.

### **Provision of Utilities**

- 9.189 No responses

- 9.190 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) – Support the proposed requirement that all new development should provide Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) and that foul and surface water drainage run-off should be kept separate. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England) - Fully support this proposal. ACTION: Noted.

- 9.191 - 9.192 No responses

### **Employment**

- 9.193 – 9.194 No responses

- 9.195 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Future employment needs of Stone would best be served by reinforcing the range and diversity of employment opportunities in and around the town centre and by providing new greenfield land for industrial and warehousing development to the west of the A34 (site SN-b).  
ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stone development strategy approach and development locations.

### **Town Centre**

1 response (I H Leadley) – Concern about the viability of Stone town centre due to increased numbers of empty shop units caused by high business rates. A balance is required between fast food outlets, restaurants and day time businesses.  
ACTION: Noted.

9.196 - 9.200 No responses

### **Historic Environment**

9.201 No responses

### **Transport**

9.202 – 9.204 No responses

### Sustainable Communities Strategy

9.205 1 response (Messrs Hartley) – Strongly support the development of land in their ownership off Trent Road to deliver new housing provision in Stone and enhance the existing Green Network area, contributing to the Borough's vision.

ACTION: Noted.

### **Areas outside Stafford and Stone**

---

#### **Green Belt areas**

9.206 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Agree that Eccleshall, Gnosall, Hixon, Great and Little Haywood are sufficiently far away from the Green Belt to ensure that development in these locations will not undermine the regeneration of the North Staffordshire conurbation. ACTION: Noted.

9.207 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Staffords Estates) - Agree that Eccleshall, Gnosall, Hixon, Great and Little Haywood are sufficiently far away from the Green Belt to ensure that development in these locations will not undermine the regeneration of the North Staffordshire conurbation. Yarnfield, although surrounded by Green Belt, is sufficiently near to the outside edge of the Green Belt, and distant from the North

Staffordshire conurbation, that further development at this location would also not undermine regeneration.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Borough's preferred development strategy approach.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - Large scale development in Eccleshall may well conflict with regeneration priorities in Stoke. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Borough's preferred development strategy approach.

## Housing

1 response (First City Limited) – Support the development of client's land Dewick Industrial Estate at Brocton as a mixed use scheme including residential, community facilities and open space due to lack of business interest in marketed vacant units, planning policy requiring use of previously developed land for housing of a mixed size and tenure, and enhancement of local character. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - Supports the development of Dewick Industrial Estate at Brocton. ACTION: Noted

9.208 No responses

9.209 5 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) – Over 2,000 new dwellings are completed or committed outside of Stafford town leaving less than 1,000 to deliver for the minimum growth scenario. To meet the higher growth scenario housing land should be released in the main settlements, including Hixon. Provision should be made for the delivery of between 100 and 250 dwellings in the identified settlements of Eccleshall, Gnosall, Great and Little Haywood and Hixon to fund the necessary infrastructure provision should the higher scenario be necessary. As Hixon benefits from an existing employment base, which serves the wider local area, it should be prioritised as a location for housing growth.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Borough's preferred development strategy.

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK) - Over 2,000 new dwellings are completed or committed outside of Stafford town. 750 or more new dwellings could be delivered at Stone to meet the minimum or higher growth scenario or lack of delivery at Stafford. To fund necessary infrastructure and a suitable housing mix / range provision should be made for the delivery of between 100 and 250 dwellings in the identified settlements of Eccleshall, Gnosall, Great and Little Haywood, Hixon and Weston. No selected settlements should receive less than 100 new dwellings based on the residual housing requirement outside of Stafford and Stone. However Gnosall should receive a level of additional housing development due to the new health centre, serving the local rural area and scale of services and facilities. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Borough's preferred development strategy.

1 response (Mr Gough for Lord Stafford Estates) - Over 2,000 new dwellings are completed or committed outside of Stafford town leaving less than 1,000 to deliver for the minimum growth scenario although this may increase through the higher growth scenario. 250 new dwellings are identified at Yarnfield's YN-1 site which should be extended to the south to meet Yarnfield Lane. A modest increase in housing could be delivered, which would not undermine the spatial strategy.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Borough's preferred development strategy

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - Rural communities must be allowed to keep their 'country' feel with only small infill development to meet identified local needs. Avoid sprawling estates undermining community spirit and landscape degradation. Identification of numbers is very difficult but all existing empty housing stock should be assessed and brownfield land exhausted before considering greenfield sites in villages.

ACTION: Noted to be considered as part of the Borough's preferred development strategy.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - People living in the rural areas care about their communities and oppose large scale changes imposed on greenfield sites creating satellite villages. ACTION: Noted.

## **A Changing Population**

9.210 4 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - It is inappropriate to set out a locally specific housing mix for selected settlements because household sizes can be forecast but not demand.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the key settlements development strategy approach

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - A locally specific housing mix for selected settlements should be implemented. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - There should be a mix of small scale development in the rural areas. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Lunn) - A locally specific housing mix should be delivered on a settlement-by-settlement basis to meet the needs of local areas, address affordability issues and solve problems of past planning policy. Too often infill / garden development results in larger executive properties being built. Object to scale of new development at Woodseaves due to commuting and traffic problems. Great Bridgeford has very limited diversity of housing.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Housing preferred policy approach.

## **Educational Provision**

- 9.211 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - The need for development to fund additional schools or school places must be assessed on a case by case basis. ACTION: Noted.

## **Health care**

- 9.212 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) -The new Health Care facility at Gnosall reinforces its suitability as a location to accommodate additional housing development. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr M S) – New health care facility at Gnosall takes 3 days to get a doctors appointment. ACTION: Noted.

## **Flood Risk**

- 9.213 No responses

## **Open space sport and recreation**

- 9.214 3 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - Agreed that adequate provision for sport and recreation should be provided to support additional housing. Gnosall already benefits from generous facilities in this respect and is perhaps best able to support further development.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Gnosall's development locations discussion.

1 response (Jones) - Villages do not have adequate recreation facilities to sustain large population growth. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England) - Villages in the Borough have extensive surrounding farmland as well as open spaces and green areas in the built up areas and surrounding farmland that is rich in biodiversity whilst not necessarily being publicly accessible. Natural England would wish to see the potential of these areas improved and enhanced to create a strong green infrastructure near to key settlements to improve the quality of life and local economy. Green infrastructure must be recognised as a fundamental and integrated part of land use housing strategies outside of Stafford and Stone.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Environment / Green Infrastructure preferred policy approach.

- 9.215 - 9.218 No responses

## Provision of Utilities

9.219 2 responses

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Support the approach of Sustainable Drainage Systems, separation of foul and surface water run off, foul water storage and increased storage capacity. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Natural England) - Supports the approach of Sustainable Drainage Systems, separation of foul and surface water run off, foul water storage and increased storage capacity. In terms of villages affected by a high flood risk catchment sensitive land use and land practices have a significant role to play in reducing the risks faced. There may be scope to develop a strategy with the Environment Agency and Natural England which aims to achieve more sustainable catchment management in high risk areas. ACTION: Noted.

9.220 - 9.221 No responses

## Employment

9.222 4 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - In the interests of improving sustainability, the direction of a proportion of the additional employment land provision should be directed to those settlements selected for growth.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Borough's preferred development strategy.

1 response (Jones) – Great and Little Haywood are not suitable for employment opportunities due to an increase in unsustainable domestic car use.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Borough's preferred development strategy.

1 response (Mr Gough for Staffordshire Police) - In the interests of improving sustainability, the direction of a proportion of the additional employment land provision should be directed to those settlements selected for growth. It is noted that some settlements do not currently have employment opportunities. The extension of existing employment areas in the rural area is not appropriate to meet the needs of the rural communities selected for growth, other than at Hixon itself and at Weston due to its proximity to Hixon. Consequently, new greenfield sites will have to be identified at the selected settlements if a balanced provision of employment and housing is to be made.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Borough's preferred development strategy.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Raleigh Hall to meet employment needs of new development at Eccleshall is too simplistic. Would oppose Greenfield employment allocations at Eccleshall.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Eccleshall development locations discussion.

9.223 2 responses

1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - The extension of existing employment areas in the rural area is not appropriate to meet the needs of the rural communities selected for growth, other than at Hixon itself and at Weston. Consequently, new Greenfield sites will have to be identified at the selected settlements if a balanced provision of employment and housing is to be made. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Borough's preferred development strategy

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Question that opportunities can be created for professions or skilled trades people close to home which suit their employment needs. Concern about Junction 14 scenario. ACTION: Noted.

9.224 1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Rural based employment development should be allowed provided there is mitigation for protected species and little or no noise and light pollution. ACTION: Noted.

### **Historic Environment**

9.225 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - The impact of new development on historic assets should be minimised by restricting development.

ACTION: Noted.

### **Transport**

9.226 3 responses

1 response (Jones) – Strongly object to new development at Little Haywoods due to the impact on the local road network which are unsuitable for Heavy Goods Vehicles needed for construction bringing risks of injuring pedestrians and cyclists.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Support the quiet lane proposal and question the scale of development at Raleigh Hall due to transport problems.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Dr Oliver) – Welcome a quiet lane initiative. ACTION: Noted.

9.227 1 response (Jones) - Development should be centred on Stafford and Stone with access to rail stations and comprehensive bus links encouraging sustainable transport. Developing locations at Great and Little Haywood with poor public transport provision will not provide sustainable development and contrary to the Local Transport Plan.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Borough's preferred development strategy.

9.228 No responses

### **Rural Services and Facilities**

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) – Eccleshall has not been losing services and facilities but are reaching capacity. ACTION: Noted.

9.228 1 response (Mr Gough for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) - The best way of supporting declining rural services and facilities is to direct development to the larger settlements, in order to provide the best chance of retaining services which will serve not only that settlement but those within its catchment.

ACTION: Noted.

### **Sustainable Communities Strategies**

9.229 2 responses combined into 1 response (Jones) – Object to new development at the Haywoods as this will increase car based commuting to work due to lack of public transport. Stafford and Stone are the only sustainable locations for new development based on transport terms. Developing areas such as Great and Little Haywood will mean people will shop / socialise and use the facilities at or near their places of work.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Borough's preferred development strategy.

## **CHAPTER 10 – Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy**

---

10.1 – 10.4 No responses

10.5 2 responses

1 response (Natural England) - It is important that the Core Strategy delivers the important mechanism of planning obligations and / or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for achieving biodiversity maintenance and enhancement and green infrastructure goals.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Chapter 10 – Planning Obligations preferred policy approach.

1 response (Mrs von Elbing) - Agree with Natural England but hope that the money is not used to buy agreement to development in sensitive areas.

ACTION: Noted.

10.6 – 10.11 No responses



## Community Infrastructure Levy

10.12 – 10.22 No responses

10.23 2 responses

1 response (Mr Pert) – Money from the Community Infrastructure Levy should not be used to fund infrastructure which is already part of public bodies regional requirements / responsibilities. Instead this additional money should provide supplementary facilities or services. Furthermore local people's representatives should decide what money is spent where, rather than money being used in other communities or in an unfocused way without it meeting a specific local objective, concern, need, or requirement. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (British Waterways Wales and Border Counties) - British Waterways requests that Section 106 Agreements and / or Community Infrastructure Levy monies generated from canal side sites by third parties should be ring-fenced for improvements to waterway infrastructure as well as maintenance to ensure the canal receives a positive benefit and improvement to the public realm.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through Chapter 10 – Planning Obligations preferred policy approach.

10.24 No responses

10.25 4 responses

1 response (Jones) - The current planning process should be retained in its present form in Stafford Borough. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Messrs Hartley) - Strongly recommend that the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in Stafford Borough be resisted as the current mechanisms of planning obligations is adequate for delivering infrastructure. The introduction of CIL is likely to hinder and delay positive development, especially in the foreseeable economic climate. Stafford Borough should be supporting economic recovery by reviewing existing planning obligation requirements particularly for affordable housing. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) - Stafford Borough is an authority where the introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy could be advantageous, given the scale of housing and employment growth envisaged which will require new infrastructure and service provision. This should be fairly and proportionately distributed between developers based on phasing of development and set at an appropriate level to include affordable housing requirements and other costs whilst not disincentivising land owners. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (McCarthy & Stone (Dev) Ltd) – The Council should consider whether the provision of affordable housing is inside or outside the Community Infrastructure Levy. If it is outside then the Council needs to carefully consider the level of CIL charges it will request of the house building industry as these will affect the viability of development schemes and the ability developers have to provide affordable housing. ACTION: Noted.

## **CHAPTER 11– Local Monitoring and Review**

---

11.1 No responses

11.2 3 responses

1 response (Jones) – Suggested locally specific indicator being % of brownfield to % greenfield for development by location.

ACTION: Noted with general indicator and targets already covering this matter through National Indicators.

1 response (Messrs Hartley) - Some measure of the quality as well as the speed at which planning applications are processed should be added to the list of specific indicators and targets required.

ACTION: Noted with reference to new national indicator H6 concerning Building for Life standards.

1 response (Natural England) - In terms of environmental quality we would like to suggest that a green infrastructure related measure is included such as 'Change in area of green infrastructure'.

ACTION: Noted with general indicator and targets already covering this matter through National Indicators.

## GENERAL RESPONSES

---

### SUMMARY OF RESPONSES & ACTIONS

1 response (Dr Ireson) – Objections to new housing, employment and traveller site at Hixon. Public consultation exercise had inadequate mapped information. There are traffic problems with noise and air pollution in Hixon with no traffic calming measures proposed to solve these issues. Oppose Hixon being targeted again for significant new housing development increasing its size by 70% with no consideration of new infrastructure, access, increased traffic, provision of medical facilities, schooling or quality of life for the existing residents. Object to increased industrial development on greenfields rather than brownfield with many existing units closed or derelict, limited local employment, impact on the local school and sheer scale of new development. Object to a new traveller site in Hixon.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the Hixon development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs Kelsall) – Object to new industrial development at Hixon due to current level of existing unoccupied units, traffic and heavy goods vehicles affecting the local narrow laned and dangerous road network. Object to new housing development due to lack of new infrastructure, services and facilities available, traffic problems and impact on local road network causing dangers, loss of green space and village character in a thriving community.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the Hixon development locations discussion.

1 response (Ms Toft) – Object to new housing development in the Walton area of Stafford at SF-7 and SF-8 due to loss of character, visual landscape, Public Rights of Way and green space, devaluation of housing prices, impact on the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, lack of local infrastructure, services and facilities with impact on schools, impact of the new road with noise and air pollution with disruption.

**ACTION:** Note objections to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs S Jones) – PDF response to specific paragraphs:

1.1 No need for such drastic change. The development should take place on brownfield sites. Apart from issues of loss of biodiversity, increased flood risk, and other environmental issues the rural parts of the borough currently attract significant levels of tourism which will undoubtedly be affected if greenfield sites are built on. **ACTION:** Noted.

1.2 Why have views about no need for development of villages and rural communities been ignored?

**ACTION:** The new Plan is being prepared in the context of Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) requirements and national policy approach.

- 1.3 Why did Stafford Borough Council accept a 20% increase in housing without local consultation?  
ACTION: The new Plan is being prepared in the context of Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) requirements and national policy approach.
- 2.2 Development of villages contradicts several statements in the 'Sustainable community strategy 2008 – 2020'. The proposed development of villages would be damaging to the environment through loss of green spaces and increased car use as the villages cannot sustain the required employment levels and the public transport systems are insufficient.  
ACTION: Core Strategy to deliver the Sustainable Community Strategy for the Borough and County level.
- 2.3 Support visions in County Sustainable Community Strategy but oppose Greenfield development. ACTION: Noted.
- 2.4 Support visions in County Sustainable Community Strategy but oppose Greenfield development. ACTION: Noted
- 3.5 Strongly object to Greenfield development undermining rural areas.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 3.7 Accept housing and infrastructure development in Stafford for regeneration but not accepted in villages due to impact on environment and sustainable way of life. ACTION: Noted.
- 4.12 Rural development to increase travel to work implications.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 4.30 Greenfield development will have flooding implications.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 4.33 Greenfield development will increase run off problems. ACTION: Noted.
- 6.6 Question number of proposed Greenfield locations in context of environmental protection and suggestion to use brownfield sites.  
ACTION: Noted
- 6.11 Support development at Stafford and Stone only.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.
- 6.12 Object to new development in rural principal settlements on greenfields due to lack of local infrastructure, loss of character and biodiversity, increased flooding, loss of wildlife, increased car use and many facilities would be overstretched. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.

- 6.13 Object to new development in rural principal settlements on greenfields due to lack of local infrastructure, loss of character and biodiversity, increased flooding, loss of wildlife, increased car use and many facilities would be overstretched. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.
- 6.14 Object to new development in rural principal settlements on greenfields due to lack of local infrastructure, loss of character and biodiversity, increased flooding, loss of wildlife, increased car use and many facilities would be overstretched. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.
- 6.15 Object to new development in rural principal settlements on greenfields due to lack of local infrastructure, loss of character and biodiversity, increased flooding, loss of wildlife, increased car use and many facilities would be overstretched. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.
- 6.17 Disagree with Options C & D conclusion of Sustainability Appraisal.  
ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.
- 6.23 The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Initial Findings shows Options C & D are unsustainable and detrimental to character, identity, environment and biodiversity.  
ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.
- 7.1 Oppose Greenfield development and beyond brownfield capacity, object to 20% increase in housing accepted.  
ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.
- 7.13 Oppose development at Great and Little Haywood.  
ACTION: Noted and objections to be considered through the Haywoods development locations discussion.
- 8.34 Object to new housing development at Great and Little Haywood with misleading plans shown as development would merge the villages, lead to significant loss of Greenfields, require major new infrastructure, the local road network is too narrow and unsuitable for widening, loss of biodiversity and hedgerows, drainage and sewage problems, flooding with surface run off blocking local roads.  
ACTION: Noted and objections to be considered through the Haywoods development locations discussion.

- 8.36 Limited employment in the Haywoods leading to increased commuting, no secondary school, lack of public transport provision, increased traffic and accidents with new housing and risk to local school children, detrimental to the village character and environment. It is important to maintain the separate identities of Great & Little Haywood.  
ACTION: Noted and objections to be considered through the Haywoods development locations discussion.
- 9.13 Energy efficiency is important. ACTION: Noted
- 9.26 Brownfield sites to be developed and boundaries kept.  
ACTION: Noted and refer to the Development Strategy.
- 9.34 Existing standards of brownfield development should be maintained and greenfields used as a last resort. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.36 Brownfield sites should be used before Greenfield sites. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.106 Do not accept infiltration rates can be improved by housing development.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.113 Protect open space and green network. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.130 Protect floodplains including for wildlife and if possible recreational access.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.131 Green infrastructure to ensure biodiversity is not lost. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.136 Inadequate sewerage system is a major issue in Great and Little Haywood.  
ACTION: Noted and objections to be considered through the Haywoods development locations discussion.
- 9.209 Development to be focused on Stafford and Stone using previously developed land and minimal in villages. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.
- 9.213 Consider impact of Greenfield development on surface run off and implications for existing properties and local roads. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.214 Best to avoid development on green space rather than use green infrastructure as part of housing development. ACTION: Noted
- 9.223 Extension of existing industrial estates is better than using Greenfield development. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.224 Rural based industry must be sensitive to existing buildings and the environment. ACTION: Noted.

- 9.225 The historic environment is important. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.228 Financial support for public transport will not overcome inadequate road capacity or commuting levels such as at Great and Little Haywood.

ACTION: Noted.

- 9.230 Disagree with development outside of Stafford and Stone except on a very small scale. Must use brownfield land and be in line with the Sustainable Community Strategy. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Staffordshire County Council) – PDF response made on a range of subject elements and paragraphs throughout the document.

Environmental Policy Response

**Cultural Heritage** – Suggest amendment to section 4.27 to read ‘ ... However not all nationally important remains that merit preservation are necessarily scheduled.’ Highlight that the Historic Environment Record (HER) is now publicly accessible on Heritage Gateway. ACTION: Accepted.

- 8.36 Development on fields between Great and Little Haywood would damage historic character and GN-3 with LH-1 would impact on the setting of Grade 1 Registered Parkland at Shugborough. Other villages also to take account of historic landscape character considerations.

ACTION: Noted and consider through the Haywoods development locations discussion.

- 9.30 Welcome that the majority of new build structures to meet Commission for Architecture & Built Environment (CABE) silver standard for design but should be informed by historic character and sympathetic to existing built character. ACTION: Noted.

- 9.109 Baseline evidence to be updated by Historic Environment Character Area assessments and referenced.

ACTION: This work is currently being prepared to inform the Core Strategy preferred option and Chapter 9 – Environment preferred policy approach.

- 9.156 Welcome intention to reduce impact on historic setting of Stafford, retain sight lines and building heights / massing. Key factors to be sympathetic design of historic character supported by RSS Policy QE2 B i.) with extensive urban surveys being prepared for Stafford, Stone and Eccleshall to be included in LDF evidence base. ACTION: Accepted

- 9.201 Stone Extensive Urban Survey to support the evidence base.

ACTION: Accepted.

9.225 Welcome reducing new development impact outside of Stafford and Stone on historic environment but should reference historic landscape character importance as worthy of protection.

ACTION: Accepted and refer to Chapter 9 – Environment preferred policy approach.

**Ecology** – Welcome key objectives and concept of Biodiversity Enhancement Zones. Make reference to enhanced habitat networks and connectivity.

ACTION: Accepted and refer to Chapter 9 – Environment preferred policy approach.

Comprehensive habitat survey and up-to-date review Sites of Biological Importance required for LDF evidence base, locally important sites reviewed every 5 – 10 years to comply with PPS9 up-to-date environmental information. Appropriate Assessment to be used for location selection of residential and employment development and green infrastructure. Welcome limited development at Milford and Brocton due to Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. ACTION: Noted.

Development to the south or east of Stafford town has the highest potential to have adverse effects on Cannock Chase SAC, through traffic emissions and increased recreational pressure. Selection of all locations in the Borough should be informed by ecological survey and assessment. In addition to minimising adverse effects on biodiversity, consideration should be given to delivery of green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement in association with new development. ACTION: Noted.

9.31 Support flexible approach to residential density to retain landscape and biodiversity features. ACTION: Noted.

9.36 Assess biodiversity of potential sites including previously developed land. ACTION: Noted.

9.104 Welcome green infrastructure delivery of Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan (SBAP) targets and biodiversity enhancement. Consider preparation of biodiversity opportunity map for habitat improvements and connectivity.

ACTION: Noted and refer to Chapter 9 – Environment preferred policy approach.

9.130 Support role of floodplains in green infrastructure including biodiversity enhancement & restoration. Sport facilities to avoid fragmentation of ecological networks. ACTION: Accepted.

9.131 New country park south of Stafford to relieve some recreational pressures from Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) but not all.



Appropriate Assessment subjected to green route links to Cannock Chase due to increased recreational pressure. ACTION: Noted.

- 9.214 Strategic approach for natural open space provision for networking and ecological / amenity value. ACTION: Noted.

Community Infrastructure Levy to contribute to strategically planned publicly accessible natural open space rather than site specific areas lacking ecological connectivity and other benefits as well as deliver proposed Biodiversity Enhancement Zones, mitigate Cannock Chase SAC impacts.

ACTION: Noted and refer to Chapter 10 – Planning Obligations preferred policy approach.

Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan targets for habitat restoration and creation with biodiversity enhancement delivery to be used. Habitat targets allocated to Biodiversity Enhancement Zones. ACTION: Noted.

**Forestry** – Set of constraints in paragraph 3.5 regarding new development to include no loss of ancient or ancient semi natural woodland as well as veteran trees, important for this strategic stage rather than at planning permission to avoid loss of important woodland, hedgerows and trees.

ACTION: Noted.

**Landscape** – Local character assessment by County Council to be included in development approach. Landscape quality greatest to east and west of Stafford. At Stone the greatest quality is to the east so more landscape constraint needed to follow RSS Policy QE1. All other villages also to take account of landscape character considerations including the Haywoods proximity to Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and heathland pressures.

ACTION: Noted.

Welcome retention and enhancement of landscape distinctiveness and policy reference in document (paragraph 9.110) using local landscape character assessment. Landscape to be included in spatial portrait. Section 9.28 to include reference to require development to preserve and enhance distinctive character. ACTION: Accepted.

**Rights of Way** – Greater emphasis on Rights of Way Improvement Plan with encouraging increased usage and green infrastructure advantages. Welcome an opportunity for partnership. ACTION: Noted.

#### Transportation Policy Comments

Core Strategy to take into account completions and commitments with inconsistencies between the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Final Report to be addressed. Completions, commitments, deliverable sites within Residential Development Boundaries, new Greenfield

requirements and SHLAA deliverable sites to be considered for each settlement.

**ACTION:** Noted and refer to Development Strategy approach.

Concern that SHLAA identification of deliverable and developable sites fails to consider physical access constraints, sustainability and costs with assumption that sites adjacent to Residential Development Boundaries are deliverable but this is not the case in transport terms. Sites with access constraints identified as deliverable, not in line with paragraph 54 of PPS3, lack of economic viability for sites.

**ACTION:** Noted and considered through the SHLAA Review process.

Development primarily located on sustainable brownfield land within Residential Development Boundaries for walking, cycling and public transport. Support focus on Stafford and Stone but priorities needed for site selection, using Accessibility Analysis from the County Council. Other settlement development based on completions and commitments, access to services and facilities, site availability within Residential Development Boundaries and site delivery on settlement edge.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.

Site selection to take into account SHLAA deliverable areas, highway access and transport infrastructure constraints. Greater level of options provided for Greenfield release than required by Regional Spatial Strategy.

**ACTION:** Noted.

Stafford = concern about road alignment in southern direction of growth abandoned by County Council. Stafford Eastern Distributor Road safeguarded. Concern about road alignment on western direction of growth being inconsistent with Stafford Western Access Improvements which will relieve town centre pressures, regeneration of housing and employment with larger strategic housing area and support public transport. Further evidence to demonstrate sustainability and delivery of land south of Stafford for RSS requirements than other options as well as evidence to support assumption of northern direction of growth impacting on North Staffordshire conurbation. Paragraph 8.14 to refer to flooding and access constraints south of Stafford. Locations SF-5, SF-c and SF-d not likely required to deliver eastern distributor road, lack of flooding recognition and highway infrastructure. **ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

Stone = Half of new development in Stone met by existing completions, commitments and sustainable sites within Residential Development Boundaries. Concern about significant access, funding and landscape constraints of Greenfield sites with no evidence for proposed highway

infrastructure need and no evidence for deliverability of schemes. No public funding to deliver major road infrastructure in Stone. Question the deliverability of sites identified in the SHLAA due to significant road infrastructure requirements at SN-1 to SN-5.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Stone development locations discussion.

Eccleshall = Support for limited housing growth as settlement sustainable through public transport, access to local services within Residential Development Boundary. Concern about significant access, funding and landscape constraints of Greenfield sites with no evidence for proposed highway infrastructure need and no evidence for deliverability of schemes. No public funding to deliver major road infrastructure in Eccleshall. Question the deliverability of sites identified in the SHLAA due to significant road infrastructure requirements at EC-2. Most sustainable location is EC-4 for access to services and facilities whilst EC-1, EC-3 and EC-5 not identified as deliverable by the SHLAA

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Eccleshall development locations discussion.

Gnosall = Concern about significant access, funding and landscape constraints of Greenfield sites with no evidence for proposed highway infrastructure need and no evidence for deliverability of schemes. No public funding to deliver major road infrastructure in Gnosall. Question the deliverability of sites identified in the SHLAA due to significant road infrastructure requirements at GN-1 to GN-3 as well as GN-5 and GN-6. Most sustainable locations are GN-4 to GN-7 to local centre, public transport and, for GN-4, to local school but not identified as deliverable by the SHLAA.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Gnosall development locations discussion.

Hixon = Accept high level of employment makes local employment more likely with 24% cited in Census 2001 but question sustainability of development sites with only HI-5 within 10 minutes walk of local centre and increased need to use car. No public funds for major road infrastructure in Hixon.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Hixon development locations discussion.

Great Haywood and Little Haywood = Limited local services accessible by sustainable modes except school for Little Haywood sites. Existing bus services inadequate for housing growth due to infrequency.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Haywoods development locations discussion.

Haughton = Only limited housing to support local needs due to availability of local services and increased reliance on the car. No deliverable sites shown

by the SHLAA. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Haughton development locations discussion.

Weston = Only limited housing to support local needs due to availability of local services and increased reliance on the car. A deliverable site of 110 dwellings shown by the SHLAA so question need for Greenfield release.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Weston development locations discussion.

Woodseaves / Yarnfield = Only limited housing to support local needs due to availability of local services and increased reliance on the car.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Woodseaves / Yarnfield development locations discussion.

Tittensor = New housing focused on sustainable sites within the existing Residential Development Boundary. Support for limited development due to public transport links, services and facilities.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Tittensor development locations discussion.

Chapter 9 – higher densities than 30 dwellings per hectare may be achieved so reducing Greenfield requirements. Further details required of Greenfield release having taken into account completions, commitments and sustainable previously developed land. Priority to be given to brownfield housing sites to ensure sustainable development with good public transport accessibility and local services to walking and cycling focused on existing centres and interchanges. Use higher densities, mixed use development and suitable locations in line with PPS3 with 60% on previously developed land.

ACTION: Noted.

Housing mix with location, type and density to consider single person households and access to services and facilities due to needs of ageing population. ACTION: Noted.

Stafford Western Access Improvements are already protected with a major scheme bid being prepared for delivery. Transport study identifying need for other transport infrastructure. Concern about inviting comments on Stafford Eastern / Western bypass route and the Western Access Route should be protected and whether park and ride should be developed to the north and south of Stafford. Caution should be taken when considering opinions that have not been fully informed regarding the need, implications, costs and benefits of these major transport infrastructure proposals. Also, successful park and ride schemes depend on limiting the availability of town centre parking opportunities. ACTION: Noted.

The SUATMS summary to be updated with Staffordshire County Council.  
ACTION: Accepted.

Stone - Caution should be taken when considering opinions that have not been fully informed regarding the need, implications, costs and benefits of proposed new roads for Stone. ACTION: Noted.

7.4 Amend title to correctly reference settlements outside Stafford and Stone due to anomaly with paragraph. ACTION: Agreed.

1 response (Ranton Parish Council) – Number of comments made.

2.4 Support broad aims of vision with Stafford being a significant regional borough, administrative and industrial development to support living and working. ACTION: Noted.

3.5.1 Agree with vision, protecting the Green Belt and Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty for character retention, protecting historic villages and agricultural land. ACTION: Noted.

3.7 Support focus of new development on larger settlements with infrastructure and transportation links for increased population with new employment at Stafford for M6 access but town centre development may suffer from congestion without new circular routes to by-pass congested areas.

ACTION: Noted.

6.29 Option C is the preferred strategy with access to A roads and existing services and facilities. ACTION: Noted.

6.31 Existing Residential Development Boundaries to be retained in smaller settlements to restrict Greenfield development, support historic character and existing level of services and facilities.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.

7.13 Concern about 20% increase above 10,100 new homes due to impact on infrastructure. Agree with apportionment split between settlements but development not to detrimentally effect rural areas.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.

8.16 Concern about development south of Creswell (SF-g) due to extension of Stafford town west of M6 into agricultural land, high traffic volumes at Junction 14 and floodplain implications of River Penk (SF-10).

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

- 8.21 Employment development is appropriate between Stafford and Stone along the A34. ACTION: Noted.
- 8.nn Larger settlements such as Eccleshall, Hixon and the Haywoods have services and infrastructure for additional housing development with access to an A road.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.
- 8.41 Although on an A road Haughton has too few services and facilities for new housing development with focus on Gnosall preferred.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.
- 8.43 Although on an A road Weston has too few services and facilities for new housing development with focus on the Haywoods preferred.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.
- 8.46 Although on an A road Woodseaves has too few services and facilities for new housing development with focus on Eccleshall preferred.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.
- 8.50 Protect Green Belt land north of Stafford Borough with brownfield development at Tittensor being acceptable due to transport links but local services and facilities to be improved. However Yarnfield is unacceptable for new development due to road and local services.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.
- 8.55 Object to expansion of Ladfordfields site due to traffic problems increasing, poor site condition, lack of high quality jobs generated and unsustainable location but support new development at Raleigh Hall due to location with Eccleshall.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.
- 9.11 Question economic viability of wind energy & turbines as well as solar energy. River Trent has limited hydro generation potential so biomass is the only significant energy resource but concern about loss of agricultural food production land. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.12 Methane gas production with significant energy generation but plants limited in scale for agricultural landscape. ACTION: Noted.

- 9.13 Need to consider economic justification for on-site solar energy.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.26 Protect Green Belt land north of Stafford Borough with brownfield development at Tittensor being acceptable due to transport links but local services and facilities to be improved. However Yarnfield is unacceptable for new development due to road and local services.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach
- 9.36 Support use of brownfield land by using former industrial areas rather than gardens for infill housing development due to impact on community and housing densities. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.41 Support mix of housing types but affordable housing in context of development location, access to public transport, retail and employment areas. Rural areas require access to private transport which is not compatible to affordable housing. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.46 Agree with mix of housing types and lifetime homes. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.47 Question delivery of housing provision of elderly and disadvantaged people through the private sector. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.54 Support economic use of rural buildings but residential development may only be viable so needs sensitive to environment. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.70 40% affordable housing is unrealistic, especially in rural areas with lack of public transport and need for private cars. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.77 Rural exception sites to consider public transport and local employment opportunities with local need evidence required. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.87 Recognise opposition to new traveller provision in rural areas with existing residents not contributing to local community. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.92 Support re-use of existing employment sites for employment rather than housing. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.110 Agricultural landscape of Stafford Borough to be protected and valued.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.113 Protect open spaces in Stafford Borough for local character.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.117 Tourism development to be marginal to focus on high value jobs in high technology sectors around Stafford. ACTION: Noted.

- 9.124 Support range of housing types but limit development in villages due to lack of infrastructure, services and facilities. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.125 Support provision of elderly housing. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.126 Provision of homelessness accommodation in Stafford and Stone. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.129 Support increased health provision in larger villages based on Gnosall approach. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.130 Protect rivers and floodplains from development as a valuable open space resource. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.131 Support provision of country parks. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.135 New leisure facilities to be close to housing to reduce travel movements. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.146 New employment focused on high technology sector, use brownfield rather than Greenfield land to avoid loss of character. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.149 No tall buildings in Stafford town centre above six storeys.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.158 Stafford east and south bypass essential with new housing to reduce pressure on radial road system. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.159 Question value of the inner bypass for Stafford on traffic flows compared to east and south bypass. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.160 No park & ride scheme is needed in Stafford. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.167 Question the viability of dedicated bus lanes without major road expansion scheme. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.78 Affordable housing provision in rural areas to be considered in the context of public transport availability, local employment opportunities and demonstrated local need. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.88 Recognise opposition to new traveller provision in rural areas with existing residents not contributing to local community. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.93 Support re-use of existing employment sites for employment rather than housing. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.111 Agricultural landscape of Stafford Borough to be protected and valued. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.114 Protect open spaces in Stafford Borough for local character.  
ACTION: Noted.



1 response (Harris Lamb Ltd) – PDF response representing land owners of major brownfield site in Stone; Barloworld Scientific, Tilling Drive with significant contribution to future housing requirements.

- 3.7 Support Stone identified as a location for high quality residential development whilst retaining household growth and local employment. Support controlled growth to avoid undermining North Staffordshire conurbation objectives and retain local character. Stone to be focus for additional development without compromising objectives. Support progress on LDF before RSS housing requirements are finalised to deliver growth with sufficient flexibility to meet the Borough's needs (paragraph 7.3 and 7.13). Stronger emphasis should be placed on Stafford and Stone on sustainable grounds with less emphasis on other settlements and reject restrictive development at Stone under Option D which would not deliver a market town function or support Advantage West Midlands initiatives.

ACTION: Noted to consider in the Development Strategy.

Stone has a housing requirement distribution of 10% to 22% in line with the adopted Stafford Borough Local Plan 2001 and further consideration of brownfield sites in sustainable locations should be given over Greenfield development. Land at Barloworld Scientific considered before other housing location options for 160 dwellings and long term future of allotments and sports pitches. Business use next door is being marketed and relocation of other units occurring. ACTION: Noted with site identified through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment process rather than an allocation.

- 9.175 Object to a blanket phasing approach in Stone due to North Staffordshire conurbation objectives, only related to Greenfield sites undermining market housing. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (White Young Green for Aldi Stores Ltd) – PDF response.

- 9.149 Support expansion of Stafford town centre boundary, primary and secondary shopping frontages to accommodate new retail and office requirements. Stafford development opportunities being sought and support a more viable destination being created. ACTION: Noted.

- 9.151 Unclear concerning further convenience floorspace provision requirements for Stafford due to lack of future assessment for new convenience floorspace and RSS no quantitative assessed need. A sound basis to assess future need for convenience floorspace is needed regarding spatial development options in line with retail and office provision.

ACTION: Noted and consideration given to retail needs assessment of convenience goods and floorspace.

9.151 Stafford is poorly represented by discount food retailers. Development opportunities are being considered and support Stafford being a more viable retailing destination. One additional medium sized foodstore is required in Stafford based on quantitative need for convenience floorspace with preferred development opportunities shown to comply with PPS6 and compliment the existing retail offer, Stafford's vitality and viability.

ACTION: Noted and consider a retail needs assessment of convenience goods and floorspace.

Spatial Options 14 are mostly unsuitable for convenience retail development except SFTC-T10 in context of Planning Policy Statement 6 (PPS6) or the successor document. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Coal Authority) – Main interest in safeguarding coal as a mineral resource and future development is undertaken safely regarding subsidence and legacy of coal mining. The very northern fringe of the Borough next to the City of Stoke on Trent and Newcastle under Lyme contains coal resources which are potentially capable of extraction by surface mining operations. The remainder of the Borough is underlain by deep coal resources which have been investigated previously for extraction, but to date the potential has not been exploited. The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that surface coal resources are not unduly sterilised by new development. In cases where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process. In the case of Stafford Borough the area of surface coal resource is small in geographic extent and is contained within the Green Belt and therefore it is highly unlikely that sterilisation is likely to occur as a result of any built development. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Larkin) – Object to new housing development at the Haywoods due to the impact on local character, lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage problems, flooding on Back Lane with surface run off and the scale of development proposed.

ACTION: Noted with objections to be considered through the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs McKeown) – Strongly object to new housing and employment proposals at Hixon with no substantive evidence to support the proposals. Concern about the vagueness of maps and consultation material regarding developments with queries about access and housing types. Question the over provision of options and the decision-making process regarding the preferred locations. Criteria should be considered including reducing car journeys, maintain local character, access to services and facilities including open space, health, local shops, public transport, road safety, roads and footpaths, distribution of housing and employment locations. Hixon has experienced significant housing development in recent years with new development proposed increasing its size beyond Eccleshall. No other village is subject to such a scale of development with no justification regarding employment as only 6% local residents work in Hixon. Significant road building would be required for HI-3 and HI-4 with unclear access for HI-1,

serious road safety concerns at top of village, and undermining rural character and setting. Oppose increased industrial development at Hixon undermining village character and lack of evidence to support local employment, lack of impact on greenhouse gas emissions, spread employment and housing opportunities elsewhere to balance environmental impacts, loss of employment sites in other settlements for housing. The scale of development at Hixon is inappropriate and should not be used to meeting housing and employment requirements. Support suspension of consultation exercise due to mapping errors and lack of consistency.

**ACTION:** Noted objections to be considered through the Development Strategy approach and Hixon development locations.

1 response (Mr McKeown) – Strongly object to new housing and employment proposals at Hixon. Facts given about population growth compared to scale of new development proposed and impact on Hixon. Hixon has experienced significant housing development in recent years with new development proposed increasing its size beyond Eccleshall. No other village is subject to such a scale of development with no justification regarding employment as only 6% local residents work in Hixon. Very few facilities have been provided by new housing developments with the most significant being delivered by the Parish Council in terms of sport and recreation provision. Assessment of services and facilities with limited provision compared to Eccleshall. Clear and accountable decision making is required from the Council. Significant road building would be required for HI-3 and HI-4 with unclear access for HI-1, serious road safety concerns at top of village, and undermining rural character and setting. Oppose increased industrial development at Hixon undermining village character and lack of evidence to support local employment, lack of impact on greenhouse gas emissions, spread employment and housing opportunities elsewhere to balance environmental impacts, loss of employment sites in other settlements for housing. Concern about the vagueness of maps and consultation material regarding developments with queries about access and housing types. Question the over provision of options and the decision-making process regarding the preferred locations. The scale of development at Hixon is inappropriate and should not be used to meeting housing and employment requirements. Support suspension of consultation exercise due to mapping errors and lack of consistency.

**ACTION:** Noted objections to be considered through the Development Strategy approach and Hixon development locations.

1 response (Mr Walker) – Object to new housing and employment development at Hixon due to pressure on existing infrastructure based on the current scale of development with a major electricity upgrade needed, overloaded sewerage and drainage system at south end of Hixon and freshwater disruption. Loss of village character with an increased Police presence required and loss of safe environment, inadequate level of services and facilities such as health and education. Traffic congestion problems and increased commuting will occur with parking issues, lack of pavements in Hixon with road safety issues and people commuting into work at the

industrial estates. If development is needed it should be at the southern and western areas on brownfield land using New Road, sewerage and drainage not affecting the village whilst avoiding the northern and eastern areas.

**ACTION:** Noted objections to be considered through Hixon development locations discussion.

1 response (Centro) – Emphasis importance of strong correlation with the principles set out in the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (WMRSS) as outlined through Policies T1-T12, the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) and the West Midlands Local Transport Plan, especially important to land use planning and reducing the need to travel, with emphasis on regenerating the area and locating intense development in places that are well served by public transport. Centro considers that there needs to be a stronger emphasis on Transport and in particular public transport and access to employment, services and facilities, as currently there is limited reference, to be expressed through the vision, spatial options and potential development areas. High quality public transport system is needed to access sustainable development locations whilst reducing carbon emissions for transport sector. Outside of sustainable locations public transport investment to be encouraged to avoid car use increases. Paragraph 9.160 - Support development of Park & Ride scheme north and south of Stafford with housing development to encourage public transport. Support increased parking at Stafford station and encourage a high quality bus interchange. Paragraph 9.167 support bus priority in town centre balanced with radial routes. Stafford railway station and West coast mainline to be upgraded for increased operational efficiency.

**ACTION:** Noted with increased reference to transport within the Spatial Vision.

1 response (Stone Rural Parish Council) – PDF response provided.

5.3 Additional parking provision needed with housing and retail as public transport may be inappropriate. **ACTION:** Noted.

6.22 Welcome retention of Oulton Green Belt boundary and Aston by Stone Residential Development Boundary. **ACTION:** Noted.

6.29 Accept Option C is best option but support Option D with no development at Stone. **ACTION:** Noted for Development Strategy.

6.31 Disagree with review of Residential Development Boundaries.

**ACTION:** Noted.

7.7 If Residential Development Boundaries amended desirable sites for large houses will occur causing local road network impact particularly at Aston by Stone. **ACTION:** Noted.

- 7.9 Oulton boundary retained so Green Belt unaffected.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 7.13 Additional housing in remaining villages within Residential Development Boundaries. ACTION: Noted.
- 8.4 Take account of completions and commitments with a third of requirements for the Borough and three quarters of minimum for Stone.  
ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy.
- 8.11 & 8.12 Object to northern direction of growth for Stafford due to northward creep towards Stone. Retain existing rural area.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Stafford development locations discussion.
- 8.17 – 8.21 SN-2 will destroy high landscape value and create access problems requiring a new railway bridge to overcome traffic delays at level crossing (SNPR-2). SN-3 is located on Walton Heath with loss of landscape and public amenity open space. SN-4 is preferred but loss of agricultural land. SN-a would breach the A34/A51 towards Aston adjacent to the River Trent. SN-b concern about southward encroachment towards Stafford with current lack of landscaping, use of agricultural land and encroachment on Aston.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Stone development locations discussion.
- 9.2 Agree development at Stone should be constrained with Option D having credibility due to stretched Stone services and facilities.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Stone development locations discussion.
- 9.9 – 9.13 Consider renewable energy but not wind generation due to impact on local landscape. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.18 Improved ventilation and insulation of buildings. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.31 Density to change with site requirements, related to house size and types. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.36 Brownfield land to be used before Greenfield sites. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.41 – 9.46 Affordable housing for rent rather than sale to avoid impact on the market. 100% affordable housing owned by Council or housing association. ACTION: Noted.

- 9.70 Affordable housing close to employment with few houses in rural areas to avoid travel to work issues. Link employment and affordable housing sites.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.92 Support re-use of employment sites for employment rather than housing but mixed development can reduce travel. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.104 Support green infrastructure to deliver Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan and biodiversity enhancement. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.106 Support Sustainable Drainage Systems and 20% infiltration rate improvements on new development over Greenfield areas.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.113 Support protected open space and green network. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.117 Oppose large scale tourist attractions in the Borough. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.120 Support new telecommunications apparatus in new employment areas rather than new housing areas. ACTION: Agreed.
- 9.125 Support provision for special needs. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.167 Oppose bus only lanes due to congestion. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.175 Support phased development in Stone for the North Staffordshire conurbation objectives. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.177 Minimise the level of development at Stone. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.178 Affordable housing to support walking to work. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.195 Support small and medium sized enterprise and light industry.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.201 Support reduced impact of new development on historic assets in Stone.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.209 About half of 3,000 new homes to be provided outside Stone in other settlements. ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Cllr Stamp) – Agree with the vision and key objectives but disagree with housing division to Haughton and Gnosall. Scale of development at Haughton is unacceptable due to community cohesion except for 30 – 45 houses with the remainder directed to Stafford and Stone or smaller villages to support local services and public transport. Haughton sites have difficulty of crossing the A518 road for school children and the elderly. Preference in the Haughton Parish Plan for sites to the north of the village

(HN-1 to HN-4). Concern about access onto A518 from Gnosall and Haughton into Stafford due to congestion exacerbated by new housing. New road infrastructure should be provided to solve problems accessing Stafford, not just provision to access new housing developments at Gnosall.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Gnosall and Haughton development locations discussion.

1 response (Eccleshall Business Focus Group) – Object to the scale of new housing development and all sites in Eccleshall due to lack of new infrastructure investment, the drainage system in Eccleshall High Street is inadequate, parking and traffic problems, lack of public amenity space and combining the local schools.

**ACTION:** Noted and consideration to be given through the Development Strategy and Eccleshall development locations discussion.

1 response (D Stocking) – Object to new developments due to loss of countryside heritage with brownfield land to be utilised with available infrastructure and limited environmental impact before cheaper Greenfield sites to avoid countryside destruction. Greenfield development would cause loss of wildlife, biodiversity, historic assets, increased traffic and population, loss of identity and rural character, loss of village life and communities. This is contrary to the Sustainable Community Strategy and not using existing vacant properties.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (FBC Manby Bowder for Mr Stubbs) – PDF response.

3.7 Suitable sites in rural settlements to consider development's harm.

**ACTION:** Noted.

6.15 Support Option F for growth distribution to examine site suitability on development merits. **ACTION:** Noted.

7.7 Small scale housing and employment development to be considered at Salt without detriment through limited Greenfield and infill, north of Salt Road to contribute to settlement sustainability. Reflected in Scenario Options 1.

**ACTION:** Noted.

9.36 Housing requirements will need brownfield and Greenfield development in appropriate locations with site size and suitability considered.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.

10.24 – 10.25 Support standardised Section 106 agreements with suitable flexibility for scheme viability. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (G Willard for Aldi) – PDF response related to Stone.

Aldi aims to deliver in locations with proven need and existing food retailers providing a complementary food offer. In Stone interested in site on western side of Stafford Road, vacant site with access onto A34 and for pedestrians. PPS6 requires Council's to allocate sites using clear evidential need for future projections and hierarchy.

Support vision for a thriving economy where businesses supported and economic prosperity increased. Concern that a proven need to promote and encourage growth in retail and suitable sites is required. Physical limitations of Stone town centre and available land considered with brownfield possibilities for additional retail provision.

Option B is supported, building upon existing services and infrastructure at Stafford and Stone or Option C with settlement hierarchy shown. Considered that Stone has additional growth capacity for housing and employment to meet regional targets and support existing services and infrastructure. Future growth locations to consider the impact of A34 on pedestrian movements and modes of transport, thus influencing new development east or west of A34. Preferred locations for development to the western side of Stone. Areas of floodplain should not be used for new development being important features of Stone, unless for recreational or community needs but not for commercial use. Additional employment allowed in Stone on existing employment land released for suitable purposes to deliver good quality and secure job opportunities.

Justification is required to set a limit of 10,000 square metres convenience goods on additional retail space in Stone, amount of development space available and deliverable in the town centre to justify constraint. Stone town centre constrained by development with little additional scope for further retail development. Stone town centre boundary based on sound retail evaluation of rental value and footfall. Question the severed nature of Stone and its ability to provide for retail growth projections with current shopping facilities. A new facility is needed on the western side of Stone suitable due to strong customer demand, need for additional food retail space, serve Stone and its hinterland, qualitative need for discount food retailer, safe vehicular and pedestrian access points, use previously developed land, improve road conditions via management and pedestrian movements. Support additional road infrastructure but question assessment of A34 severance with the following to be addressed: promote development to support pedestrian safety, walking and cycling and improved everyday food and shopping needs in western area of Stone.



**ACTION:** Noted and consider additional retail evidence for convenience in the context of Stone and the Regional Spatial Strategy non-strategic centre approach.

1 response (The Haywood Society) – PDF response with serious concerns about total housing numbers, density and locations with community implications in Colwich due to flooding, sewage disposal, densities, local road network at capacity and limited parking for existing facilities. Object to amended Residential Development Boundaries at Great and Little Haywood, particularly the coalescence of the villages with loss of open space. GH-1 has fewer problems but flooding issues on site and downstream via drainage.

Recommend even small development will have sewerage and flooding issues to be addressed or be limited; deliver a new village to provide for housing requirements separated for any other settlement including infrastructure, carbon neutral and replicate natural growth of rural life. Avoid loss of character and public hostility.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Haywoods development locations discussion with support for GH-1.

1 response (Berry Property & Business for Mr Martin) – PDF response giving support for residential development on client's land north of Egg Lane, Hixon due to level of services and facilities in the village, sustainable distance to larger settlements, level of employment provision and sustainability credentials to support existing businesses facilities and services such as the local school. The development would help fund village hall refurbishment and road access, affordable housing and local economy. The land has access to foul water and mains water supplies.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Hixon development locations discussion.

2.3 Support housing development at key settlements to help new businesses and workforce. **ACTION:** Noted.

2.4 Agree with vision but focus on affordable housing through land supply and increased home ownership to improve quality of life. **ACTION:** Noted.

3.5 Support expanding services and facilities in Hixon with high quality housing and employment provision for local people. **ACTION:** Noted.

3.6 Support providing new housing and improved infrastructure, services and facilities in selected rural settlements. **ACTION:** Noted.

3.7 Support key objectives but listed by settlement, set out increased employment opportunities for key rural settlements.

**ACTION:** Noted but no change to key objective listings.

- 4.2 40% of Borough population live outside of Stafford with needs for new housing development, avoid a focus on Stafford.  
ACTION: Noted in the context of 70% growth to Stafford identified through the Regional Spatial Strategy.
- 4.6 Significant projected increase in elderly population to impact on services and facilities. Landowner to support village hall improvements.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 4.33 Land has low risk of flooding with sustainable drainage reducing flooding elsewhere from housing development. ACTION: Noted.
- 5.3 Question scale of development in Stafford compared to 40% population in other areas. ACTION: Noted.
- 5.4 3,000 new homes outside of Stafford so essential need in rural villages such as Hixon. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.
- 5.5 Important to cater for requirements of all Borough's communities with increased focus on rural areas to avoid migration to Stafford and Stone and to represent population distribution. ACTION: Noted.
- 6.5 Affordable housing is essential in rural areas for existing rural residents at affordable prices thus maintain socio economic balance and younger generations through provision. ACTION: Noted.
- 6.12 Support Option C due to sustainable development of urban and rural housing demand, improvements to infrastructure and utilities, focus on settlements listed to meet services, facilities and employment needs as well as reducing car travel. ACTION: Noted.
- 6.14 Option C with development achieved at Hixon being sustainable, good access to employment, facilities and public transport. ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.
- 6.17 Support Options C and D. ACTION: Noted.
- 6.20 Hixon boundary amended for new housing and employment including land off Egg Lane. ACTION: Noted.
- 6.29 Support no Green Belt development and focussed growth at Hixon.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 6.31 Support review of existing development boundaries. ACTION: Noted.
- 7.1 Support Greenfield release due to lack of brownfield land.  
ACTION: Noted.

- 7.8 Number of larger villages in the Green Belt with limited peripheral expansion so focus on Hixon for development. ACTION: Noted.
- Scenario Option 1 – Hixon has sustainability and employment land credential for new housing development. ACTION: Noted.
- 7.4 Hixon is better served by employment, services and transport than other settlements for housing and employment away for Green Belt.
- ACTION: Noted.
- 7.13 Support higher growth scenario with 7,000 homes to Stafford and more residential development to rural settlements including Hixon due to employment capacity. ACTION: Noted.
- Southern direction of growth at HI-4 and HI-5 are most appropriate for Hixon due to separation from existing employment areas and key advantages including road improvements, location to village services, rounding off the village and minimal open countryside encroachment.
- ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Hixon development locations discussion.
- 8.32 Development would improve village services, sustain local businesses and encourage new retail facilities range in Hixon. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.13 On-site renewable energy provision accepted. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.41 Market to determine housing mix. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.42 Retirement provision accepted on land. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.56 Proportion of affordable housing provided to support local people, maintain rural settlement character and rural exception site available.
- ACTION: Noted.
- 9.77 Rural exception site to be supported by need. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.209 Hixon is a sustainable location for 175 – 300 new homes.
- ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.
- 9.210 More 2, 3 and 4 bedroomed family and retirement houses required. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.223 Industrial estates can support local people, sustain local retail businesses and shops with appropriate location and scale particularly outside Stafford such as Hixon with existing infrastructure and road links. New housing will reduce commuting at Egg Lane. ACTION: Noted.

- 9.229 Local services and facilities will be sustained by new housing and infrastructure investment. ACTION: Noted.
- 10.224 Support standardised Section 106 Agreements over Community Infrastructure Levy which may discourage developer investment due to uncertainty.
- ACTION: Noted
- 1 response (Tweedale for Mr Holt) – PDF response to support client’s land at Eccleshall.
- 3.5 Support spatial vision and role of Eccleshall. ACTION: Noted.
- 4.63 & 4.64 Support level of services and facilities associated with Eccleshall including public transport with elevated status in hierarchy.
- ACTION: Noted.
- 6.12 Support Option C with Eccleshall and Hixon access to employment opportunities. ACTION: Noted.
- 6.29 – 6.31 To support Option C the development potential to Eccleshall to be further explored. ACTION: Noted.
- 7.1 Support key principles with final housing numbers following Regional Spatial Strategy examination. ACTION: Noted.
- 7.4 Welcome role of Eccleshall to provide for housing due to sustainable and appropriate locations. ACTION: Noted.
- 7.13 Eccleshall has a wide range of services and facilities, employment and public transport / highway links to be reflected in the development provision.
- ACTION: Noted.
- 8.22 Support Eccleshall south and east direction of growth EC-1, EC-2 and EC-3 owned by client whilst EC-4 and EC-5 are inappropriate.
- ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Eccleshall development locations discussion.
- 8.24 Eccleshall has significant services and facilities but relatively small population so appropriate for new housing as well as employment at Raleigh Hall to support sustainable credentials. There is limited brownfield land in Eccleshall hence the need for Greenfield in agricultural use.
- ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Eccleshall development locations discussion.
- 8.25 Most appropriate locations for housing development are EC-1 and EC-2 then EC-3 due to strategic road locations and traffic to alleviate pressure and mitigate impacts by landscaping measures.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Eccleshall development locations discussion.

- 8.26 EC-3 would require a new road junction but limited infrastructure. However development at EC-4 and EC-5 would have environmental impacts, traffic and highway issues with existing schools and lack of local road network capacity restricting development. ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Eccleshall development locations discussion.

1 response (Bloor Homes for Messrs Stacey, Mullee & Holt) – PDF response for client’s land south of Eccleshall. Support the Council adopting the higher growth scenario and test greater provision to 13,300 new homes due to latest household formation data and consistent with national policy of flexibility. Concern about sub division of development with 37% of Borough’s population living outside Stafford and Stone not reflected in development provision to meet needs. There are strong sustainable attributes to larger settlements thus supporting Option D. Support housing development at EC-3 with landowner co-operation for delivery and no new highway infrastructure required and limited landscape sensitivity implications including historic character. ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Eccleshall development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs Dawson) – Wildlife will be endangered. Increased traffic along narrow country lanes. Views spoilt. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs Ladell) – PDF response objecting to the new road east of Eccleshall rather than widening Blurston’s Lane which is cheaper and provide a bypass to reduce town congestion and pollution.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Eccleshall development locations discussion.

1 response (Stafford Chamber of Commerce & Industry) – PDF response supporting the Growth Point bid and delivery of new development. Support the vision and Option C for growth distribution and development with new allocations to have strong sustainability qualities despite requiring Greenfield sites. High standards of energy efficiency to be achieved and limited climate change impacts and appropriate transport infrastructure with new development. Mixed development and links between housing and employment to be delivered with infrastructure. Employment provision with public transport and parking provision to attract new investment and deliver success as well as retail and office developments in Stafford. New employment supports local economic growth sectors with skills, knowledge and prosperity. Specific development sites should be identified to support investment opportunities and remain competitive with other areas and regions. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (PPS for Mr Talbot) – PDF response to support client's land north of Gnosall with focus of development at principal settlements. A more flexible approach to increase housing choice across the Borough to meet urban and rural needs whilst avoiding loss of character. Deliver sustainable communities by improving living standards in rural areas, choice of housing, employment and services. Support review of Residential Development Boundaries on fringe of settlements as well as some sites in the North Staffordshire Green Belt for infill or on settlement edges to meet demand for lower density housing whilst not undermining regeneration initiatives and reducing pressure on brownfield sites. Some settlements not suitable for development but new employment allocations to existing Recognised Industrial Estates and limited housing development to maintain sustainable growth. Housing to be mentioned in the Sustainable Community Strategies as well as the overall Borough vision. Support key principles, vision and reference to need with approach to growth in settlements. Support rural renaissance and regeneration for housing needs as well as principal of Green Belt approach. Flexibility is required through the strategy to support communities in all settlements rather than a new settlement. Gnosall has significant services and facilities with good transport links for growth especially to the north at Audmore Road.

Support affordable housing targets but balanced with viability. Rural exception sites are important for housing delivery in rural areas. Extra care housing is important for an ageing population using lifetime home standards in attractive locations on fringe of principal settlements.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Gnosall development locations discussion.

1 response (PPS for Mr Allman) – PDF response to support client's land south of Clayton with focus of development at principal settlements. A more flexible approach to increase housing choice across the Borough to meet urban and rural needs whilst avoiding loss of character. Deliver sustainable communities by improving living standards in rural areas, choice of housing, employment and services. Support review of Residential Development Boundaries on fringe of settlements as well as some sites in the North Staffordshire Green Belt for infill or on settlement edges to meet demand for lower density housing whilst not undermining regeneration initiatives and reducing pressure on brownfield sites. Some settlements not suitable for significant development with new employment allocations to existing Recognised Industrial Estates and limited housing development to maintain sustainable growth. Housing to be mentioned in the Sustainable Community Strategies as well as the overall Borough vision. Support key principles, vision and reference to need with approach to growth in settlements. Support rural renaissance and regeneration for housing needs as well as the philosophy of the Green Belt but infill development on edge of settlements should be allowed. Flexibility is required through the strategy to support communities in all settlements rather than a new settlement. North Staffordshire conurbation brownfield development to be balanced with some Greenfield releases for a wider choice of housing types and locations.

Some of the housing figure for Stafford Borough should be identified to Green Belt fringe areas of the North Staffordshire conurbation to support urban expansion and regeneration with strategic links to Stafford. There are some anomalies with the Green Belt boundary at Clayton where infill development could occur with access to higher order services and facilities including public transport.

Support affordable housing targets but balanced with viability. Rural exception sites are important for housing delivery in rural areas. Extra care housing is important for an ageing population using lifetime home standards in attractive locations on fringe of principal settlements.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (P Thompson) – PDF response with support for development at Norton Bridge due to rail links and existing residential development helping to reduce congestion and facilitate commuting through M6 access. Support varied housing with access to other settlements as well as existing facilities similar to other areas of the Borough. Eccleshall has traffic problems on existing roads with new development exacerbating the issues, detrimental to the town's character and spreading residential development. Suggest a northern ribbon development towards Raleigh Hall to provide access to employment sites. Object to the proposed new road as dangerous but suggest a new road from Walton Hall to Loggerheads to remove traffic from Eccleshall. ACTION: Noted support for new settlement and objection to new development at Eccleshall for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Milwich Action Committee) – PDF response with support for existing Residential Development Boundary to maintain character and sufficient access to services for the community. Future development must meet proven local need, in keeping with character and housing stock, limited in scale, the need for employment opportunities but avoid commuting, conversion of redundant buildings and access to services. Services and facilities are provided in Stone so therefore significant development in this settlement should be matched by service infrastructure to avoid impacts on Stone and surrounding areas. Concern about traffic speed, increase in HGVs and volumes on local rural road networks to be considered with new development.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Betts) – PDF response with objection to 13,000 new homes to be spread across all the villages creating desirable hamlets and burdening other villages, unfair on tax payer. No village to take more than 20% new development with current lack of consistency.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr D J Harvey) – PDF response objecting to no plan changes for Cold Meece despite new housing, opposing new and re-use of employment sites. Query previous reference to huge investment but no reference in current plans.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (C Harvey) – PDF response objecting to no plan changes for Cold Meece despite new housing, opposing new and re-use of employment sites. Query previous reference to huge investment but no reference in current plans.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (The Shrewsbury & Newport Canals Trust) – PDF response with support for paragraph 9.115 regarding Newport canal's inclined plane through a subsequent enabling policy. Support a new road to links Norbury Junction to A519 despite some local opposition. Scheme is some distance from the existing village with landscaping for the new road and parking areas generating significant tourist interest and support for the local economy.

ACTION: Noted with support to be considered in the context of the Habitat Regulations Assessment and Natural England's concerns.

1 response (Advantage West Midlands) – PDF response with support for Option C approach with development locations ensuring access to services and facilities, jobs and public transport to minimise transport demands, energy use and environmental impacts. Development not to prejudice North Staffordshire urban renewal initiatives with Gnosall, Eccleshall, Hixon and The Haywood sufficient distance from this area although development at Stone could have implications.

ACTION: Noted

Supply of employment land is crucial to support housing growth, to be reflected in higher growth scenario (paragraph 7.13). Object to targeted employment sites for particular uses (paragraph 9.90) leading to vacancy and lack of demand. Support a policy encouraging re-use of employment sites in sustainable locations. The document should mention retention of the Creda site at Blythe Bridge for employment uses. To deliver growth brownfield sites should be maximised although some Greenfield development will be required.

ACTION: Agreed.

Support for policy on landscape, Green Infrastructure SPD and important of historic assets and landscape to attract and retain people. Support increased tourism and leisure potential contributing to the area and attracting inward investment.

ACTION: Noted.

Support the provision of small sites in rural areas for affordable housing to meet local need as well as conversion of rural buildings for employment use to diversify the economy and assist development. Encourage more efficient resource use and energy infrastructure. Supports paragraph 9.09 to 9.11 for potential renewable energy including hydrocarbon energy for local electricity generation, commercial opportunities and reduced greenhouse gas concentrations. Support minimum on-site renewable energy generation balanced with viability and investment deliverability through flexible application.

ACTION: Noted for incorporation into the new preferred approach.

Significant carbon dioxide reductions requiring changes to energy planning and future use linked to energy supplies and infrastructure taking account of cumulative



impacts. Planning policy in Stafford Borough should aim to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes level 5 and consideration of zero carbon approaches including for non domestic buildings such as commercial buildings reducing carbon emissions as well as Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) excellent buildings for preferred locations. Building for Life standards to be complemented by West Midlands Sustainability Checklist for all areas based development schemes.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through Chapter 9 – Climate Change preferred policy approach.

1 response (Manby Steward Bowdler on behalf of Mr and Mrs Swinnerton) – PDF response

- 3.7 Suitable sites in rural settlements to consider development's harm.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 6.14 & 6.15 Option E provides development at selected growth points with Option F allowing growth distribution to examine site suitability on development merits.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 7.5 Haughton is considered suitable for housing and employment development as a sustainable location close to Stafford. Agree with Haughton for housing growth in Scenario Options 1. The most suitable direction for growth is south of Haughton at HN-6 and possibly HN-5 close to services and facilities with public transport links to Stafford Spatial Options 7. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.36 Housing requirements will need brownfield and Greenfield development in appropriate locations such as Haughton with site size and suitability considered.  
ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.
- 10.24 – 10.25 Support standardised Section 106 agreements with suitable flexibility for scheme viability. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Broom) – PDF response objecting to increased development in Stafford Borough with spread of urbanisation from Birmingham northwards to be resisted in rural Staffordshire. Village development will extend built up areas with loss of identity and character, increased traffic congestion, flooding and surface run off problems. The Haywoods suffers from drainage and sewage issues with question of need for increased housing.

ACTION: Noted objections to development including at The Haywoods to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr J Shephard for Stafford Gospel Hall Trust) – Support the vision and links to Sustainable Community Strategy but amended to refer to faith communities as a distinctive part of community sector.

- 3.2 Welcome new social infrastructure with new housing development.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 3.5 Welcome locally specific vision with Council to be aware of communities including faith communities. ACTION: Noted.
- 4.6 Welcome recognition of ageing community with amended paragraph suggested.  
ACTION: No change.
- 6.12 Support Option C approach. ACTION: Noted.
- 6.19 Core Strategy to define the meaning of infrastructure, with a table incorporated for Section 106 Agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy requirements.  
ACTION: Accepted.
- 9.13 On-site renewable energy only required in line with RSS policy and national building regulations. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.92 Re-use of existing employment area to be related to transport networks as some areas are unsustainable. Welcome a non-prescriptive approach and other non-employment and non-residential uses can occur in redevelopment areas.  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.93 Support national car parking standards. ACTION: Noted.
- 9.95 Welcome cemeteries, churchyards and burial grounds contributing to Green Infrastructure and production of Green Infrastructure SPD (Paragraph 9.98).  
ACTION: Noted.
- 9.106 Support Sustainable Drainage Systems but question the 20% more efficient infiltration target on low permeable soils. Support floodplains but avoid blighting potential redevelopment sites. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Pegasus Planning for Maximus Strategic) – PDF response relating to land controlled north of Beaconside, Stafford with supporting evidence to be prepared to show viability and sustainable local for housing growth. Sustainable Community Strategies Vision amended to reflect need for natural resource protection and environmental enhancement in line with PPS1 including action on climate change and energy consumption.

ACTION: Noted, to be referred to the Policy & Improvement team.

Support the spatial vision for Stafford economy and high quality housing but question greater emphasis on addressing climate change rather than “a rich environment resilient to effects of climate change.” The vision should consider the higher growth scenarios up to 13,100 dwellings but welcome additional employment, office and retail provision with extra housing growth. ACTION: Noted.

- 4.55 Support consideration of West Midlands super garrison at Stafford with major benefits but Ministry of Defence to support new infrastructure provision and housing provision for the Army in addition to RSS requirements. ACTION: Noted.

Core Strategy to be progressed with flexibility to meet the higher growth scenarios suggested through the RSS process based on Stafford's Growth Point status. Infrastructure is a key component for growth delivery at Stafford to be supported by public sector investment. ACTION: Noted.

Support Option C with 70% focus on Stafford town for growth and 30% elsewhere recognising Stone as the next most sustainable settlement. Agree with factors identified in paragraph 6.19 including consideration of services, facilities, employment, environmental impact and infrastructure. Support paragraph 6.28 regarding new settlement and Green Belt based on commuting, climate change and loss of open countryside rather than sustainable urban extensions.

ACTION: Noted.

Sustainability Appraisal process should consider higher growth scenarios for Stafford Borough above 7,000 new dwellings to Stafford. North Staffordshire conurbation urban renewal initiatives should not be taken account for Stafford although accept for Stone and northern areas of the Borough due to self sustaining market. Sustainable urban extensions will be crucial to deliver development requirements. ACTION: Noted.

Further analysis should be carried out on higher growth scenarios set out by Nathaniel Lichfield's Report rather than the 12,100 figure. Support Stafford identified for housing and employment growth with settlement hierarchy reflecting resources and all relevant factors. Support the proportionate split approach with Stafford taking greater percentages if the higher growth figures occur. ACTION: Noted.

Oppose certain development locations including areas of flood risk such as SF-5 without evidence of how to overcome constraints. Oppose heavy reliance on completions and commitments to establish final numbers for settlements as these could meet shortfalls in increased RSS housing provisions and query delivery of sites via paragraph 54 of PPS3. Some schemes agreed through the previous housing boom will not be delivered. ACTION: Noted.

Support housing and employment at SF-2 and SF-a sustainable urban extensions including client's land due to excellent access, limited flood risk and landscape constraints as well as complementing super garrison proposals. Growth to west of Stafford restricted by the M6, to the south by Green Belt and Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, to the east by sensitive landscape, flooding and less accessible to M6 motorway. ACTION: Noted.

Development of land south of Stafford with implications for cross border working and inappropriate due to the Green Belt as other directions of growth exist avoiding such issues. Phased development may be appropriate to the north of Stafford Borough but not for Stafford to ensure growth delivery. Support retention of Green Belt boundaries

and no safeguarded land to be identified. No other Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt should be considered. ACTION: Noted.

Greater consideration to be given to renewable energy through the document with policy framework to include hydrocarbon resources.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through Chapter 9 – Climate Change preferred policy approach.

Agree it is inappropriate to set previously developed land targets due to scale of Greenfield housing development required and suggest cancelling the sequential approach to brownfield land in previous PPG3 now replaced by paragraphs 37 and 38 of PPS3 for planned locations with emphasis on public transport and community facilities. ACTION: Noted.

Housing mix approach to comply with PPS3 with concern if increased single person households leads to requirement for fewer bedrooms and apartments not reflecting market demand distorting housing supply. Support a percentage of affordable housing in all new developments but not controlling mix and type of housing suggested in para 9.41. ACTION: Noted.

Object to a policy requiring the provision of Lifetime Homes but rather use planning obligations based on demonstrated need to provide for the elderly as well facilitated by Code for Sustainable Homes to Code 6. Variety of housing including sheltered housing and extra care housing acknowledged. ACTION: Noted.

Agree with affordable housing thresholds to ensure greater proportions in rural settlements but strongly oppose the proportion of 40% with Northern Housing Market Area target being 22% of overall housing. Economic viability assessment required to establish proportion thus preventing development and reducing delivery. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (GVA Grimleys for Highways Agency) – PDF response agreeing with the Option C approach and lack of development west of M6 motorway. Greater emphasis on transport within Stone is required rather than telecommunications but welcome work on Stafford. The following issues need to be addressed: heavy traffic flows between M6 Junction 13 and 14 exacerbated by local traffic to avoid Stafford congestion, impact of traffic growth on Junction 13 operationally, significant queuing at Junction 14 northbound slip road threatening M6, impact of major road scheme to south east of Stafford to be tested. Sustainable transport infrastructure delivered through increased growth with strong emphasis to limit residual trip impacts and interest in recent Network Rail additional funding for increased rail capacity at Stafford and Colwich to be considered through the Core Strategy.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (South Staffordshire District Council) – PDF response giving no support for development of land south of Stafford to meet the needs of Stafford Borough which has significant implications for the Core Strategy. Explicit reference is required to explain which strategic options involves land south of Stafford and links to County Town of Stafford. Land south of Stafford contrary to Sustainability Appraisal process and Council's preferred option C if not taken into account. Concern about community infrastructure and demonstrating delivery including the possible new road, schools, new country park, neighbourhood policing unit and park & ride scheme. Strongly disagrees with paragraph 9.35 as in conflict with PPS3 para. 36 and 40 using brownfield land as priority. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Hallam Land Management Ltd) – PDF response with strategic sites related to Core Strategy with clarification required. Question the identification of firm housing and employment figures due to the RSS process on-going and changes may require a review so support proportions and ranges for Stafford rather than a fixed figure. Support Option C with focus on Stafford and Stone but avoid unsustainable growth elsewhere not matched by market needs. Question the need for a phased approach related to local market information and delivery of land south of Stafford without cross border co-operation thus effecting distribution elsewhere (para 7.1). Delivering housing in Stafford is a major challenge with 5,000 homes allocated whilst in Stone only 300 homes required to deliver 1,000 target. Object to higher growth scenarios increasing Stafford proportion rather than other settlements due to deliverability and wish employment provision to also increase. Question deliverability of SF-8 at Stafford. Object to SN-1 due to access across railway and new roads, isolation from rest of Stone, junction pressures on Lichfield Road, topography, inability for high quality design and open space provision within prominent landscape. SN-2 unsuitable due to distance from Stone, new access road across railway causing delays. SN-3 restricted by open access land and SN-5 has flooding issues. SN-4 is sustainable and deliverable with no flooding and highway constraints, access to Eccleshall Road, close to town centre with road improvements and pedestrian links, close to school and local facilities, no ecological or archaeological issues. ACTION: Note support for SN-4 with consideration through the Stone development locations discussion.

Code for Sustainable Homes to be accepted and not extended by Council policy with solar energy reducing density levels. PPS3 seeks to deliver housing with no requirement for brownfield first which will restrict supply. Housing mix must meet market demands including type. Viability assessments are required to ensure affordable housing is delivered with objection to pepper potting approach and Registered Social Landlords to deliver affordable housing. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Environment Agency) – PDF response with development north of Stafford used to control surface water flows to Marston / Sandyford Brook facilitated through a Level 2 SFRA. Stone development in north westerly direction linked to River Trent rather than impacting on smaller tributaries. Hixon has drainage issues due to flat gradient restricting development at HA-b, HA-c, HI-a and HI-b with high water table. In the Haywoods GH-1 needs off site watercourse improvements with

direction of growth to south preferred. Weston prefer south west direction. Yarnfield oppose growth impact on small watercourses to directed to west or east. Tittensor preserve floodplain.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the settlement locations.

All development to take account of PPS25 regarding flood risk management and drainage including Major Developed Sites in Green Belt. Densities to provide space for water. Support brownfield preference to Greenfield development to assist securing remediation of contaminated land through PPS23. Support sustainable drainage systems, 20% infiltration rates, floodplains and green infrastructure links as well as Stone's floodplain to be protected from development. Policies included regarding demand management and water efficiency to minimise water use as this area is moderately water stressed to assist carbon dioxide emissions. Support Level 4 Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM efficiency standards in new developments. Sewage work network capacity for clean and foul water requires attention to avoid loss of watercourse quality with Severn Trent Water liaison to separate surface water and foul elements. In rural areas treatment plants and existing works to be improved. Future water systems are to be maintained as well as sustainable drainage.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through Chapter 9 – Climate Change and Environment preferred policy approach.

1 response (Walton Priory Middle School) – Views from school children with acceptance of new housing in Stone but some opposition with account taken of infrastructure, traffic problems, need for housing, requirements for new services and facilities, open space provision, flooding problems, loss of open countryside, implications of new development and roads including SN-1, SN-3 and SN-4.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Barton Willmore for Grainger PLC) – PDF response for owners of Ranton Estate including Great Bridgeford and Ranton land as well as land west of Ladfordfields Recognised Industrial Estate. Support the vision and principles for expansion of services and facilities in rural areas with additional housing. Generally support key objectives with additional facilities alongside housing but a new objective for housing provision within villages not just for affordable housing.

ACTION: Noted

7.5 Great Bridgeford to be included with settlements due to size, level of services and facilities, and ability to deliver new facilities through new growth in accordance with the vision and key objectives.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.

- 7.6 Object to Green Belt development on previously developed land at Tittensor and Yarnfield for housing, not in accordance with PPG2 but support housing development on Greenfield land as an alternative. Support Great Bridgeford and Ranton identified with Residential Development Boundary. ACTION: Noted.

Other settlements listed for potential growth will require new village centres, services and facilities so Great Bridgeford should not be excluded with good location, existing provision and available land.

Support new employment development at Ladfordfields with direct road access, no constraints, ability for public transport provision, rural economy viability and employment base. ACTION: Noted.

Support new tourist attractions and visitor accommodation with a marina development at Norbury Junction and recreation tourism at Ranton Abbey. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (West Midlands Regional Assembly) – PDF response with concern about development undermining the North Staffordshire Housing Market Area and urban renaissance of the Major Urban Area but policy restraint and phased delivery proposed. Plan supports retention and growth of existing service centres with focus on Stafford and Stone aligning with RSS strategy. Employment growth to overcome deprivation and vulnerability. Policy formulation needed for environment and green infrastructure. Transport system related to local schemes to support development. RSS requirements for office and retail being met in Stafford. Settlement hierarchy to reflect growth levels with links to infrastructure delivery. No reference to phasing approach in RSS Phase 2 but policy of restraint for North Staffordshire and no categorisation of employment land (Policy PA6A).

Overall residential development and distribution consistent with RSS with preferred option to provide clearer indication of distribution. Higher growth scenarios to focus on Stafford as a settlement of significant development. Support development restraint and phasing to assist North Staffordshire conurbation for urban renaissance with clear definition although development at Tittensor and Yarnfield could conflict with the approach due to scale of development. Creates issues with settlement hierarchy and Green Belt settlements not generally considered for development. Question whether existing major developed sites sufficient to change approach with material benefit to be evidenced. The settlement hierarchy to be amended to reflect scale of development at Yarnfield and Tittensor compared to Group 2 settlements and 250-300 dwellings. Further justification is required for continued inclusion and alignment to strategy in context of PPG2.

ACTION: Noted with greater consideration given to residential development at Tittensor and Yarnfield arising from this response.

Support focus of employment development on Stafford town but question level of new allocations to Recognised Industrial Estates in rural areas to scale and character of locations.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.

Site capacities to identify how office and retail requirements will be met.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (NJL for Mr Sanders) – PDF response regarding land east of Stone Road, Tittensor within the Green Belt to be released for development to meet the needs of the local community. Very special circumstances relate to the economy and flexibility. Welcome Sustainable Community Strategy to meet community needs for sustainable and accessible development provided by clients site. Support Option F with new development extensions to existing settlements including necessary Green Belt releases due to property market implications, over use of brownfield sites and lack of family housing. Sustainable Green Belt releases will ensure delivery with people located close to employment and transport links. Oppose level of housing in Stafford due to failure to sell houses in current market, increase empty properties and oversupply of town centre apartments. Other sites in Tittensor are proposed for development but less integrated with local services on A34 road. Less account should be taken of existing completions and commitments which may not be delivered and therefore fail to meet housing requirements and affordability issues. Tittensor to be allocated a specific number of homes but existing sites are inappropriate opposed to client's land with good access and transport links, public transport and support for local services with employment land. Oppose policy of restraint resulting from North Staffordshire urban renewal programmes due to lack of deliverable sites identified in Stafford Borough to meet requirements. Large areas of strategically placed land for mixed uses should be released with self-sustained resources, services and facilities. Local energy production could be provided on site. Safeguarded land to be identified at Tittensor due to strategic and sustainable location with links to TT-1 and TT-2. Effective master planning is required without set design standards. Support site specific housing densities with consideration of Green Belt, Greenfield and brownfield land based on delivery with the sequential approach not to restrict housing provision. Support the market to determine housing mix. Lifetime homes based on robust evidence of need. Site can help deliver a sustainable Tittensor with community infrastructure, services and facilities. Affordable housing should not lead to sites being unviable with individual assessment through Section 106 Agreements and Code for Sustainable Homes implications. Support rural exception sites and targeted employment sites to deliver jobs in sustainable locations close to new housing reducing travel to work issues. Support green infrastructure and biodiversity with landscape policies based on robust evidence with loss balanced against development benefits. Support a new health care facility on land at Tittensor with good hospital links. Create a link road for local road network improvements as well as public transport provision and infrastructure.

ACTION: Noted based on support for client's land to be considered through the Development Strategy approach in relation to Tittensor.



1 response (RENEW North Staffordshire) – PDF response with concern about detrimental impact of options proposed at Stone, Tittensor and Yarnfield on North Staffordshire’s regeneration. Support the phased development principle to avoid prejudicing the urban renewal initiatives with implications at Stone as well as Tittensor and Yarnfield. Support development of Stone later in the Plan period. Further details are required for an impact analysis on the RENEW programme. Affordable housing to be prioritised to counter dominance of owner occupation thus rebalancing the local housing market and avoid market competition through adjacent housing markets.

ACTION: Noted with greater consideration given to residential development at Tittensor and Yarnfield arising from this response.

1 response (J E Mosley) – Object to the public consultation exercise and flawed approach with Council inconsistencies. Oppose affordable housing at Colwich and the Haywoods blighting local property prices and not just providing homes for local families. Brownfield before Greenfield and jobs before houses.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (DTZ for Mr Griffin) – PDF response with support for client’s land off Doxey Road, Stafford partly Greenfield and brownfield to deliver 650 homes and links to Burleyfields / Castlefields. Land has no impact on Green Belt or floodplains, no historic environment implications and limited impact on protected environmental designations, the majority is brownfield, includes public open space nearby and Residential Development Boundary, well located to Stafford town centre, services and facilities with public transport to provide residential requirements with strong developer interest to be delivered within 5 years at 50-100 units per year. There are no known legal or ownership issues, no physical topography or access constraints with adequate infrastructure in the locality. The site is no longer acceptable for employment use with relocation in the Borough.

ACTION: Noted and support for client’s land as housing to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Cannock Chase AONB Partnership) – PDF response with scale of development in Stafford Borough bringing negative impacts on the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) from increased recreational use and commuting across the area to be addressed through project mitigation paid for through planning obligations including the country park south of Stafford.

ACTION: Noted.

Paragraph 2.4 to include retention of landscape quality. Support for green infrastructure links between Stafford and the AONB as well as alternative recreational areas. Support no significant development in settlements adjacent to the AONB. Object to increased recreation pressure from new development at Stafford, the Haywoods and Hixon requiring significant mitigation measures if progressed, particularly SF-6 to SF-8. Support for development north of Stafford but query southern and eastern distributor road due to impact on AONB, wildlife and traffic

volumes. Appropriate Assessment in combination assessment should be taken into account with new development implications.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach and Stafford development locations.

Support sustainable living, renewable energy, landscape character and designated sites regarding potential renewable energy generation projects. Support travelling families sites outside of the AONB to protect visual impact and habitats. Support reduced vehicular transport in the AONB with sustainable transport modes to be encouraged. Support green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement as well as landscape character. Support new visitor accommodation in the Borough and spending within the AONB facilitating practical management and education. Support criteria for telecommunications and visual implications. Measure to protect designated areas to be included in Environmental Quality section.

**ACTION:** Noted.

Support, in principle, a new country park but investigate deliverability before housing development, meeting visitor aspirations, effect of diverting visits from the AONB, financial management and viability, signage requirements, economic returns achieved.

**ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Aragon Planning for the Bond Hospital Trust, Mr Butterworth & Williams) – PDF response relating to land owned south of Stafford with clarification of maxima or minima housing and employment figures from Regional Spatial Strategy as well as Ministry of Defence intentions. Support Option A focus on Stafford to meet objectives and infrastructure requirements, note Option C approach but Stone to be avoided due to impact on North Staffordshire conurbation whilst Residential Development Boundaries only revised to reflect new development. SF-8 south of Stafford to be developed as a sustainable urban extension delivering housing and key infrastructure such as SFPR-2 whilst development to the north phased and de-allocation of HP-3. Oppose Green Belt allocations with new housing and employment delivered together to reduce commuting. Housing development costs should be minimised for developers such as energy use and sustainable construction implications.

**ACTION:** Noted to consider support for SF-8 through the Stafford development locations.

Accept Meaford designation as Major Developed Site in Green Belt but reject other sites listed. Design to be dealt with in separate SPD to enable developers to take account of local circumstances. Sequential approach of brownfield and Greenfield based on sustainable site merits. Reduced need for affordable housing due to economic downturn making prices more attainable. Protect existing employment sites in accessible locations for retention and re-use.

**ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Mr D Morrish) – PDF response with criticism of engagement with the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector. Spatial Vision - Concern about Stafford being identified with exceptional services in light of planned new development which will significant impact on infrastructure such as schools. Significant investment will be need to meet future requirements, beyond that achieved through Section 106 agreements but welcome

the holistic assessment of infrastructure including utilities and energy use due to impact on movement networks in the future. Object to the retail provision in Stafford town centre due to current commitments, growth of out of town centres, number of empty shops, impact on townscape character and patterns elsewhere.

Spatial Portrait - Greater emphasis of biodiversity in urban locations and gardens through the spatial portrait and question the retail improvements in Stafford due to out of town centres. ACTION: Noted.

National and regional policy – Object to the Core Strategy being prepared to meet Regional Spatial Strategy requirements due to flawed growth forecasts not being relevant. Planned provision in Stafford will not be required leading to an oversupply of housing land and sporadic development. Provision should only be made for local need but support employment and office requirements. ACTION: Noted.

Spatial Options – Support southern and eastern directions of growth for Stafford to deliver the distributor roads, a viable park & ride scheme, water resource capacity and surplus education provision, supports regeneration in North Staffordshire. Support SF-1 north of Stafford based on infrastructure but not SF-2 until the future of Ministry of Defence land is known. Employment to be south and east of Stafford to support distributor roads and park & ride scheme. Reference is needed to Meaford concerning development delivery in Stone but not elsewhere. No development in Gnosall or Eccleshall.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.

Support site specific approach for housing density due to parking standards and realistic delivery of sustaining neighbourhoods and public open space provision. Support brownfield, with definition before Greenfield consistent with PPS3 including vacant and derelict sites. Not all brownfield land is suitable for housing with delivery to meet local need. Density should be considered in context of other factors. Support housing mix for lifetime and specialist homes, delivery of neighbourhood policing units and social rented housing. Support for housing thresholds and transport measures but oppose a park & ride north of Stafford as well as removal of the bus station. Support new development in the town centre but oppose taller buildings. Support the Green Infrastructure SPD to include habitat creation but query reference to PPG17 Assessment work with additional text added. Concern about delivery of planned infrastructure for growth through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) system including community provision. Suggest monitoring of Section 106 agreements and CIL. ACTION: Noted

1 response (Mr J LeFroy) – PDF response questioning the LDF consultation approach being left open to inappropriate interpretation of development's scale and impact on settlements with the subsequent document identifying maximum houses per settlement. Concern about scale of house building and population increase with significant strain on communities and infrastructure alongside an ageing population, congested local roads, demographic changes and economic pressures. Growth to be restricted to 5,000 – 6,000 by 2026 supported by infrastructure based on maintaining

character, meeting local needs, avoiding large standard housing estates failing to meet individual requirements such as home working / older relatives, number of vacant properties. ACTION: Noted.

The Local Development Framework to consider the recession and its development consequences, reduce the number of empty properties, impact of population increase by 25%, evidence of village growth without undermining character, represent realistic locations. Move away from predict and provide model to delivery of local needs for communities by local house building companies. Provision of infrastructure is vital with new development including acute hospital cover. Support the vision but query the public sector funds to deliver due to the current economic circumstances. Stafford to have 10% growth with appropriate infrastructure and premium employment land and offices, increased recreational and sport provision including the country park but avoid raised expectations due to economic climate. Welcome improved facilities for rural settlements through selected growth with details set out for delivery. Minimum growth scenario is unrealistic to ensure character retained and local housing need. Stafford's road system is too congested. ACTION: Noted.

Support on-site renewable energy and hydrocarbon energy resources as well as energy efficiency standards but not wind generation. Housing density on site by site basis and support sequential approach to housing delivery. Question whether the market can deliver correct housing mix except with local engagement. Role of Council to purchase development land. Support lifetime homes and specialist provision in major housing schemes. Support re-use of rural buildings for economic use such as home working. Affordable housing to be flexible enough to avoid lack of development with rural exception sites from local communities. Support re-use of existing employment sites in suitable locations and national car parking standards. Support green infrastructure policy and additional tourist attractions including Newport canal. Telecommunications to maximise operational capacity and limit controversial locations. Strongly challenge capacity of Stafford hospital to cope with increased ageing population and housing provision with further evidence provided. Protect the southern and western access routes around Stafford with Park & Ride consideration as well as Stafford rail station improvement including parking. Investigate the potential for a bus station in Stafford. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Stoke City Council) – PDF response with North Staffordshire regeneration not to be undermined by housing provision in Stafford Borough. The highest priority is for regeneration of the inner urban core of North Staffordshire early in the Plan period. There are interrelationships with the housing market of Stafford Borough causing concern if development north of Stafford town. Welcome recognition of potential development impacts of Stone, Tittensor and Yarnfield on North Staffordshire with respective phasing approach depending on scale. By 2016 North Staffordshire should be more effective in competing with other housing areas but take account of longer time horizon due to economic downturn.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy and phasing policies.

1 response (Brocton Parish Council) – PDF response agreeing with spatial vision and key objectives including protection of Green Belt and Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. No development in the Green Belt and no Greenfield development southwards (paragraph 6.2). Concern about Brocton in Group 2 settlements leading to Residential Development Boundary changes and Greenfield loss so oppose review of Residential Development Boundaries leading to character and historic environment losses. Peripheral development at Brocton to be considered in context of Appropriate Assessment and Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation as well as potential new road proposals with impact on green buffer. Object to housing development at SF-7 to SF-9. Water sewerage infrastructure to be reviewed prior to any more development at Brocton. New roads south of Stafford should not be linked to housing development. Support the Park & Ride scheme but query the location and not serving local people, new housing needs public transport improvements although Stafford road network would struggle to accommodate bus lanes without serious congestion. Requirement for a central bus interchange. Village services and facilities must be maintained in the future but public transport is not necessarily supported by commercial operators. Prefer Section 106 Agreements but Parishes to benefit if Community Infrastructure Levy is established.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Indigo Planning for Commercial Estates Group) – PDF response concerning land east of Stafford at Tixall Road to support residential led development to meet requirements and Growth Point. Support balance of employment land development to the north of Stafford due to access onto the M6 and transport links, the moderate to high landscape sensitivity and not prejudicing Stone and regeneration of the North Staffordshire conurbation through housing development. Land east of Stafford has low to moderate landscape sensitivity in a robust contained and separate area from Tixall, would deliver the eastern distributor road as a local highway link based on assessment of current studies together with mixed use development. Local highway mitigation could be applied prior to the eastern distributor road so the area is suitable and deliverable for housing in the short and longer term complementing sustainable urban extensions north and west of Stafford without significant infrastructure requirements. Land south of Stafford would require the southern distributor road in the longer term and agreement with South Staffordshire District Council which is not currently promoted. Development is not likely except in the medium to longer term. Land west of Stafford is close to Stafford Castle with moderate to high landscape sensitivity requiring the western access link over the railway and although close to the town centre is not deliverable until the medium to long term.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

Significant urban extensions are required to deliver Stafford's growth as shown by the vision and objectives (para 3.6). The existing housing land supply includes extant consents, outline permissions and sites older than 5 years so querying deliverability including SHLAA sites relating to developable land and provision of infrastructure (para 6.26). Support development strategy based on Option C with focus on Stafford

to deliver RSS housing requirements and Growth Point. Support review of Residential Development Boundary for Stafford to provide for new development on sustainable Greenfield sites with land south of Stafford implemented after other urban extensions (para 6.31). Higher growth scenario to be revised upwards to reflect Nathaniel Lichfield's report and Growth Point for Stafford with flexibility for expansion of MoD Stafford. The lower growth scenario is an absolute minimum (para. 7.3). Clear focus of development for Stafford, with less in Stone and rural areas to deliver proposed strategy (para. 7.4 & 7.5). Greater clarification needed about the proportionate split of housing and employment by settlement with an employment shortfall, object to reliance on Stone and rural areas with Stafford figures not maxima so there is potential to increase growth without detriment to Stone. Increased employment development to be directed to Stafford. The table to be updated to include Nathaniel Lichfield growth scenario (para. 7.13). Reject the proportionate split reflecting existing supply of housing due to unsustainable rural locations delivering housing targets rather than sustainable areas in Stafford town with infrastructure and affordable housing requirements. Challenge reliance on existing commitments due to economic situation so adjusted downwards thus committed supply of sites not to influence development patterns in the future (para 8.4). SF-3 and SF-4 are unclear with SF-3 being land west of Baswich Lane and SF-4 being land north and south of Tixall Road so information to be reviewed and reference to eastern distributor road in SF-3 as well as excellent highway links, impact on local road network and commuting whilst SF-4 can be developed earlier (para 8.11). Reference to joint studies being undertaken with South Staffordshire District Council for land delivery within the timeframe (8.14). Parts of SF-3 could be delivered without the eastern distributor road (8.15). Question the land west of Stafford being considered to be most sustainable prior to finalisation of Stafford transport study with proposals for western access road limiting development in the short to medium term thus requiring other locations to ensure housing delivery in accordance with PPS3 and RSS (8.16).

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

Object to Code for Sustainable Homes standard and target above Building Regulations at design stage (para 9.18). Housing density to accord with national and regional policy although some flexibility on a site by site basis to account for other factors (para 9.31). Question the level of 4 bedroomed houses in context of 2007 Strategic Housing Market Assessment of oversupply smaller terraces and apartments with flexible housing mix and type required to reflect demand as set out in PPS3 (para 9.37 to 9.41). Flexible approach to affordable housing provision related to development costs, reduced values and viability without a strict policy preventing delivery of schemes (para 9.70). Requirement for eastern and southern distributor roads identified after completion of studies for alignment based on sound evidence and assessment of alternatives (para 9.158). Stafford western access route is protected with no justification but must be demonstrated based on sound evidence and assessment of alternatives (para 9.159). **ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (King) – Object to loss of agricultural and amenity land to housing development. **ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Mr E Hill) – PDF response with concern about non inclusion of site and unclear delineation of the Barlaston Residential Development Boundary related to ground features. Land is part of the village, owned by one family and would deliver high quality homes. Land is partly outside the Residential Development Boundary and Green Belt area. Existing policy for delivering higher housing requirements is required not just on brownfield but also Greenfield areas. The land at Barlaston would increase housing opportunities to an established residential area in a rural settlement. The Green Belt boundary should be reviewed to reflect openness and strong boundaries whilst supporting residential development on the site. There are no environmental, cultural or other constraint limitations.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach in context of national and regional planning policy.

1 response (Creswell Parish Council) – PDF response expressing significant concern about the impact on Creswell of traffic problems associated with the M6 motorway and connecting road including the A34, A513 and A5013 with separation of the village and safety issues by queuing traffic only exacerbated by new development both north of Stafford and further afield at Eccleshall, Woodseaves and Ladfordfields. Support re-location of M6 junction 14 with associated new link roads to create a northern boundary to new development north of Stafford and bypass Creswell Grove thus solving problems and increasing capacity on the M6 as well as providing an integrated Park & Ride scheme with HGV parking facility. Support widening the A513 to facilitate new development and delivering the eastern distributor road. Suggest a new motorway junction 13a to provide access to the west including Ladfordfields and Newport avoiding Stafford town and Creswell Grove. Major infrastructure strategies and solutions are needed as well as other supportive infrastructure through a comprehensive plan. Suggestion that new housing should occur on SF-1 and SF-I due to their elevated and prominent position also with support from Marston Parish Meeting and landowners whilst SF-2 should be used for high quality, value added research and development employment types in low-lying ground. Oppose SF-h as this is extending the Primepoint 14 development into open countryside.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

Clear development boundaries should be shown rather than directional arrows. Query the gas infrastructure implications at SF-h as this was not considered to be an issue and why not on other sites, pipeline to be protected. Welcome development of SF-g bringing new facilities to the community including small scale buildings and solve access problems. Concern about the safe access of SF-h onto A34 road whilst access from the existing Primepoint development would lead to overcapacity of existing road network. Object to SF-2 as not a sustainable urban extension yet SF-1 and SF-I could be integrated with Parkside through new infrastructure and a northern road boundary. Oppose extension of employment development onto SF-1 and housing on SF-I due to isolation created. Concern about electricity supply and sewerage reaching capacity as well as limited internet access and loss of local facilities. Heavy Good Vehicles are damaging the local road network and speed controls are inadequate. Allotments to be promoted.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

Support vision of high knowledge and high valued added jobs with community to be served by integrated transport networks. Support new business opportunities for research and development beyond graduates. Concern about air quality and delivery of social infrastructure in rural areas through investment with new development. Land south of Stafford should be used for development to support delivery of new development. Query housing on brownfield before Greenfield yet employment development is accepted on Greenfield. Support sustainable drainage systems and infiltration rate approach, landscape reference, protecting areas of open space and green network, tourist attractions and visitor accommodation, new approach for telecommunications. Support lifetime homes as well as locally placed small and medium sized enterprise for light industry, research and development. Support eastern and southern bypass schemes. Query lack of reference to affordable bus services. Development must contribute to local infrastructure with limited delivery from Section 106 agreements and query whether Community Infrastructure Levy is better.

**ACTION:** Noted for further consideration through the Core Strategy preferred approach.

1 response (JVH for Walton Homes) – PDF response with support for Option C & D with focus on Hixon due to employment provision, not in the Green Belt and effective delivery of housing in the current market on Greenfield sites, reducing commuting and has sufficient services and facilities. Support development south of New Road on western side south of airfield linked to school. **ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Haston Reynolds) – PDF response with support for Option C but with limited provision in smaller settlements for viable services and facilities. Development on land south of Stafford only used when other alternatives around Stafford have been used. Development will need to be delivered in multiple directions of growth to meet requirements. Support eastern direction of growth for Stafford at SF-3 and SF-4 providing a balanced development form, less incursion into the countryside than northern direction, contribute to the eastern distributor road but not wholly deliver it, increase housing densities, served by existing sewage treatment works, not liable to flooding and close to services and facilities.

**ACTION:** Noted support for eastern direction for Stafford to be considered through the development locations discussion.

1 response (D Stocking) repeated – Object to new developments due to loss of countryside heritage with brownfield land to be utilised with available infrastructure and limited environmental impact before cheaper Greenfield sites to avoid countryside destruction. Greenfield development would cause loss of wildlife, biodiversity, historic assets, increased traffic and population, loss of identity and rural character, loss of village life and communities. This is contrary to the Sustainable Community Strategy and not using existing vacant properties.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.



1 response (JT & DC Goucher of Baden Hall) – PDF response promoting site at Cold Meece for housing and employment development. Oppose any approach to relax brownfield focus for new development which is the nature of clients land based on Government policy despite scale of growth. Object to focused development strategy failing to provide mixed use development in other locations than main settlements which can support existing activities, green infrastructure and services with links to Yarnfield for sustainable regeneration. Object to Eccleshall and Raleigh Hall development on Greenfield sites impacting on countryside and setting rather than re-development sites. Support the sustainable development proposal at Norton Bridge for future mixed use with opportunities for environmental enhancement. Challenge the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) approach including economic viability and flexibility requirements. Support for sustainable development reflected by site at Cold Meece through a local community, well constructed development including Code for Sustainable Homes level 5 – 6, community activities, well connected through transport and job opportunities minimise water and energy use through renewable technologies including wind, combined heat and power, hydro-electric and ground source heat pumps. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Emery Planning Partnership for Mrs Harris) – PDF response to support land west of Gnosall (GN-8) with plan period extended to 2031 rather than 2026 to provide a 15 year strategy, support higher growth scenario plan for 786 homes per year based on Growth Point status and Nathaniel Lichfield report including upward trend for housing delivery through the Regional Spatial Strategy. Gnosall has a large population, services and facilities, public transport connections, local housing need and self sustaining being in a preferable position to other settlements such as Eccleshall, Hixon and the Haywoods. Other sites in Gnosall have highway and environmental constraints with viability issues whilst GN-8 is deliverable, a sustainable location, limited landscape impact, deliver affordable housing and not effected by flooding. ACTION: Noted support for GN-8 at Gnosall.

1 response (Trent Vision Trust) – PDF response with support for sustainable community strategy approach, spatial vision and key objectives for Stone leading to growth and new infrastructure, services and facilities. Trent Valley corridor to be improved to overcome physical and visual barriers with the town centre including new housing, services and facilities through a sensitive, well designed approach. Stone to be supported in the retail hierarchy to compete with Trentham Gardens shopping area, with welcome funding from Advantage West Midlands for rejuvenation extending the historic assets, visitor facilities and canal improvements. ACTION: Noted.

Spatial Portrait to give more emphasis to Stone's declining retail and employment offer, to be addressed by renewal and development. Strong support for Option C with focus on Stafford and Stone to address decline and deliver new mixed use development through schemes whilst objecting to Options A and D. New housing development to be integrated into the town centre with support for land east of Stone across the railway and SN-5 rather than a new ring road west of the town diverting residents to shopping in Stafford.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Stone development locations discussion.

New infrastructure should be provided for Stone with allocation of a mixed use development and extension of the Stone town centre boundary to bring forward development in the Trent Valley corridor, including leisure and amenity space in floodplain areas. Strongly opposes phasing Stone's development later in the Plan period causing greater decline (para 9.2). Support for new health centre in Stone, floodplain land used for green infrastructure rather than housing, release land outside of floodplain for mixed use development, support use of sustainable urban drainage and new office based employment close to the town centre. Query the lack of a key diagram in the consultation as required by PPS12 for the preferred strategy approach.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Stone development locations discussion.

1 response (Staffordshire Wildlife Trust) – PDF response with regard to ecological desk top study required including new information available. Geological and geodiversity features are to be protected. Site EC-2 to protect wetlands and provide habitat with a full ecological assessment required due to protected species. Site GN-3 to provide protected bird species survey and other species. Sites GH-2, GH-3, LH-1 and LH-2 limited development due to great crested newts breeding with survey work required to establish useage. Site SF-8 with geological features, habitats links and investigation of protected species.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the settlement development locations.

Support on-site renewable energy and code for sustainable homes with challenging targets set for on-site renewable energy, including for elderly housing. Minimum housing density not to cause loss of green infrastructure or compliance with Accessible Natural Green Space Target (ANGST) standards. Brownfield verses Greenfield should consider biodiversity value of both land types. Impact of rural conversions on wildlife and countryside is important. Support policies for sustainable transport, access for all and good design as well as green infrastructure and meeting habitat and species targets. Avoid development on floodplains including at Stafford but use for habitat and amenity space as well as use of sustainable drainage systems in all developments, improving infiltration rates and surface run off. Object to Newport canal extension due to impact on Site of Special Scientific Interest. Object to built development in the Trent Valley corridor due to impact on climate change. Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 Agreements to provide biodiversity and geodiversity gains including green infrastructure principles. Monitoring to include Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan area specific targets and geodiversity targets.

**ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Mr J S Francis) – Eastern distributor road for south east Stafford must be built along its original line of route G. If this is not possible, the alternative route along the flood plain from St. Thomas's Mill to Junction 13 of the M6. This route should be preferred as it will intercept with all the southern and eastern radial routes

into Stafford and would therefore allow easier access from these routes to both junctions of the M6, without the need for excessive junctions and traffic lights at the intersections of other roads. To cope with the density of housing required, there is no alternative but to build this road and in this position, it could be built as a dual carriageway. If route G were used, the County Council must ensure that the protected route is reinstated and maintained for this purpose.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Cllr Stafford Northcote) –7,000 new dwellings to be built by 2026 would be unsustainable for Stafford, a 25% increase in population & homes. An increase of 3,000 - 4,000 homes in the rural areas is beyond their sustainable capacity in such a short timescale due to impact of the recession, ageing population, increasing single person households, impact on local road network and traffic increases.

**ACTION:** Noted.

A general growth rate of 10% could perhaps be managed in villages such as Great Haywood & Hixon over around 20 years, and not lose their individual identities as long as 1) Village infrastructure is completely overhauled, particularly the existing sewage systems. No more dwellings should be built unless and until the drainage systems are totally improved, in particular to the Haywoods; 2) No linking of the two settlements of Great and Little Haywood due to separate identities and the fields between the two villages provide a useful green corridor; 3) Inadequate highway provision for cyclists and pedestrians in particular to Hixon, where many of the lanes have no footpaths at all; 4) Pressures on present Medical provision in the villages in part due to the ageing population with no resident doctor in Hixon. Cyclists are at considerable risk in other parts of the parishes, notably the A51, the A513 and Tixall Lane; 5) The access to the main roads serving the Haywoods threatened by flooding. More traffic would worsen an already dangerous situation; 6) Improved bus services from the Haywoods and Hixon to Stafford & Rugeley.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Hixon and Haywoods development locations discussion.

Support more provision of affordable homes. Rural conversions (barns) should be adaptable for home working, not just for residential use, and also retain some element of usage for economic development. Blocks of flats are not necessarily a poor option - witness the award winning scheme in Lichfield, and the Forge in Great Haywood. Vacant homes should be brought back into use as quickly as possible. Transport: Consider seriously a Park & Ride option for Stafford, study the viability of a central bus station, the possibility of a rail station for Colwich and the Eastern bypass around Baswich. **ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Hopton & Coton Parish Council) – Hopton village is of distinctive character and any significant development would decimate that character with limited infrastructure to support any significant development. The Parish Council's preferred option would be Option C.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Council for the Protection of Rural England CPRE National Office) – PDF response with significant opposition to the planning process and Core Strategy approach. Greater emphasis on countryside in the Sustainable Community Strategies due to Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to support the economy.

Vision and Key Objectives - Object to housing and employment linked together and its delivery across a range of settlements in Stafford Borough as well as use of land south of Stafford. Object to LDF complying with Regional Spatial Strategy approach due to lack of need and current economic climate. Development in rural settlements due to impact on commuting, emissions and lack of employment which would conflict with focus on major urban areas for job creation. ACTION: Noted.

Spatial Portrait – Greater expression of Stafford Borough's character including comparison figures and focus on biodiversity / open countryside, farmland conservation and minimising flooding, lack of sketch for Stafford and Stone regarding overall pattern. ACTION: Noted.

National and Regional Policy – Object to sustainable development definition and using aspirations of Regional Spatial Strategy for growth including a lack of challenge to Nathaniel Lichfield Report. Housing development must be linked to local need and affordable in terms of new infrastructure requirements as well as commuting implications. ACTION: Noted.

Development Strategy – Environment is a key concern with sustainability impacted by dispersed employment. Only viable settlements are Eccleshall, Hixon and Gnosall but lack services and facilities including employment and public transport. Affordable housing is only delivered as the expense of massive housing development. Object to Principles for Settlement Development Groupings including Woodseaves and suggests review to tighter Residential Development Boundaries and no Rural Exception sites. Query the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment process with lack of deliverable factors considered and inappropriate conclusions. Support no new settlement. ACTION: Noted.

Development Strategy options - Support phasing of development but not acceptance of Regional Spatial Strategy figures with loss of countryside. Oppose rural settlement expansion due to commuting, carbon emissions, lack of services but acknowledges affordable housing issues, major land loss and lack of physical infrastructure. ACTION: Noted.

Potential Locations – Priority for brownfield land. Avoid Stafford developments on high ground (SF-1 to SF-4, SF-6 to SF-8) including impact on Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and lack of new road proposal study. Development will increase radial traffic problems, employment is not accessible to workers and on high ground. Ministry of Defence land at Stafford to be used for sustainable urban extension and redeploy military to other sites. Housing finance unlikely to deliver infrastructure and affordability. Avoid Stone Greenfield expansion to east or west on high ground, in any event requiring significant road infrastructure.

Eccleshall to consider local road network, not assisted by new road possibility at EC-1 and EC-2 whilst impact on traffic congestion, Conservation Area and landscape. Dismiss the approach of housing and employment needs balanced together with South Staffordshire Council urgent study. Gnosall with lack of infrastructure, services and facilities for new housing and employment development onto open countryside (GN-1 to GN-3, GN-8 & GN-9) with new road GNPR-1 and other Gnosall sites. Travel to Stafford exacerbated with problems and lack of employment fit. Hixon avoided due to Greenfield urban expansion, restricted employment and infrastructure related to low population base. Similar for the Haywoods, Haughton and Weston with commuting increased, Woodseaves remoteness and lack of facilities, loss of greenfields and limited local need. Yarnfield support brownfield development using Stone's infrastructure and Tittensor if not into the Green Belt. Object to Ladfordfields and Raleigh Hall due to commuting and Greenfield use.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach and settlement development locations discussion.

Delivering Sustainable Future – Support high standards of design, climate change to be addressed due to impact on movements, support energy generation and conservation including methane and new technologies but not windfarms, Merton rules for large developments, zero-carbon standards for sustainable homes, no Green Belt changes, housing density to reflect character and maximise land use to avoid countryside loss, concern about loss of Greenfield verse brownfield, housing mix to deliver affordable housing and lifetime homes / specialist provision, object to rural conversions due to countryside impact and commuting, support affordable housing of good design but limited in rural areas to meet identified need, concern about traveller provision due to migration, support high quality employment and re-use of industrial land despite recent failures, oppose maximum car parking standards, support sustainable transport modes, protecting floodplains and sustainable drainage systems, landscape character, support open space, sport and recreation provision and appropriate tourism with telecommunications taking account of resident concerns. Stafford to include Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) conclusions, demographic change, decentralised social facilities, protection of floodplains, limited urban expansion and country park links to Cannock Chase AONB, green links and network, new infrastructure based on appropriate costs, high quality employment in the town, use of Ministry of Defence land and a viable town centre, support for Conservation Areas and transport based on robust study before decisions made regarding public transport solutions and new roads, support Park & Ride, increased rail and bus provision with a bus station, concern about capital investment and lack of links through new development. Stone with opposition to new development, support for floodplains. Lack of links between the Local Development Framework (LDF) and Local Transport Plan.

**ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Dolphin Land) – PDF response regarding land at Tittensor Road, Barlaston for rural exception site currently in the Green Belt for 15-20 dwellings, close to existing services & facilities, brownfield and public transport connections with developer engagement, is not contaminated, has infrastructure provision, owner willing to sell and strong demand for affordable housing. Support for Option C and

note extension for development including land within the Green Belt. Barlaston is suitable for development due to scale and nature particularly for affordable housing and seeking engagement with Registered Social Landlord.

ACTION: Noted support for client's land at Barlaston for affordable housing but in the Green Belt.

1 response (Dolphin Land) – PDF response regarding land off Grindley Lane, Meir Heath for rural exception site currently in the Green Belt for 50 dwellings abutting existing housing, close to existing services & facilities, public transport connections with developer engagement, is not contaminated, has infrastructure provision, owner willing to sell and strong demand for affordable housing. Support for Option C and note extension for development including land within the Green Belt. Barlaston is suitable for development due to scale and nature particularly for affordable housing and seeking engagement with Registered Social Landlord.

ACTION: Noted support for client's land at Meir Heath for affordable housing but in the Green Belt.

1 response (McDyre & Co for Mr Edwards) – Promoting residential development of land off Old Croft Road, Walton on the Hill, Stafford. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Hall) – Proposed developments at the northern edge of Stafford (SF 1 and 2) will cause increased congestion at peak times on the Redhill Roundabout at the A34 / Beaconside junction. With regards to Stone proposed developments at SN1 and SN2 will cause traffic congestion on Lichfield Road and will require a new primary school in the Aston Lodge area as St Michael's has no capacity for expansion.

Proposed developments at SN 3 and 4 will cause traffic congestion on the Eccleshall Road down to the Walton Roundabout, particularly at peak times exacerbated by schools. Manor Hill Primary School and Walton Priory Middle School will need to be expanded and possibly Tilling Drive Primary School, increasing pressure on Alleyne's High School. The increased number of houses will cause pressure on amenities in the town such as Doctors. Proposed development at SN5 will cause loss of car parks, restrict visitors / shoppers and may cause the closure of shops. Increase elderly Housing Association flats to enable less affluent people to remain in Stone. Housing that is built in the area should have a large proportion of houses for families / couples at 2 / 3 bedrooms. Consideration given to problems caused to existing developments by flooding when further building is undertaken.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Stone development locations discussion.

1 response (King Sturge for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd) – Maps provided on CD concerning land north of Stafford. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Larkin) – Object to lack of plain English through the consultation exercise making it difficult to respond to the document and request better engagement in future. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (The Theatres Trust) – concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and therefore anticipate policies relating to cultural facilities. Support acknowledgement of Stafford as the principal centre for theatre, cinema and art gallery and support the vision. Expect a preferred option policy for the Town and District Centres to protect and promote existing cultural facilities including museums and libraries whilst allowing new development which contribute to the town centre vitality and viability. Cultural, leisure and tourism facilities that are likely to attract large numbers of visitors should in the first instance be clustered within the strategic town centre and should have good accessibility to the public transport network. It would be appropriate for the smaller town and district centres generally to provide entertainment, leisure and cultural facilities of an appropriate scale and kind to serve their roles and catchments. Concern that planning obligations do not include theatre buildings as this provides significant funding for improvements.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through Chapter 10 – Planning Obligations preferred policy approach.

1 response (Ms Metcalf) – PDF response focussed on Chapter 9 but welcome specific location options for Stafford in a sustainable settlement and access to public transport. Support high design standards and phased development at Stone to support North Staffordshire with issues of migration. Support increased infrastructure with development and reference to Habitat Regulations. Support renewable energy for solar and large scale wind turbines not on hills. Support carbon capture and prefer energy conservation to on-site renewable projects, support passive solar heating in sealed homes but zero-energy is too expensive. Support brownfield development and re-use of employment sites, support local employment in villages and self build housing. Oppose high density development due to car impacts and lack of open space. Appreciate windfall development not likely to meet housing requirements so urban extensions will be needed but dispute Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) figures. More family housing needed including for the elderly to meet carers with 1 person household growth overstated due to students and demographic change. Affordable housing addressed for whole sites as part of mixed estates for social cohesion and provision of facilities with greater proportions in the future due to restricted finances. Support lifetime homes approach for the future as well as specialist accommodation. Support neighbourhood policing and employment in rural conversions. Local housing need should be met including in villages with walking and cycling preferred.

**ACTION:** Noted.

Gypsies supported with services and facilities, support re-use of employment sites. Concern about loss of parking in Stafford town centre, need for a bus station, non connection of bus services and long walks. Avoid flood plain development, support landscape, sustainable drainage systems, open space and canal based recreation. Sufficient hotel spaces and avoid telecommunications affecting schools. Object to park & ride, build in Penkridge rather than Stafford to avoid congestion, mixed housing types and extra care scheme. Support for vulnerable people but can be expensive, health care provision needed. Support green infrastructure, new country park, sport and recreation but improvements to leisure centre and access to new

pools. Support sustainable drainage systems and high technology industries near University, increased recycling and new infrastructure to meet MOD requirements. Concern about shops closing in Stafford, avoid tall buildings and support shopping frontages. Multiple comments about Stafford town centre options listed. Support District Centres with new housing development. Object to new road schemes east and south of Stafford rather than better M6 capacity. Impact of western access on green infrastructure and query viability of park & ride scheme. Stafford railway station to increase capacity, provide a bus station and dedicated bus lanes in town centre. Stafford Urban Area Transport Management Scheme (SUATMS) not to provide road building. Community Infrastructure Levy to support social housing and support walking & cycling links. Stafford needs attractive recreational and cultural spaces including in the town centre. ACTION: Noted.

Stone to have improved health and maternity provision, support employment with small & medium sized enterprises, increase retail but no tall buildings, appropriate housing mix and recreational facilities. Support employment in rural areas with mixed development, use of rural conversions. Oppose rural public transport subsidy but support retention of rural services and facilities. Reluctant support for Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Wragg) – Note development of Milwich but still many redundant farm buildings ripe for conversion into dwellings and potential development in large gardens. However there is insufficient infrastructure to take a large number of new housing within the Parish. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Defence Estates) – PDF response welcomes recognition of Ministry of Defence (MOD) land at Stafford, Swynnerton training area and continued operational uses in the vision and key objectives (para 3.5 & 3.6). Suggest amendment to rural area objectives to refer to Swynnerton training area to reflect MOD land at Stafford objective. Support refer in spatial portait (para 4.17 & 4.55) with a reworded paragraph. Current housing provision does not include service families accommodation thus in addition to 7,000 new homes for Stafford with appropriate provision through the RSS process (para 7.1). Stafford's growth to be in a north easterly direction due to increase Army (para 8.16). Service family accommodation to be except for LDF policy on mix of household type, tenure and price in order to meet military needs. Government supports military personnel and leavers through Key Worker Living Scheme but lack home purchase opportunities potentially due to inability of establishing local connections which is currently being addressed. Strategic Housing Market Assessment to consider needs of operational defence personnel which should be addressed by the Borough to improve access to social housing and exemption to provide affordable housing element through service family accommodation developments (para 9.55 – 9.70). Rewording of paragraph 9.147 for consistency regarding 22 Signal Regiment and the Tactical Supply Wing. ACTION: Noted and agree re-worded paragraph.

1 response (Mr Pym for Mr Lloyd) – PDF response relating to Hixon with support for vision and key objectives directing development to the village due to improvements for services and facilities, local employment and sustainable location facilitated by housing growth. Concern about focus on Stafford with no more than 50% to any



settlement to avoid leading to unachievable infrastructure costs in current climate and non delivery so greater flexibility in smaller settlements to be expressed through key objectives. Support review of Residential Development Boundaries to provide sustainable rural settlements. Hixon has brownfield capacity for development with strong support for HA-c due to good access and no weigh limitations, improve industrial appearance and commercial activity. HA-a is not being promoted for employment due to access issues making it preferred for housing as well as being Greenfield so avoid Pasturefields expansion. Object to absence of housing option south of New Road with good access to local facilities and well screened whilst meeting local aspirations, to be re-considered for 38 houses and employment. Support brownfield development and new health facility in Hixon. Continued development of Hixon Airfield to support local employment. Housing land could release funds for local facilities and traffic calming through planning obligations rather than Community Infrastructure Levy.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Hixon development locations discussion.

1 response (Government Office West Midlands) – PDF response welcoming earlier discussions on the Issues & Options Paper leading to amendments and the Summary as well as reference to the Planning Inspector’s key matters raised concerning strategic sites, land south of Stafford and housing for military personnel. Sections 1 to 5 can be used for the Submission Core Strategy but with the spatial portrait before the vision and objectives as well as providing more detailed regional and sub-regional context for Stafford Borough. Key Diagram needed for Publication draft of proposed spatial development strategy. Development scenarios useful for flexibility in Submission Core Strategy with new homes for military personnel additional to RSS requirements and the Preferred Options document to include a smaller number of strategic site allocations / broad locations requiring long lead-in investment and central to strategy delivery. With reference to land south of Stafford delivery is required through South Staffordshire’s Core Strategy raised through the RSS Examination process. Urgent work is required between the two Councils to establish if it is one of the most sustainable and suitable locations for future development. Core Strategy policies restricted to key strategic matters and kept to a minimum, not repeating national and regional policy. Core Strategy to be complemented by an implementation / delivery plan with key stakeholder support. Use the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) updated Soundness self-assessment. Refer to high quality rather than premium employment land, specify retail provision is for Stafford town rather than Borough, review of Residential Development Boundaries not a Core Strategy matter, more focus on preferred areas for gypsies and travellers, a policy for spatial strategy approach for Stafford town centre.

**ACTION:** Noted and apply relevant changes to the Preferred Options document.

1 response (Gnosall Parish Council) – PDF response strongly objecting to new development at Gnosall being contrary to the Sustainable Community Strategies of improving quality of life and protecting the environment together with community inclusion and reducing crime. New development would cause loss of open countryside, biodiversity, environmental and flooding problems, undermine

community inclusion and increased incidents of crime, increase commuting for work and shopping due to lack of local facilities compared to Eccleshall and destroy Gnosall's character. The least worst site is GN-4 due to access, delivery of affordable housing and minimal impact on residents. More detailed comments raised in associated information.

**ACTION:** Noted objections and support for GN-4 to be considered through the Gnosall development locations discussion.

1 response (Staffordshire Police) – PDF response with reference to the increased need for Police services arising from new development. Welcome reference to Neighbourhood Policing Units and advocate adoption of Police's Secure by Design and Staffordshire Police Authority's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) relating to Section 106 Agreements to secure contributions and deliver effective policing. Secured by Design supports the Sustainable Community Strategies and the Vision by designing out crime via crime prevention and security at pre-application stage leading to environmental, housing, economic, community safety and quality places to live and work. Justification of Secured by Design through lifetime homes, affordable housing and mix, code for sustainable homes and specific paragraphs in Planning Policy Statements and the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

**ACTION:** Noted with reference to Secured by Design through Chapter 9 – Design preferred policy approach.

1 response (RPS Planning for Barratts West Midlands) – PDF response relating to land north of Baswich for 35 dwellings with support for flexibility on housing numbers and potential strategic locations to meet need. Core Strategy to show delivery specifically for Stafford town linking spatial vision to appropriate development opportunities with land at north Baswich suitable, available and achievable in the first 5 years in a highly sustainable location, outside of floodplain, unaffected by environmental and legal constraints, accessible infrastructure and services. Core Strategy to be flexible and plan for 14,100 new homes over the plan period due to latest household projections and increased RSS provision in line with national and regional policy to secure soundness. Support delivery of housing allocation for Stafford town within the Borough rather than use of land south of Stafford such as land east of Stafford and north Baswich. A credible evidence base is required with the lack of site identification in the SHLAA Final Report contrary to Government guidance and engagement with delivery partners. SHLAA should be updated prior to the Core Strategy preferred option including public consultation on land north of Baswich to ensure soundness and consideration of Stafford growth options whilst not being restricted by eastern distributor road protected route which is rejected due to lack of commitment from delivery agencies. Support for Option C with the main focus being Stafford due to population, services and facilities so accommodate at least 10,000 new homes. Support limited on-site renewable energy but not prescriptive energy efficiency policy for residential development to prevent stifling delivery and appropriately tested. Oppose non mandatory standards through Code for Sustainable Homes, particularly in current economic climate. Housing development should be in sustainable locations and not sequential to brownfield. Support housing mix and density to be flexible for the area's needs with affordable housing to be delivered through market housing to address affordability issues but questions the viability of

40% target with evidence needed. Clarification is sought about how the eastern distributor road will be delivered through either Section 106 Agreements or the Community Infrastructure Levy. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (National Farmers Union – West Midlands) – Support themes in the spatial vision but the countryside has a range of functions including for food production. Support the visions aim to provide affordable housing including in rural areas to provide for local needs and support a diverse and regenerated rural economy and renewable technologies. Support for "increasing rural employment through renewable energy schemes including biomass, low impact hi-tech industries in agricultural buildings and sensitive new national and regional tourist attractions which enhance the high quality environment of the area". Support the approach of re-using rural buildings for economic use and delivering housing only if this is not capable. It is not appropriate to suggest schemes and policies that aim to improve the quality of the natural environment and provide opportunities for landowners to manage their land in a sensitive manner as this is ongoing including improvements for habitat and species. Object to Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan targets as these are already being achieved by Environmental Stewardship initiatives. Welcome no development on floodplains but concerned about increased public access to these areas beyond the Rights of Way network due to impact on farmland and food production. Water pollution from inadequate sewerage treatment facilities is a significant concern for the farming community with new housing development needing to demonstrate treatment works have been assessed and upgraded to avoid water pollution during storm events.

ACTION: Noted make reference to Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan targets in policy context.

1 response (Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners for Severn Trent Water landowner) – PDF response with concern that the Core Strategy is identifying individual sites rather than broad locations. Supports the higher growth scenario put forward in order to provide flexibility to meet RSS requirements with support for Option E and F development strategy to include consideration of land south of Newstead for 360 homes. Land offers cross-border development opportunities despite being in the North Staffordshire Green Belt and although no boundary changes are proposed this would present an exceptional case to enhance the Green Belt function by meeting housing requirements and releasing a larger area as open space provision.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Seighford Parish Council) – PDF response with concern about traffic implications on the Parish, A5013 & B5405 from potential development at Eccleshall, Woodseaves, Yarnfield, Ladfordfields and Raleigh Hall causing peak time overloading, impact on M6 junction 14, dangerous lorry collisions mounting pavements affecting pedestrians and cyclists. Opposition to gypsy and traveller sites in rural areas and should be located on brownfield urban sites.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Colwich Parish Council) – PDF response opposing housing development at The Haywoods due to impact on rural environment. The Haywoods are distinct villages of character but merged together will lose their identity regardless of planning conditions, loss of amenity for residents and visitors to Cannock Chase and Shugborough Estate impacting on the tourism economy, loss of wildlife and habitats with increased noise and light pollution. Specific concerns raised regarding lack of employment increasing commuting and traffic congestion on narrow access roads with safety concerns and A51 improvements. Lack of parking to access local services and facilities in Great Haywood with danger of cycling on local roads. Inadequate bus services and no train service, foul sewers not supporting existing housing so significant investment needed for a new treatment works to be appropriately sited. There are water supply problems and electricity disconnections with surface water drainage inadequate. Lack of health facilities, sports facilities, education provision and elderly services in the Haywoods to be provided by the developer at significant cost. Loss of environment, wildlife and habitats as well as footpaths and Rights of Way in the countryside.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through The Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (High Offley Parish Council) – Supporting the retention of the Residential Development Boundary for Woodseaves with potentially 40 homes deliverable including 13 with planning permission. Reject the statement that housing development at Woodseaves will not require major infrastructure as the sewage system is currently at capacity as well as water supply. Lack of employment locally will increase carbon dioxide emissions so commercial development would be required but not new retail provision due to impact on local shops. There is a lack of recreation provision with WO-1 to be partly used for school expansion and amenity space with the secondary school catchment area being Stafford, not Newport. There is a lack of transport infrastructure including public transport and new roads to address traffic problems of local and through traffic generated by Donnington's new freight terminal. Any development to include affordable housing to support the local school in the future whilst the area has a rich and varied rural environment and wildlife.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Woodseaves development locations discussion.

1 response (District Youth Forum) – A range of matters were raised with positives being an economic boost, improved facilities, homes for people, provision of facilities for children and young people and bring diversity to the area. The negatives were green land to the south of Doxey would be destroyed, overpopulation, more jobs, it would heighten current problems and lead to the need for more policing and hence privacy invaded to ensure order was kept. Nice areas that were created might be trashed. Jobs needed with housing, use empty homes, consider impact of recession, provide affordable housing rather than second homes, support young people with sport facilities, provide for gypsies and elderly people with accommodation, protect the countryside and floodplains, vacant shops and old Tesco's for skateboard park. Need for new supermarkets, extra power, extra cars, extra recreational facilities and environmentally friendly homes. **ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (ISE Estates Ltd) – Support land owned next to Beacon Business Park (SF-c) for employment development to be increased from 15 to 20 hectares being a gateway to Stafford and other areas having a greater scale of employment provision, the only area east of Stafford with good links to the M6, increasing capacity for Staffordshire Technology Park's uses, excellent links to existing community facilities and new facilities could be provided, track record for delivery to support the Stafford business community.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Marston Parish Meeting) – Support the key objectives and Marston parish being an agricultural based economy. Query new development north of Stafford due to utilities infrastructure, Common land exchange and wildlife habitat diversity. Development proposed is disproportionately large related to the environment and infrastructure. Support for HP13 and new road allocated in Stafford Borough Local Plan. Strongly oppose further development with similar structures to Primepoint 14 so proposals for SF-1 to be proportionate, similar to those of the Beaconside Technology Park, to lessen the visual impact and light pollution. Seek a reduction of housing in SF-2 and locating the larger industrial buildings from SF-1 to the lower areas of SF-2 as an alternative.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Shenton) – Strong objection to development at Gnosall, Haughton and Woodseaves due to lack of infrastructure, lack of finance to deliver housing development. Proposals not to be progressed until economic and financial situation is clear, employment opportunities are increased, a robust assessment of local need for affordable housing, evidence of population increase and extra traffic can be accommodated. **ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (David Kidney MP) – PDF response recognising the concern about the level of new housing development required in Stafford Borough to 2026 although housing growth has been accommodated effectively since 1997. Plan to consider sustainable development, economic / environmental and social gains for society with protection of character and high design standards, reduce commuting and deliver employment, reduce carbon emissions and increase energy efficiency with reduced crime and increased public services. Consultation on the LDF to support future society.

Housing development must come forward to meet need in the local community due to affordability issues, longevity and care of vulnerable people as well as effective use of existing stock. Predictions can be difficult but future housing is required as set out from Government through regional planning to the local level supported by Growth Points. Queries lack of consultation prior to Growth Point leading to infrastructure funding mainly for sustainable transport package. Stafford is the right place for increased housing based on sustainable development together with increased military provision in the future. Development to the north of Stafford will

support requirements as well as other locations. Castlefields is a sustainable location to the town centre yet requiring protection of Stafford Castle. Further justification for land east and south of Stafford with implications of new road proposals due to Greenfield land take, previous development impacts and limited impact on congestion. Object to development between Great and Little Haywood due to rural impact and flooding issues whilst development to the north of Great Haywood may have sewerage and water flooding problems as well as limited burial space. Hixon concern about out-of-date map leading to reconsultation proposal. Local need assessments are required in rural areas to establish level of new house building reflected in the Borough's plan. Empty homes to be used.

Focus of public sector jobs in Stafford could be effected by reducing public sector spending by Government change whilst manufacturing and green technologies for power can support the future economy as well as new business start ups. Links between the University and military will strengthen ICT, communication and surveillance role whilst tourism and conferences supported by a high quality local environment and canal network. Support maximising delivery of new employment sites.

ACTION: Noted.

Query the future transport plans for the Borough with studies to be completed and consulted upon. Support a new bus station for Stafford and increased bus priority with improved services. Improve access to rail services locally and provide a coherent cycling network and safe pedestrian routes. Road space management and reduction in traffic lights as well as improving maintenance of rural roads.

Support green infrastructure for the quality of life and biodiversity as well as reducing carbon emissions, health improvements and sustainable transport modes. Support a new park integrated to the local environment but not for mitigation of housing development.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Jones) – Object to new development in Great and Little Haywood, as well as poor quality consultation exercise and maps, with a lack of local employment, narrow local road network, poor access to the A51, flooding problems and lack of services and facilities. Query need for housing based on local need / population growth and acceptance of housing without reference to local residents and brownfield capacity. Outside of Stafford and Stone there is a lack of public transport provision and no sustainability credentials to support housing growth. Assumptions need to be revised in light of the current economic situation, house prices and growth projections.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Cllr Perkins) – Support Option B focus on Stafford and Stone with rural villages to decide planning decisions. Drainage and sewage are major concerns in Great and Little Haywood and Colwich which need to be addressed for new housing development. Strongly object to GH-1, GH-2, LH-1 and LH-2 due to impact on character, merging of villages, loss of environment and lack of sustainable living,

traffic problems and restricted space for improvements such as footpaths. Object to any further development at Hixon until new infrastructure is provided including roads, footpaths, schools, medical facilities, public transport, sewage and drainage. No new employment until access via New Road and Church Lane to A51 are improved.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through Hixon and the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Dr Bloor for Haywoods Society) – PDF response with serious implications for Colwich Parish local community of any development due to flooding, sewage disposal and impact on Trent Valley, public hostility, limited parking and local road access issues as well as historic environment and character implications. All five locations require Residential Development Boundary adjustments opposed due to precedent of village merging and loss of open space. Development at GH-1 with flooding and drainage issues. Support a new village with infrastructure, sustainable development and carbon-neutral to reduce impact on other settlements.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Planning Prospects for St Modwen Ltd) – PDF response with support for Option C with review of Residential Development Boundaries to support new development and growth. Land south of Stafford only considered once all possible development options in the Borough have been used. Detailed consultation required on eastern and southern road schemes with public sector funding support, not just from local development schemes. Support higher growth scenario proportionate split with focus on Stafford and Little Haywood for housing whilst increased employment at Stone. Support east, south and west development expansion of Stafford but restricted to the north due to North Staffordshire conurbation. Support use of land off Lichfield Road for future development in Stafford occupied by Alstom providing for existing uses and new mixed use development of housing and food retail. Strongly support SF-6 with two phased housing development as well as SF-12 for housing. Strongly support LH-2 at Little Haywood for housing as well as SF-5 for housing and SF-d as mixed use development. Support Meaford power station as Major Developed Site for employment. Support 30 dwellings per hectare with individual densities on sites with appropriate housing types, tenure and price split Object to Lifetime Homes and Specialist Needs housing policy requirement but based on developer assessment of local need. Affordable housing based on economic viability and local need to avoid restricted development. Support targeted employment types with increased provision around Stafford in the right locations for diversity and mix of uses including housing. Support enhancement of tourist attractions including further development of Trentham Gardens and increased visitor accommodation. Extend Stafford town centre boundary to Sainsburys, Madford Retail Park and Bull Hill as well as primary shopping frontages. Strongly support SFTC-T1 for retail. Support continued use of Section 106 Agreements rather than Community Infrastructure Levy.

**ACTION:** Noted support for land owned interested sites and policy comments for consideration through the Preferred Options document.

1 response (Mrs Crane) – PDF response with objection to inaccurate Sustainable Community Strategy visions due to lack of public transport provision, loss of open space and Greenfield development. Object to Spatial Vision due to Greenfield development which should be reduced due to traffic and character impacts, congestion, reduced leisure centre size. Oppose new retailing due to empty units. Scale of housing development at lower and higher growth scenarios is unsustainable, in excess of local need, environmentally unacceptable, not realistic to use brownfield, implications for wildlife and biodiversity and Government funding should be rejected. Concern about inefficiency of Park & Ride due to shopping habits and traffic congestion for new housing. Limited impact of eastern distributor road on traffic movements into Stafford. Lack of services and facilities in settlements for new housing development with biodiversity and wildlife impacts. Support brownfield development with limited environmental impacts. Support Stafford development to the west and north regardless of implications on North Staffordshire conurbation with no development of eastern distributor road. Reduce impact of development on Stafford's towns and villages and oppose hydrocarbon energy if this uses Greenfield sites. Targets to avoid loss of agricultural land and impact on Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Oppose close targeting of employment sites for specific uses but support re-use of employment sites to reduce Greenfield loss. Support new country park, increased leisure, recreation and open space provision with new development, protection of green space and floodplain areas with query over infiltration rates. New water supply provision required as well as gas and electricity. Object to tall buildings with town centre boundary not leading to increased empty properties and support for historic environment. Provide further information on transport for public comment needed. Object to southern distributor road on environmental grounds and floodplain, object to Park & Ride, object to dedicated bus lanes and bus station, support SUATMS but query funding for new road schemes as well as deliverability due to permitted development and infrastructure. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Maude) – Object to new housing development at Main Road, Milford with lack of consultation and significant environmental impacts on the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as well as previous rejection of the eastern distributor road and property values. There are implications on visual landscape, topography and drainage, impact on local road network, poor access, lack of infrastructure, services and facilities whilst other sites around Stafford are more appropriate with less impact.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Menard) – Object to increase in housing numbers due to cost of infrastructure, current economic climate, empty homes, utilising existing potential including brownfield land. Object to new housing development in Eccleshall due to lack of services and facilities with insufficient future expansion explained as well as new employment with spare capacity at Raleigh Hall due to the recession. Traffic problems in Eccleshall and access routes will be exacerbated by new development and not solved by ECPR-1 due to movements from EC-1 and EC-2 as well as environmental and landscape impacts. Development of EC-4 and EC-5 will increase pressure on existing roads with significant improvements needed. Limited



development in Eccleshall to support local young people and avoid increased town age profile should not be affordable low cost housing impacting on house prices. Prefer development to the east of Eccleshall.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Eccleshall development locations discussion.

1 response (National Grid) – PDF response with reference to high pressure underground gas pipelines north of Stafford, north of Great Haywood and at Weston with local authorities to advise developers to refer to the Health and Safety Executive. Notification to be made regarding any affect on National Grid's infrastructure and policies for transmission lines, allocations including such transmissions or adjacent to high voltage electricity sub stations, diverting transmission lines, countryside, landscape and infrastructure / utility provision.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford, Great Haywood and Weston development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs Sumner) – Objection to new development at Gnosall, Gnosall Heath and GN-5 due to traffic congestion, access onto A513, flooding and loss of open countryside.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Gnosall development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Miller) – Wish to see support letters for development at the Haywoods and response from local MP and Stafford Borough Members for the ward.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Williams) – PDF response objecting to scale of development with impact on character, natural environment, not deliver high quality housing for local people and no local employment opportunities. Development will destroy character, habitats, increase commuting and pollution, be unaffordable and lack of quality jobs, impact on local road safety and loss of greenfields. Use brownfield sites close to existing infrastructure, use empty properties and avoid impacts on country roads.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Fisher German) – PDF response to support land adjacent to Bower Lane, Rugeley for a comprehensive development to solve local traffic problems. Support Sustainable Community Strategy and spatial vision but include reference to relationship with adjoining authorities. RSS review should be used to re-assess Option F and distribution to cross border settlements and bypass construction from residential development supporting local services and facilities. Spatial Options to include cross border development for a sustainable economy, cohesive community, recreational opportunities and least environmental impact. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (British Wind Energy Association) – PDF response with support for onshore wind energy and renewable energy generation. Strongly recommends policies to deliver renewable energy, increased energy efficiency and minimise climate change impacts. Strongly recommends an overarching climate change policy

with specific policies rather than generic statements. Include a robust criteria based renewable energy developments policy to judge applications linked to PPS22 and use of a Supplementary Planning Document. Recommend policies to protect historic environment to support climate change. Landscape and townscape protection to be consistent with PPS22 and renewable energy with avoiding assumptions on technical and commercial feasibility whilst not requiring justification of need and information requests appropriate to scale and policy considerations. Support smaller scale renewable energy schemes, reducing carbon emissions, climate change advantages and identification of suitable areas. Policy to provide a mandatory requirement for on-site renewable energy, 10% electricity generation and energy efficiency with suggested policy wording given. Policy on sustainable design and construction methods including energy efficiency. Evidence base is required on local feasibility and potential technologies to provide a target for new development, greater use of low-carbon energy, development applicable and rationale. Plan to promote all forms of renewable energy and efficiency.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through Chapter 9 – Climate Change preferred policy approach regarding renewable energy and the evidence base.

1 response (Mr Barnes) – Support principles of Regional Spatial Strategy with focus on Stafford for 70% housing growth and regeneration initiatives in the North Staffordshire conurbation whilst oppose increased retirement provision in Stone. Support Option C with very limited Residential Development Boundary and Green Belt amendments to enable affordable housing in villages. New development in Stone to reflect local infrastructure and services with SN-3 and SN-4 and associated roads to assist A34 Walton roundabout but query delivery of SN-1 and SN-2 due to crossing West Coast mainline, landscape impacts and access to the town centre.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy and Stone development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Wheeler) – PDF response with opposition to new housing development in Stone due to impact on local character and reducing the market town's living environment (para 3.3). Concern about SN-3 due to impact on traffic congestion, local schools, loss of wildlife and habitats. Suggest using land with direct access onto the A34 and A51 to reduce local traffic impacts. Support Option D to avoid new development at Stone and protect the town's character.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Stone development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Irwin) – Object to scale of development proposed with imposition for Government and impact on the country. **ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (K & J Butler) – Object to scale of new development and impact on Great and Little Haywood with the plan suspended until after the General Election when the Government has a correct mandate and local politicians urged to reject the requirements. Carbon dioxide emissions will not be reduced because of an increasing population, use of good agricultural land, loss of natural resources through construction, lack of brownfield land being used and a lack of social policy to reduce

population. New development will require new sewerage infrastructure, increased local employment and public transport to avoid commuting, increased school and health provision as well as provision of burial space which should be allocated.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Grime) – Object to the burden of new development on communities in the Borough particularly at Gnosall and Gnosall Heath with loss of environment and wildlife, poor roads and lack of emergency service cover as well as joining the settlements together. Development should be spread across all settlement proportionately with affordable housing provision. With regard to the current plans and Gnosall and Gnosall Heath specifically, the villages lack the infrastructure to support the proposal, they have poor road connections (the only major road, the A518, is considered dangerous even at today's traffic levels); have an overburdened sewage system; have insufficient police, fire and ambulance cover; have inadequate educational and social facilities; have few shops and no village centre. Development at GN-2 and GN-3 cause loss of local amenity space. Future plans considered in context of recent planned development including at Donnington, traffic implications and the need for a bypass along proposed GN-4 and GN-5, improved public transport, education provision and impact on secondary schools in Stafford, provision of recreational areas, new retail and employment opportunities, water and sewage infrastructure with impact on agricultural land.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Gnosall development locations discussion

Housing should be delivered after infrastructure is provided. Query why land west of M6 and Stafford has not been considered with links to motorway expansion and reduce pressure on villages, concern about new development impacts on A34 Lichfield Road and subject to eastern distributor road being built. Level of need has dropped, change to economic situation due to immigration changes with a focus of housing and jobs to the north of England rather than the Midlands.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Major Prendergast MBE) – PDF response with analysis of housing completions and commitments directing that all the new development can be accommodated in Stafford town with its infrastructure and employment focus. Support Option A and discount Option C and D except for affordable housing provision to support local people. **ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Mr Corfield) – Oppose the LDF due to undemocratic, scale of development with lack of viable employment opportunities, lack of funding for new infrastructure required including for leisure. Oppose new development in Gnosall due to lack of services and facilities with local shops undermined by supermarkets, loss of character and agricultural land / food security with community growth based on local need rather than social engineering to provide for migration.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Gnosall development locations discussion.

1 response (Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council) – Concern about the misrepresentation of sites within and outside of Stafford and surrounding Parishes in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Final Report with implications for delivery of 7,000 new homes. Strong support for protection of open countryside and opposes development outside of the Eastern Distributor Road protected line which must be constructed to Lichfield Road A513 before any new housing development. Support extension to Stafford crematorium but oppose SF-3 with school capacity requiring new primary provision. Support Options C and D but with significant concern about development at the Haywoods and increased traffic generation through cumulative effects. Concern about Heavy Goods Vehicles using local road network and historic buildings affected. Green infrastructure, wildlife and habitats should be maintained and impacts on the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty mitigated through Section 106 Agreements. Support development at SF-4 within the boundary of Blackheath Lane and Baswich Lane.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Stafford and Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Lovell) – Object to new low-cost, high density social housing in Stafford Borough and objection to new housing development at Great and Little Haywood and Colwich based on use of Greenfield land between villages, loss of character and identity, pressure on utilities, health services and local schools, lack of commercial, retail, parking and road infrastructure with a new village centre required but where? Traffic congestion created in Little Haywood would be significant with little parking to access services and facilities, and poor road infrastructure for buses and pedestrians.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Ms Furber) – Object to scale of new development in rural villages, particularly Hixon due to impact on rural location and lifestyle, loss of countryside, impact on local communities, services and facilities.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Hixon development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Whittaker X2) – Protect the wildlife, habitats and trees in Stafford Borough. Concern about Hixon development with public consultation showing inaccurate maps, development options in the wrong place, impact of growth leading to Hixon being bigger than Eccleshall, lack of Health Centre, Shops, Police Station, Library, Playing Fields, Schools, no reference to traveller site proposed and no reply to a legal ruling or implications. Significant impact on property prices and values.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Jeffries) – PDF response with opposition to the whole plan, Great and Little Haywood developments, plans for Stafford eastern bypass and use of land south of Wildwood. The plan conflicts with visions in paragraph 2.2 due to traffic congestion, increased pollution, construction traffic and impact on services and facilities. Object to paragraph 2.3 regarding growth supporting quality of life. Lack of reference to the elderly (para 4.6), future education provision (para 4.34) and concern about meeting more than local need for housing (para 5.7). Do not accept this growth and listen to local people, with implications for local elections. Object to development between Great and Little Haywood due to loss of identity, poor local road capacity for access, loss of wildlife and impact on quality of life. Eastern bypass to be rejected to avoid impact on Walton High School from traffic noise and health issues, Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty location and impact on quality of life. Object to Greenfield development south of Wildwood at SF-7 not in keeping with the local environment and nearby villages. Urge the Council not to proceed with the Plans.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Stafford and Haywoods development locations discussion.

1 response (Mrs Dyke) – Object to new housing development in Eccleshall which is a delightful village but affected by traffic congestion with new housing undermining the local environment. **ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Mr Norton) – Object to scale of new development at Eccleshall due to impact on character, historic environment, with infrastructure and topography unable to accommodate new housing.

**ACTION:** Noted for consideration through the Eccleshall development locations discussion.

1 response (Haughton Parish Plan Steering Group) – PDF response with support for vision (para 2.3 & 2.4), new development realised in a structured and focused approach (para 3.1), guide additional housing on a limited scale to selected smaller settlements (para 3.5) and delivered through additional community facilities (para 3.7). Support Option C and accept limited Greenfield development at Haughton to 50 dwellings as part of growth scenarios. Support for HN-3 and HN-4 incorporating new public open space and new housing related to existing and improved school and community facilities without crossing the A518. Support for high design standards to maintain character and landscape (para 9.1) with local density levels to reflect proposal's individual nature and discount new open space areas to comply with PPS3. Support for mixed housing types (para 9.40) into new designs (paras 9.65 & 9.70). Support footpath networks, new open space and countryside with new development to provide benefits to the local community.

**ACTION:** Noted with support for HN-3 and HN-4 to be considered through the Haughton development locations discussion.

1 response (Tetlow King for West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium) – PDF response with objective of optimising social / affordable housing provision and request reference to housing in the introduction regarding services provided to the local community. Object to omission of housing to meet the needs of all residents in the Sustainable Community Strategies. Welcome reference to affordability in para 3.4 as well as the spatial vision reference to ageing population but with no differentiation between affordable and market housing through text changes.

ACTION: Noted with reference to the Policy and Improvement team.

Suggest removal of aim regarding rich environment and climate change.

ACTION: Not accepted.

Key objectives to make specific reference to affordable housing to meet locally identified need including the elderly to deliver the Vision. Justify suggested affordable housing provision for local needs in areas outside Stafford and Stone with reference to 505 per annum figure. ACTION: Noted

Spatial portrait to qualify credit crunch statement regarding impact on affordability emphasising more affordable dwellings will still be required

ACTION: Noted to provide context to current economic climate.

Preferred development options to consider rural exception sites and review of Residential Development Boundaries to meet local needs outside of existing areas. Support Plan's flexibility to meet increased housing requirements through the Regional Spatial Strategy but with greater flexibility to meet demonstrated rural area local needs. ACTION: Noted.

Delivering a Sustainable Future to reflect carbon emission impacts of residential development so sustainable forms of development, Code for Sustainable Homes targets and on-site renewable energy supported. Support high quality housing standards to be flexible to future change, site-specific density requirements to be negotiable for creativity, support sequential approach as a preference rather than requirement provided site development is not hindered, housing mix to reflect Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) findings using site size threshold % targets for sufficient affordable housing on viable sites through negotiation and economic viability evidence. 10% lifetime homes required in residential developments and commitment to specialist housing for the elderly. Object to onerous provision of Neighbourhood Policing Units with level of financial contribution set if required. Rural conversions to be considered on a site by site basis. Support approach to affordable housing and site size thresholds including Supplementary Planning Document with commuted sums accepted following independent viability assessments as well as support for rural exceptions policy. ACTION: Noted.

Flood risk and sustainable drainage systems to reflect PPS25 tests. Object to target setting of specialist housing due to developer burden but provide a commitment to range of housing across the Borough. Significant affordable housing required in Stone to meet unmet needs. Locally defined housing mix to be set by SHMA and local need to be negotiated with developers. Affordable housing exempt from

education provision as meeting the needs of existing residents. Green infrastructure to be subject to developer negotiation, no fixed target. ACTION: Noted.

General comments with affordable housing given sufficient weight and status with sub-district wide targets over Plan period, reflect local market regarding site size, local definition of intermediate and social rented, identification of 100% affordable housing sites and targeting, provision of rural exception sites, specialist needs and reuse of empty properties, effective use of Section 106 Agreements and demand factors. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mrs Derry) – PDF response advocating less housing due to more pensioners, redevelop empty business properties and car parks for housing (brownfield development), opposition to second homes wasting land resources, increase elderly accommodation. Impact on food production from Greenfield development, loss of wildlife and habitats, loss of rural character from new development. Lack of services and facilities in Great Haywood, inadequate local road network, increased pollution and pressure of flooding, sewage system with a focus on brownfield land rather than money making Greenfield sites.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Gardiner) – Objection to the scale of new housing development in Stafford Borough due to impact on rural landscape and character, failure to deliver environmental promises with likely impact for politicians at election time. Greatest concern about traffic implications of new development on the road system which is inadequate.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.

1 response (Mr Thomas for Stafford Borough Council) – No significant land contamination issues to restrict development at locations shown. Sites adjacent to M6 motorway to have air quality monitoring to ensure viability of new housing in context of traffic growth. Avoid housing near noisy activities including night time economy. Housing development to refer to refuse and recycling storage facilities. ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Development Strategy approach.

Reference to Four Ashes to be included (para 4.45), provide demographic breakdown / population comparison between urban and rural areas (para 4.5), refer to strategic pre-application discussions in Section 106 chapter for para 10.2. Reference to needs assessment for 72 additional residential pitches in para. 9.81. Housing mix based on evidence with query of North Housing Market Assessment but concern about robustness including promotion of lifetime homes, larger living space for smaller households and housing register data application for the Plan. Include reference to Rural Homelessness Study of March 2009. Seek local indicators from Environmental & Health Services for suggestions. ACTION: Agreed.

Need to explain why the Borough is going through change and amend paragraph order (para 1.1 & 1.5). Concern about economic growth contrary to sustainable development principles and reduce climate change impacts. Further explanation of vision and community services. Clarify meaning of sustainable community, significant

new green infrastructure and size of sub-regional open space. Support for sustainable homes. Prioritise brownfield sites but consider biodiversity. Housing mix targets are required, not left to the market. Support sustainable green tourism and through traffic planning. Avoid new bypasses around Stafford due to traffic generation. Add natural environment / biodiversity to para 10.23. Refer to service plan targets, links to National Indicators and other performance indicators.

ACTION: Noted.

Reference to tackling climate change, sustainable construction and sustainable transport. Include enhanced reference to agriculture (para. 4.17). Add Quiet Lanes for Stafford Borough reference as an initiative in western area. Climate change refer to County Council study and local targets. ACTION: Noted.

Amendments to para 2.1 for a sustainable community. Stafford bullet point with amendment to graduate employment. Support for local food production sector included in Areas outside growth settlements page 11 bullet point 1. Add reference to local nature reserves and other wildlife sites (para 4.19). Reference to flood plain management, washlands project, climate change & biodiversity (para. 4.30). More generalised context for energy (para 4.39). Reference to renewable energy feasibility study outcomes in para 9.9. Reference to large scale biodiversity enhancement zones (para 9.104) based on Green Infrastructure study. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Miss Simpson) – Object to new development in Hixon due to impact on rural character, loss of village identity and open countryside, impact on property values, inadequate local road network and traffic congestion. Strong objection to HI-4 and HI-5 due to visual impact and loss of footpaths with poor single track access road. Appreciate role of local employment sites but should not be expanded.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Hixon development locations discussion.

1 response (E A Gosling) – PDF response with concern about loss of prime agricultural land to retail and domestic use, impact on climate change and increased levels of housing to be of highest possible standards including green space and eco-homes. Object to infill development due to loss of character, social problems and green space. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Hunt) – PDF response with strong objection to the LDF and imposed new development from central Government which is not now required due to the recession, reduced employment, affordability issues solved and existing housing stock provision through empty homes and out migration. Reduced need for employment and retail space in Stafford, Stone and Eccleshall. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Rising Brook Baptist Church) – Churches and faith groups contributing to building new communities in Stafford bringing strong values combined with time, skills, buildings and community to serve local neighbourhoods. Churches can play an active role in planning new housing areas through partnership with local authorities,



developers and faith communities at an early stage. Three examples of church in a new neighbourhood – large model (Rising Brook Baptist Church centre), smaller model (Stafford Signposts Ltd at Highfields) and Rising Brook Neighbourhood delivering to the local community. Suggested amendments to open space provision to enable increased car parking at Burton Square to maximise use of local facilities.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Harding) – Concern about night sky pollution

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Commission for Architecture & Built Environment) – PDF response with reference of LDF's role to secure high quality designed development including robust design policies delivered through local champions, treat design as a cross cutting issue reflected in local character and implementation of design tools and mechanisms. Reference to key questions and documents. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Barnett Ratcliffe Partnership) – PDF response suggesting inclusion of land at Exeter Street as a housing development site which is not within the floodplain and will support the local community.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Stafford development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr & Mrs Kevin & S Leek) – Objecting to new housing development at Kerry's and Shaw's Lane, Eccleshall due to visual impact, increased traffic and noise, impact on wildlife, lack of Habitat Regulations Assessment, negative impact on Eccleshall community and lack of infrastructure, services and facilities. Concern about increased traffic from Donnington freight terminal combined with new housing development reducing quality of life.

ACTION: Noted to be considered through the Eccleshall development locations discussion.

1 response (Mr Eld) – Objection to proposed developments at Eccleshall, Gnosall, Woodseaves and Horton (and possibly at Norton Bridge with an Eco Village of which no mention is made in the LDF) due to inadequate current road system, especially the narrow A5013 Stafford - Eccleshall road and the Norton Bridge road from Great Bridgeford road with pressure on the M6 junction 14 roundabout backing up and being dangerous. Development at Ladfordfields and Raleigh Hall would exacerbate traffic issues through Great Bridgeford as well as impacting on the open countryside visually and on agricultural land. Such development to be restricted to Prime Point where the damage has already been done. Question the provision of gypsies in Stafford Borough's rural area being inappropriate and having significant impact on rural communities. There is a lack of infrastructure, services and facilities in rural areas as well as impacts from the Donnington freight depot on local roads.

ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Defence Estates Operations North) – Confirm that the sites highlighted are situated outside of the safeguarding area. Therefore, the Ministry of Defence has no safeguarding objections within this area. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee) – DPTAC has identified four overarching principles on which to base its advice to Government, other organisations and disabled people, which are that: accessibility for disabled people is a condition of any investment; accessibility for disabled people must be a mainstream activity; users should be involved in determining accessibility; and achieving accessibility for disabled people is the responsibility of the provider.  
ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Cllr Proctor) – Are there adequate indoor sporting facilities for the older generation?

ACTION: Noted for consideration through Chapter 9 – Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy.

1 response (Civil Aviation Authority) – PDF response relating to need of aerodromes and their operators such as a non official safeguarding map for aeronautical site to protect from adverse development, notify aerodrome operators of telecom installations within 3 kilometres, notification of wind turbine proposals and tall structures over 150 metres, venting and flaring gas releases. ACTION: Noted.

1 response (A & J Bott) – PDF response stating inability to understand the consultation process, suggesting plain English approach rather than an on-line document.  
ACTION: Noted.

1 response (Mr Gammon for Stafford Borough Council) – Inclusion for the future provision of Burial land for use by Stafford Borough Council as the Burial Authority due to capacity of Tixall Road and Stone cemeteries before 2026 thus requiring the acquisition of new space ideally between Stafford and Stone.

The site chosen would be used for many years so it is of paramount importance this is a place of comfort to the bereaved and should be an absolute minimum of 5 acres. The correct location of the site is essential. Accessibility - Ideally not on a very busy main road, public transport should be available nearby, height of water table to avoid possible water problems and drainage, not near to rivers lakes and canals, the topography of the site should preferably be undulating ground as this offers an appealing landscape, all services electricity main drainage and water must be available, and neighbours - noise of factories, schools, motorways etc can be very unwelcome and traffic build up can cause problems for Funeral Directors arriving at specific times for the funeral. The type of soil found is an important factor. The ideal soil is a light sandy loam; this drains itself and is ideal for grave excavation. Dense clay however is the least favourable which retards decomposition and is difficult to work with.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through Chapter 9 – Open Space, Sport & Recreation preferred policy.

1 response (Mr Tomkinson) – Object to new housing development at SF-8 due to increased traffic causing congestion and accidents on the local road network, brownfield land should be used before Greenfield and open countryside areas, former landfill waste site causing engineering and development problems as well as pollution hazard so need for thorough ground investigations, loss of wildlife, bird species, habitats, woodlands and Tree Preservation Orders, impact on the Cannock

Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and construction of the southern distributor road being a significant infrastructure barrier. Support development north of Stafford and query why impacts on urban regeneration schemes in North Staffordshire is relevant.

**ACTION:** Noted objection to SF-8 for consideration through the Stafford development locations discussion.

Support for brownfield development before Greenfield sites despite commercial attractiveness and market forces (para 9.36). Support mix of household price, size and tenure to avoid market limitations and developer profits with the Plan stating requirements. **ACTION:** Noted.

1 response (Mr Hurst) – Support the visions (para 2.4) but not conveyed in the rest of the document. Support and identify high quality network of accessible green space and protection of rural areas in context of housing development, support for key objectives with housing and other uses allocated for delivery (para 3.5 & 3.7). Query why Option C is advocated but settlements linked to Options E & F are included in the development options. Consider carbon emission reductions through tree planting alongside new development (para 9.7 & 9.8). Consider all forms of energy sources, not just agricultural land. Support high quality design and sustainable construction methods as well as brownfield sites. Support a range of housing mix and provision of lifetime homes and specialist housing despite market forces. Support increased green infrastructure provision. **ACTION:** Noted.

Query the implications of new development at Haughton due to loss of services and facilities recently despite increased housing, lack of employment and types of houses constructed leading to commuting, limited community facilities, parking issues and impact on the local road network, effect on wildlife and recreational provision. Future development at Haughton should be focused on HN-4, HN-5 and HN-6 to limit linear expansion and environmental impact but include open space provision, energy and design standards, elderly sheltered accommodation and based on a local needs assessment.

**ACTION:** Noted to be considered through the Haughton development locations discussion.

1 response (Berrys for Mr G Tavernor) – Support for vision but query focus on Stafford at expense of smaller settlements (para 2.3). Support Key Objectives (para 3.6). Proportion of new homes to rural settlements for sustainability (para 5.5) and avoid lack of rural development for housing and employment (para 6.10). Weston to be included in list of principal settlements (para 6.12) with modest growth due to road and public transport access, services and facilities (para 6.14 & 6.15). Support specific housing provision for Weston as a Group 1 settlement, south east direction of growth and a greater proportional split with client's site suggested through adjusted boundaries for Greenfield development (para 6.29, 6.31 & 7.13). Object to Option C and encroachment on Green Belt (para 6.29 & 7.0). Weston is more accessible than Haughton and Woodseaves. Land at WN-1 / WT-1 including housing, A51 access with new employment provision suggested north of Weston.

Support biodiversity, open space and well designed housing areas with housing density and type based on need and site specific rather than PPS3 approach (check it out). Aware of affordable housing element and appropriate housing mix, support neighbourhood policing, object to rural conversions for employment rather than housing to preserve historic assets. Affordable housing more applicable to Stafford and Stone, commuted sums in rural settlements and query viability of 40% target (para 9.63 & 9.69). Support rural exception policy based on local need and at least 2,000 homes outside of Stafford and Stone to sustain rural settlements. Support housing mix of 3-4 bedroom properties including elderly and greater provision to support services through Section 106 Agreements rather than Community Infrastructure Levy double charging in current economic climate.

ACTION: Noted.

Weston to be included in Vision with capacity to expand services whilst providing housing & employment (para 3.5). Amend affordable housing objective to reflect proven need (para 3.7). ACTION: Noted.

1 response (First City for Evans, Stott & Boote families) – Support delivery of new development to the east of Stafford on client's land north of Tixall Road. Requirement to amend references to SF-3 as not highly sensitive to landscape, flood or biodiversity. SF-4 & SF-10 in floodplain whilst SF-8 impact on setting of Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Evaluation and review land use delivery elements of the Sustainable Community Strategies for quality of life and new services / facilities. Vision and key objectives to be locally distinctive by focussing on positive managed change and certainty with 8 objectives suggested covering local character and identity, the environment, high quality development, housing delivery, employment provision, services and facilities, town centre vitality and viability, and sustainable modes of transport to manage future travel demands. Measures including choice for local transport networks. Support for positive development-led Vision and urban extension east of Stafford. Query scale of development to rural areas beyond local need through Option C being contrary to Regional Spatial Strategy thus supporting Option A in sustainable locations, using existing infrastructure, mixed use areas and Greenfield locations. Core strategy to identify edge of Stafford new development to broad locations and strategic sites. SF-3 is a strategic, comprehensive and sustainable location for housing, eastern distributor road and open space supported by access to sustainable transport modes, existing infrastructure, services and facilities, and limited impact on open countryside and landscape. Object to identification of land south of Stafford with lack of cross-border support, loss of countryside, lack of services and facilities. Focus on land east of Stafford to support growth with minima figures applied from the Regional Spatial Strategy.

ACTION: Noted for consideration through the Stafford development locations discussion.

APPENDIX 5 – RESPONSES RECEIVED & COUNCIL RESPONSE  
PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH – DRAFT CORE POLICIES

**1 – Sustainable Development & Climate Change**

---

**Climate Change**

A number of respondents expressed concern about the assumptions and implications of climate change on society such as health impacts as well as delivering new developments in the future and relationship to the transport network. However Natural England noted the threat of climate change and adapting to changing weather patterns requiring action.

Development led respondents raised concerns that the policy should be sufficiently flexible to ensure development is delivered and that the policy should be consistent with PPS25 rather than overly prescriptive particularly regarding the relationship between Flood Zone 1 and Flood Zone 2 and 3 areas. Furthermore flexibility should be applied to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) regarding technical feasibility and development viability although others proposed SuDS should be considered in all new developments. A requirement for site specific Flood Risk Assessments was suggested on sites vulnerable to flooding.

The Environment Agency has provided specific policy text amendments concerning flood risk and sustainable drainage. The Environment Agency emphasis the need for recommendations of the Water Cycle Study and the Surface Water Management Plan to inform strategic planning and site allocations. Natural England support natural habitats providing for future flood waters whilst Sport England objected to playing fields being lost to provide for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) within new developments. There was some support for water and energy efficiency usage in new development by other respondents.

Development led respondents object to the policy including specific requirements for sustainable construction relating to the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM rating due to development viability implications and a lack of supporting evidence, going beyond national requirements, reduced housing delivery as well as these matters being addressed by Building Regulations. The policy should be in conformity with the RSS Policy SR3 concerning the Code for Sustainable Homes. Government Office for the West Midlands re-iterated these points requesting convincing evidence as well as calling for less detailed text for the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM. However a number of other respondents supported these initiatives for improving the design of new developments and addressing climate change impacts.

A number of respondents asked for reference to low carbon sources of energy to be included in the policy, in line with emerging PPS1 advice, rather than just renewable energy. Development led respondents state that on site renewable requirements are too ambitious, should reflect national and regional policy including proposals set out in new PPS1 as well as refer to low carbon sources. Furthermore there is a lack of justification and evidence for the percentage requirements, the residential threshold of 10 dwellings, on site renewable schemes can be inefficient compared to larger off site provision and there is no reference to energy conservation. Some other

respondents requested for on site renewable energy to apply to employment uses. Government Office for the West Midlands stated more locally specific information concerning low carbon energy schemes should be included.

### **Renewable Energy**

Renewable energy schemes that deliver electricity outputs and add value to the wider economy, including local initiatives are supported by a number of respondents. Staffordshire County Council highlighted the work currently being undertaken through the renewable energy study to provide further locally based evidence. Government Office for the West Midlands suggested reference to decentralised energy for proposed urban extensions. There was some support for decommissioning conditions on renewable energy schemes as well as broader landscape protection and public safety considerations.

Development led respondents raised concerns that the policy should be sufficiently flexible to ensure development is delivered. One respondent promoted their client's land at Raleigh Hall biomass unit for renewable energy and the use of energy output to support residential and employment development. There was a level of support for Coal Bed Methane to be used in the future. However a number of respondents objected to Coal Bed Methane being included within the renewable energy section rather than being identified as a low carbon energy source. Furthermore paragraph 1.22 should be moved to earlier in the section.

## **2 – Environmental Protection & Management**

---

### **Environmental Quality**

There was general support for this policy from a range of respondents including for landscape character and links to green infrastructure to benefit biodiversity. Some concerns were raised about the loss of habitats and defining green infrastructure regarding open space, sport and recreation facilities. The Environment Agency were seeking deculverting in order to re-establish watercourses within new development with Natural England calling for reference to geological conservation. Development led respondents requested that green infrastructure should be provided on new developments where it is appropriate whilst other respondents requested clarification on green infrastructure matters. One site promoter at Yarnfield justified land to be included within the policy context.

### **Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)**

There was support for this policy including recognition for protecting the AONB, its Management Plan and the implications of new development in the locality. Clarification was sought by a number of respondents concerning recreation activity.

### **Landscape Character**

A number of respondents asked for policy amendments to refer to hedgerows and the requirement for individual developments to carry out site specific landscape character assessments. English Heritage emphasised clarification concerning historic landscape characteristics and the implications for particular locations. Staffordshire County Council and Natural England highlighted the county wide Landscape Character Assessment and clear definitions of National Character Areas.

### **Safeguarding the Integrity of European Sites**

There was some support for the policy with the application of mitigation measures. However development led respondents stated the policy was too onerous in restricting development and that there is a lack of evidence to underpin the policy.

### **Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation**

A number of Local Government organisations and local authorities stated that the policy should clarify that measures relate to the Stafford Borough area rather than the whole 12 mile zone. Development led respondents raised significant concerns about the policy being too onerous on developments permitted particularly at Stafford, lack of evidence to substantiate the 400 metres and 12 miles zones and a lack of clarity on mitigation measures together with their delivery not being addressed in a joined up approach.

### **Green Belt**

Landowners promoting sites requested changes to the Green Belt boundary to provide for housing development at Yarnfield, Tittensor and alongside the Creda site at Blythe Bridge. Consideration should be given to RSS development requirements. Other respondents supported the policy and maintaining Green Belt boundaries with the policy position of settlements 'washed over' by Green Belt to be clarified. The West Midlands Regional Assembly raised issues of concern regarding housing development on Major Developed Sites undermining urban regeneration initiatives.

## **3 – Housing**

---

### **Range of Dwelling Types, Density and Sizes**

There is some level of support for the policy and delivery of quality design appropriate to the local character. However a number of respondents, including Government Office for the West Midlands, objected to housing densities being restricted to 40 dwellings per hectare in Stafford and Stone town centre and 30 dwellings per hectare elsewhere, as being contrary to national planning policy so should be considered on a site by site basis. Furthermore there were objections from development led respondents to prescriptive housing ranges and sizes of 1 and 2 bedrooms without the evidence with a more balanced supply of property types delivered appropriate to local character and local characteristics. However this approach of defining dwelling sizes was supported by Government Office. Housing Plus stated that a range should be sought on all sites, not just those of over 10 dwellings, a flexible approach is supported based on local evidence with the future need for smaller accommodation units.

### **Affordable Housing**

Development led respondents objected to the affordable housing threshold of 30% rising to 40% without supporting evidence through the viability assessment, also requested by Government Office for the West Midlands, as this is contrary to national policy in PPS3 and objections were raised to the requirement for small groups of affordable homes across a development. The justification text should refer to the correct definitions of affordable housing as set out in PPS3. Economic viability should be used to determine lower targets in particular circumstances. Development

led respondents objected to the thresholds set and confusion over the payment of commuted sums with clarification requested. The Ministry of Defence requested that Service Family Accommodation should be exempt from providing affordable housing. Housing Plus strongly supports the policy to achieve the maximum level of affordable housing provision, to be considered on all sites as small clusters rather than commuted sum payments with affordable housing excluding low cost market housing. Staffordshire County Council states that the policy should consider the needs of people with long term conditions and moderate to severe personal care disability.

### **Rural Exception Housing**

There is a level of support for this policy, together with a Rural Exception Housing Supplementary Planning Document, from a range of respondents to achieve affordable housing in rural areas using local housing need assessments in association with Parish Councils. A number of Borough Council Members supported increasing the delivery of affordable housing through rural exception sites including for key workers and carers, referencing work carried out in Shropshire and the issue of perpetuity. Staffordshire County Council states that the policy should consider specialist housing to meet identified health, care and support needs such as extra care developments.

### **Lifetime Homes**

Development led respondents objected to the policy to deliver lifetime homes in advance of the Government's timescale of 2013 and highlight that a review may lead to the requirements remaining voluntary rather than mandatory except for Code Level 6. Furthermore concerns were raised about density requirements not being met due to increased floorspace of such housing. There is support for the policy for all new homes to assist people with long term conditions by Staffordshire County Council and Housing Plus.

### **Specialist Housing**

There is support for the policy from a range of respondents to deliver extra care housing needs through partnership working based on the most up-to-date evidence being provided by Staffordshire County Council. The full range of client groups should be included in the policy, not just older people and an affordable element should be provided, requested by a number of responses.

### **Gypsies and Travellers**

There was some support for the policy to ensure sufficient provision for gypsies takes place and avoiding unauthorised sites being established. The gypsy and travelling community representatives emphasis that the local authority should meet the RSS requirements for number of pitches, there should be less restrictive policy wording regarding the landscape, access to local services, Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Rural exception policies can be used to deliver sites for affordable provision although there will also be a demand for private sites. A number of respondents requested reference to travelling showmen as a policy. Staffordshire Police suggested an optimal site size of 10 – 15 pitches for occupancy



with Government Office for the West Midlands clarifying reference to the West Midlands Regional Assembly Interim Policy Statement rather than RSS Phase 3.

## **4 – Economy**

---

### **Local Economy**

There was some support for the policy in terms of delivering new employment development provided clear mechanisms for implementation are referenced. Advantage West Midlands supported the policy with increased broadband access. However development led respondents objected to the protection of existing employment land as being contrary to national policy supporting housing as well as restricting firms wishing to move premises to more suitable locations. Reference should be made to Planning Policy Statement 4 and the local evidence. Farm and rural diversification was supported for inclusion in the policy by a number of respondents. Creswell Parish Council state reference should be made to a new lorry park facility north of Stafford close to the strategic transport network and increased traffic from Greenfield employment sites.

### **Retail**

Support was expressed for the policy and its hierarchy identifying Gnosall, Great & Little Haywood although new development should be supported by master plans to guide strategic planning. The Theatre's Trust response states that greater emphasis should be given to arts and cultural provision through the policy including community infrastructure and planning obligation reference.

### **Tourism**

There was general support for the policy, which should be strengthened with a greater emphasis on delivery mechanisms, partnership working and terms describing the canal network. In terms of tourism Sport England emphasised greater use of the canal network for walking and cycling activities together with the importance of Cannock Chase for recreational provision whilst the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Partnership asked for protection against impacts of increasing visitor numbers. Government Office West Midlands called for a tourism strategy in policy.

## **5 – Design and the Historic Environment**

---

### **Design**

Development led respondents objected to the policy including CABE Silver Standard and Building for Life requirements as being too onerous to deliver development, unreasonable, not mandatory and applicable to other organisations thus may change in future. There was support for master planning and delivery of development briefs for major schemes, which should be clarified. Other respondents supported high quality designs to be applicable to all new developments with increased master planning lead by the Borough Council, more detailed criteria and specific reference to Parish & Town Design Statements. Staffordshire Police requested reference to 'Secure by Design' supporting sustainable communities within the policy whilst Sport England stated reference to 'active design' should be included.

### **Historic Environment**

There was general support for this policy from a range of respondents with minor amendments for clarity and an emphasis on design matters. Government Office West Midlands stated that the newly published PPS5 should be referenced. English Heritage emphasised excellence in design and retaining character with stronger links to Borough specific heritage assets together with Staffordshire County led projects.

### **6 – Open Space, Sport & Recreation Facilities**

---

A number of respondents, including Government Office for the West Midlands, asked for greater clarification in terms of provision standards, future investment, delivery of new facilities and the supporting evidence. There should be increased partnership working to deliver new requirements associated with development. The response from Sport England called for inclusion of provision standards within the policy, greater clarification in terms of delivering various types of open space, sport and recreation together with area specific implementation strategies and requiring a presumption in favour of all open spaces.

### **7 – Transport**

---

There is a general level of support for the policy in terms of delivering future sustainable transport provision. However development led respondents raise concerns about the policy being too prescriptive linked to the location of new development and its delivery in the context of new transport infrastructure, particularly the Eastern Distributor Road at Stafford which is objected to by those with land interests off Baswich Lane and Truro Way, Baswich. A number of respondents call for greater emphasis on sustainable transport modes and ICT, Transport Assessments, reduced impacts on rural roads, retaining local facilities, lack of reference to commercial parking provision and improvements to highway infrastructure. Government Office for the West Midlands suggested a strategic approach of transport for the public transport network to be linked to growth for inclusion as well as reference to rail.

The Highways Agency support the broad principles of the draft policy with an emphasis on partnership working, increased range of public transport mechanisms and local car parking standards whilst clarification is sought concerning Stafford's Eastern Distributor Road based on the evidence base and infrastructure needs.

### **General**

A number of respondents were concerned that there was a lack of vision, objectives and development strategy including housing figures within the document circulated for consultation, which would lead to a reactionary rather than pro-active delivery of development benefitting the Borough's communities. Development led respondents raised concerns about the lack of a policy identifying housing provision across the Borough area and its implications in the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy. Government Office for the West Midlands suggested that a number of policies could be combined or dispensed with as matters would be covered by the spatial strategy. Advantage West Midlands highlighted Stafford being an Impact Investment Location.

There were a total of 269 comments to Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough: Draft Core Policies with the key messages listed below:

- A number of respondents were concerned that there was a lack of vision, objectives and development strategy including housing figures which could lead to a reactionary rather than pro-active delivery of development benefiting the Borough's communities
- Development led respondents raised concerns about the lack of a policy identifying housing provision across the Borough area and its implications in the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy
- Government Office for the West Midlands suggested that a number of policies could be combined or dispensed with as matters would be covered by the spatial strategy
- Advantage West Midlands highlighted Stafford being an Impact Investment Location
- Specific responses were also received either supporting or objecting to each of the draft core policies within the sections on Sustainable Development & Climate Change, Environmental Protection & Management, Housing, Economy, Transport, Design and Historic Environment

### **Council Response**

- The purpose of the Draft Core Policies consultation was to specifically consider key policy topic areas. The vision, objectives and overall development strategy for the Borough, together with development provision, which were set out in the Issues and Options document, were consulted upon in more detail through the Local Choices, Draft Publication and Strategic Policy Choices consultation documents
- A number of policy topic areas to be combined and better co-ordinated within the Plan for Stafford Borough – Draft Publication
- Wording of detailed policies amended in light of comments

## APPENDIX 6 – RESPONSES & COUNCIL RESPONSE PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH – LOCAL CHOICES

### **Chapter 1 - Introduction**

---

Responses received to Chapter 1 focused on the sensitivity of Stafford Borough's high quality environment and the self sufficiency of Stafford town. A number of development-led responses promoting land interests were also provided.

### **Chapter 2 – Development Strategy approach**

---

A number of respondents supported existing Green Belt boundaries being maintained whilst development-led responses suggested minor amendments and continued identification of Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt. A response from the Registered Providers (Stafford and Rural Homes and Housing Plus) made reference to affordable housing being delivered on the edge of Green Belt settlements. There was general support for the Plan period being extended to 2031.

- **Housing Growth**

A number of development-led responses supported the figure of 500 new homes per year as a minimum in many cases with some arguing for higher figures, greater justification for the figure and clarification for Ministry of Defence provision. Other respondents objected to the figure of 500 new homes per year arguing for greater use of the existing housing stock. Several responses emphasised that brownfield land should be used before Greenfield land and infrastructure should be delivered before any additional housing is built. There was support for the Plan to be regularly reviewed in order to ensure growth targets and delivery are being achieved.

- **Question 1 – Do you agree that 500 new homes should be provided to meet local need across Stafford Borough each year for the Plan period, of which the majority of new homes should be at Stafford town?**

Development-led respondents stated that the housing requirements for Stafford Borough of 500 per year should be minima whilst other respondents objected to the provision due to lack of need for new housing. Many comments focused on the need for infrastructure and some stated that infrastructure should be delivered before development takes place. A number of responses asked for greater justification of the housing requirements based on local needs and household projections.

Development-led responses promoting land interests called for either a focus on Stafford town or providing development across the Borough depending on the location of their particular sites. Other respondents took a more balanced approach to enable some development to take place in smaller settlements through a review of Residential Development Boundaries to maintain local services and facilities as well as provide housing for local people. Some responses emphasised the link between housing development and local economic growth.

- **Question 2 – On this basis do you agree that most new development should be in and around the County Town of Stafford?**

Development-led respondents with land interests at Stafford supported a focus on the County town, emphasising the Regional Spatial Strategy Phase Two Revision figure of 70% whilst those with land interests elsewhere across the Borough objected to the Stafford focus and called for development strategy flexibility at Stone and the rural areas. Responses asked for the Council to justify the approach adopted and use of the evidence base. A number of respondents objected to the focus on Stafford due to the impact on the high quality environment and traffic congestion as well as the need for additional infrastructure and provision of local services. There was support for use of previously developed land before Greenfield development.

- **Question 3 – Do you agree that limited new housing should be identified in Stone to meet future local needs?**

Development-led respondents with land interests at Stone stated that local need required growth in the town now rather than after 2021. There was also support for employment development at Stone rather than Meaford. A number of respondents objected to further growth at Stone due to traffic congestion and constraints to further development.

- **Question 4 – Do you agree with this general restriction on new housing in the rural areas outside Stafford and Stone?**

Development-led responses objected to a general restriction of new housing in rural areas stating that a flexible policy approach is required to deliver provision for local needs and an appropriate scale and housing mix which would have a limited impact on the environment. There was also support for increased affordable housing provision in rural areas and rural exception sites. Some respondents stated that new development should be focused on the larger villages with existing local services and infrastructure. A number of respondents objected to further housing allocations in rural areas arguing for use of infill developments and previously developed land. Several responses focused on the need to consider amending current Residential Development Boundaries in order to support development to meet local needs.

- **Provision of Employment, Retail and Offices**

There was general support for more employment and providing a range of uses, supported by enhanced public transport with development-led responses promoting site interests in particular locations at Stafford and elsewhere across the Borough. There was general agreement that no more office developments would be required.

- **Question 5 – Do you agree that Stafford town centre should see further growth in non-food shopping space, to provide for future population growth and remain competitive with other regional shopping centres?**

A number of responses supported further retail provision with the focus on Stafford town centre rather than edge or out of town retail parks that is sensitive to the character of the area and provides a distinctive offer. Some respondents suggested new provision was not required due to the number of empty shops.

- **Question 6 – Do you agree that some new employment land should be allocated, in addition to the Meaford site, as an extension to the Stone Business Park?**

There was some support for further employment development at Stone to provide for local job needs whilst being sensitive to the landscape. Some respondents objected to employment development at Stone due to provision at Meaford and asked why employment sites were being lost to housing whilst at the same time allocating more employment land.

- **Question 7 – Do you feel that additional employment land should be allocated near Seighford and Eccleshall, in addition to the existing permissions at Hixon?**

Whilst concerns were raised about new employment development at Raleigh Hall and Ladfordfields due to increasing traffic congestion and volumes through Eccleshall and Great Bridgeford responses from the developers promoting these location emphasised employment development and increased job opportunities. A number of respondents objected to further employment development at Hixon and several responses sought clarification on outstanding planning permissions on employment sites and how this related to future allocations.

- **The Importance of New Development**

A number of respondents supported growth provisions for Stafford Borough through the new Plan period at the main settlements providing for more than local needs. The new Plan should set out a clear vision and development strategy linked to infrastructure delivery.

## Chapter 3 – Questions and Next Steps

---

No responses were received to this Chapter

### General

A number of responses were received raising the following key messages for consideration when preparing 'Delivering the Plan for Stafford Borough – preferred approach':

- Objections to further development at Hixon and Eccleshall
- Development-led respondents concerned about reliance on the Localism agenda and neighbourhood plans to deliver growth without specific allocations. Other respondents supported local community decision-making.
- Prioritise the use of previously developed land
- Increased employment development to be allocated west of Stafford town
- The scale of development must consider rural character and the historic environment

- Refer to the Water Framework Directive, Catchment Management Plans and Stafford Borough's evidence base regarding local surface water management and water cycle issues
- Infrastructure is needed to support growth
- The development strategy need to identify site specific boundaries in relation to strategic development sites
- Specific policies are required to provide for gypsies and community safety through Secured by Design matters
- A flexible policy is required for rural development
- Residential Development Boundaries should be reviewed to allow future growth in rural areas
- Clear justification by taking account of evidence such as local need, demand and population statistics to determine required housing provision figures

## **Council Response**

- Further detail regarding the approach to the Government's Localism Agenda, particularly in relation to Neighbourhood Plans to be set out in the Draft Publication and Strategic Policy Choices consultation documents
- The justification for the Council's Development Strategy in terms of employment and housing provision to be set out in the Strategic Policy Choices consultation document
- The use of brownfield land has continued to be a consideration in each of the consultation documents. The evidence base, particularly the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment which has been reviewed annually, demonstrates there is insufficient previously developed land to meet the needs of local communities in the future
- The Strategic Policy Choices consultation document to identify a range of options for employment land. The Employment Land Report was first published in 2007 and updated in 2010. A 2012 review will be published in early 2013. Recognised Industrial Estates and Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt continue to be part of the development strategy
- The Plan for Stafford Borough - Draft Publication to include detailed policies on design, the built and natural environment as well as the scale of new development in rural areas. The Development Strategy has continued to conserve, protect and enhance the natural environment through the subsequent versions of the new plan
- The Plan for Stafford Borough - Draft Publication to contain detailed policies on sustainable development and climate change prepared in the context of the evidence base, including the Staffordshire Renewable Energy Study completed in 2011
- The Draft Publication document to contain a policy relating to each Strategic Development Location, setting out in broad terms the infrastructure that would be required and reference to the need for a masterplan approach to each site
- The approach to development in the rural area to be set out in the Draft Publication and the Strategic Policy Choices document. The approach has become more detailed, setting out that residential development boundaries will be removed and replaced by a policy which will determine planning applications in the rural area

**APPENDIX 7 – RESPONSES & OFFICER COMMENTS PLAN FOR STAFFORD  
BOROUGH – DRAFT PUBLICATION**



Name of Respondent	Summary of Response	Officer Comments
Stafford Borough Council – Environmental & Health Service (DP1075)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To include a Design Statement for people and services affected by development (Core Policy 23)</li> <li>• Provision of adequate crematorium facilities</li> <li>• Clarification of ‘fit for purpose’ street scene in paragraphs 8.20 &amp; 8.57</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change. Manual for Streets is mentioned in para 8.228 and Core Policy 23 – Design.</li> <li>• Amend CP6 &amp; add a new policy to include reference to adequate crematorium facilities</li> <li>• Paras 8.20 &amp; 8.57 delete reference to ‘fit for purpose’ wording</li> </ul>
Stone & Valley Opposed to Severn Trent Water (STOP) – Mr K Ryder (DP1074)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paras 3.3 &amp; 3.4 – policy and guidance is too vague to prevent inappropriate applications for renewable energy affecting built and natural environments, to be improved through design and location with the local authority being the responsible authority.</li> <li>• Core Policy 10, paras 8.82 to 8.86 – welcomed as countryside is fundamental to support the Borough. Amend Core Policy 10 to safeguard the countryside from negative renewable energy proposals.</li> <li>• Development Management Policy 2, paras 8.139 to 8.142 welcomed but 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point amended to include ‘well being and/or safety’ and an additional bullet point added to read “No wind turbine/s and/or associated infrastructure development shall take place within 1000 metres of any residential dwelling.”</li> <li>• Para 8.141 to delete the word ‘limited’ on 3<sup>rd</sup> line to avoid applicants overcoming adverse impacts. Paragraph wording in conflict with Development Management Policy 2 wording due to ‘does not cause harm’ and ‘is sympathetic to’. Policy wording should also refer to ‘radar and aviation in line with PPS22’. Concern about lack of consultation with the Health &amp; Safety Executive and Ministry of Defence over recent planning application.</li> <li>• Para 8.142 concern about lack of clarity with map on page 83 ‘Renewable Energy Opportunities in Stafford Borough’ including biomass and wind turbine locations. Appreciate complexities of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Clear policies are set out through Core Policy 13 &amp; Development Management Policy 2 to provide policy context for climate change &amp; renewable energy.</li> <li>• Noted and no change. Core Policy 10 is robust and clear reference to safeguarding the countryside is included in Development Management 2.</li> <li>• Noted and no change to Development Management Policy 2 as amendment for 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point are too subjective and the additional bullet point would exclude all schemes for renewable energy.</li> <li>• Agree to amend Development Management Policy 2 to delete ‘is sympathetic to’ and replace with ‘has limited adverse effect on’ No change regarding radar and aviation which is addressed by national policy.</li> <li>• Noted and make reference to map in para 8.142 and include an appendix detailing</li> </ul>

	<p>map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 14, paras 8.143 to 8.148 welcomed and concern about impact of renewable energy proposals on the natural environment. Policy to be amended for protection and safeguarding to avoid negative impacts. Concern about conflict between wording of para 8.144 and Core Policy 14 over areas afforded statutory and non statutory protection, to be amended to avoid confusion.</li> <li>• Development Management Policy 4, paras 8.161 to 8.163 – welcome policy approach for landscape character, amended in 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point with reference to ‘Listed Buildings’ due to sensitivity changes .</li> <li>• Core Policy 17 – welcome policy approach for Green Belt to be amended to clarify the position regarding renewable energy proposals and specific locations.</li> <li>• Core Policy 24, paras 8.230 to 8.244 – policy to be amended to read “Proposals that would adversely affect the character and/or significance of a heritage asset and its setting will not be accepted.”</li> </ul>	<p>renewable energy opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to delete the words ‘sites that are nor afforded statutory protection’ from 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of paragraph 8.144.</li> <li>• Agree to amend Development Management Policy 4, 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point to read “... (including heritage assets, cultural character ...” and 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point to read “... Scheduled Monuments and assets identified on the Historic Environment Record.”</li> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to national policy on Green Belt and renewable energy proposals.</li> <li>• Noted and changes made in line with English Heritage representation.</li> </ul>
Milwood Homes (DP1071)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting land south of Stafford to be identified for residential development as part of the new Plan in the context of the three Strategic Development Locations and focus on Stafford town for growth.</li> <li>• Assessment of figures included in Appendix A – housing provision as approximate rather than actual, resulting in missing 264 new homes.</li> <li>• Object to para 5.7 of Cabinet Report dated 16<sup>th</sup> August 2011 restricting all land south of Stafford due to South Staffordshire District, Cannock Chase AONB and transport infrastructure requirements. This approach undermines the whole document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land south of Stafford is not of sufficient scale to be identified as a Strategic Development Location but will be considered as part of the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies DPD.</li> <li>• Noted and agree to include contents of Appendix A into the main body of the document, including accurate figures.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 7.7 and 7.9 and Key Objective 10 object to suggestion of restricted development south of Stafford.</li> <li>• Core Policy 2 refers to ‘at least 500 dwellings’ to be delivered and therefore is a minimum so other sites should be considered alongside the large scale allocations identified which are reliant on provision of significant infrastructure thus calling into question deliverability. Smaller scale and more sites would mean less infrastructure and more certainty. Concern about conflict with Core Policy 3 stating ‘up to 5,500 new homes’ compared to at least 500.</li> <li>• Core Policy 3 refers to a range of development locations to deliver housing but only specifies the three Strategic Development Locations whilst other sites should be identified. Question the minimise impact on landscape of the Strategic Development Locations rather than using a number of smaller sites. Major investment will be required to provide for growth at Stafford not required at other sites.</li> <li>• Core Policy 4 – concern about scale of development north of Stafford rather than a geographical spread of sites across Stafford. Development will lead to phasing due to scale and a poor living environment undermining delivery of the proposals. Concern about 30 dwellings per hectare approach to establish housing numbers contrary to Government policy and less than 2,700 homes may be provided. Part of the area already has planning permission prior to a Master Plan approach. Conflict between Core Policy 4 and para 8.34 ‘up to’ and ‘will deliver’. Object to provision of 2 and 3 bedroomed properties when para 8.4 states there is a slight over supply of smaller terraces and apartments. Concern about the need for off-site measures to alleviate flooding and surface water without any consents evidenced and other infrastructure constraints undermining land north of Stafford.</li> <li>• Core Policy 5 – concern about scale of development west of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Key Objective 10 to read “Consider future development beyond the Plan period to the south of Stafford within South Staffordshire District through appropriate infrastructure and mitigation measures.</li> <li>• Noted and agree to delete the words ‘up to’ and replace with ‘at least’ in Core Policy 3.</li> <li>• Noted and no change. Strategic Development Locations are identified in this Plan whilst other sites considered through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies DPD.</li> <li>• Noted and agree to deleted the words ‘as a Supplementary Planning Document.’ In the first paragraph of Core Policy 4 and 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point replace the words ‘up to’ with ‘approximately 2,700’. Noted and no change concerning over supply of smaller terraces and apartments as different to 2 &amp; 3 bedroomed houses.</li> <li>• Noted and agree to deleted the words ‘as a</li> </ul>
--	---	---

	<p>Stafford rather than a geographical spread of sites across Stafford. Development will lead to phasing due to scale and a poor living environment undermining delivery of the proposals. Concern about 30 dwellings per hectare approach to establish housing numbers contrary to Government policy and less than 2,200 homes may be provided. Concern about delivery of land west of Stafford due to unsecured funding for the major highway improvements. Part of the area already has planning permission prior to a Master Plan approach. Confused by 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point and Core Policy 5 first paragraph prejudicing the whole scheme. There are 5 historic landfills in the area, not mentioned as a constraint, thus making 2,200 homes undeliverable. Conflict between Core Policy 5 and para 8.37 'up to' and 'will deliver'. Object to provision of 2 and 3 bedroomed properties when para 8.4 states there is a slight over supply of smaller terraces and apartments. Concern about the need for off-site measures to alleviate flooding and surface water without any consents evidenced and other infrastructure constraints undermining land west of Stafford. Concern about lack of deliverability if full Western Access Improvement Scheme not constructed and confusion between Core Policy 5, Key Objective 6, Key Objective 11, Core Policy 3 and para 7.10 about delivery of the Scheme and its components.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 6 – concern about scale of development east of Stafford rather than a geographical spread of sites across Stafford. Concern about 30 dwellings per hectare approach to establish housing numbers contrary to Government policy and less than 600 homes may be provided. Concern about delivery of land east of Stafford due to unsecured funding for the major highway improvements. Conflict between Core Policy 6 and para 8.40 'up to' and 'will deliver'. Object to provision of 2 and 3 bedroomed properties when para 8.4 states there is a slight over supply of smaller terraces and apartments. Concern about the</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Planning Document.' In the first paragraph of Core Policy 5 and 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point replace the words 'up to' with 'approximately 2,200'. Noted and no change concerning over supply of smaller terraces and apartments as different to 2 &amp; 3 bedroomed houses. Noted and agree to amend Key Objective 1 to read "... Stafford provided parts of the Western ...", amend 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point of Transport &amp; Access section in Core Policy 3 to read "Deliver the Western Access Improvement Scheme and phase one of the Eastern Access ...", and amend 11<sup>th</sup> bullet point of Core Policy 5 to read "... transport improvements, specifically providing Phase 1 from Martin Drive to Doxey Road."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to deleted the words 'as a Supplementary Planning Document' in the first paragraph of Core Policy 6 and 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point replace the words 'up to' with 'approximately 600'. Noted and no change concerning over supply of smaller terraces and apartments as different to 2 &amp; 3 bedroomed houses. Noted and agree to amend Key Objective 1 to read "... Stafford provided parts of the Western and Eastern Access ...", amend 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point of</li> </ul>
--	--	--

	<p>need for off-site measures to alleviate flooding and surface water without any consents evidenced and other infrastructure constraints undermining land east of Stafford including a new waste water pumping station and proximity to the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation. Concern about lack of deliverability if full Eastern Access Improvement Scheme not constructed and confusion between Core Policy 6, Key Objective 6, Key Objective 11, Core Policy 3 and para 7.10 and 8.43 about delivery of the Scheme and its components.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend inclusion of site south of Stafford – A449 Ash Flats into the LDF for residential provision of 250 – 300 houses as less constrained than other Strategic Development Locations, is deliverable with solutions to access point using roundabout on A449, drainage capacity and noise issues are sufficient.</li> </ul>	<p>Transport &amp; Access section in Core Policy 3 to read “Deliver the Western Access Improvement Scheme and phase one of the Eastern Access ...”, and amend 11<sup>th</sup> bullet point of Core Policy 6 to read “Deliver phase one of the Eastern Access Improvement Scheme ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land south of Stafford at A449 Ash Flats is not of sufficient scale to be identified as a Strategic Development Location but will be considered as part of the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies DPD.</li> </ul>
Mr & Mrs Scott (DP1070)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the Government’s new approach to planning through the National Planning Policy Framework with lack of developer restrictions.</li> <li>• Core Policy 1 - concern about major greenfield development at Stafford and existing / proposed new road infrastructure. Maximise use of brownfield land before greenfield release.</li> <li>• Core Policy 2 – concern that development north and east of Stafford are not adhering to the principles of development in the open countryside, leading to significant urban sprawl.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Government to respond to consultation on the Draft National Planning Policy Framework.</li> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words ‘Therefore only’ in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: “Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is insufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations.”</li> </ul>
BNP Paribas Real Estate for Trine Developments Ltd (DP1065)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision &amp; Core Policy 2 – concern that there is insufficient housing identified to support economic growth, the Growth Point and Ministry of Defence requirements. Support the focus on Stafford town.</li> <li>• Concern that the housing target will not be achieved in Stafford</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 2 second sentence to read “... over the Plan period, excluding military housing requirements, ...”</li> </ul>

	<p>due to the reliance on three Strategic Development Locations requiring significant infrastructure and a greater choice of sites is needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 2 – housing target to be a minimum figure and support new sites identified in appropriate locations around Stafford.</li> <li>• Promoting land east of Old Rickerscote Lane and south of Rickerscote Hall Lane to be allocated as residential development for up to 110 houses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land east of Old Rickerscote Lane and south of Rickerscote Hall Lane is not of sufficient scale to be identified as a Strategic Development Location but will be considered as part of the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies DPD</li> </ul>
BNP Paribas Real Estate for Mr J Baker (DP1064)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision &amp; Core Policy 2 – concern that there is insufficient housing identified to support economic growth, the Growth Point and Ministry of Defence requirements. Support the focus on Stafford town.</li> <li>• Concern that the housing target will not be achieved in Stafford due to the reliance on three Strategic Development Locations requiring significant infrastructure and a greater choice of sites is needed</li> <li>• Core Policy 2 – housing target to be a minimum figure and support new sites identified in appropriate locations around Stafford.</li> <li>• Promoting land west of Sandon Road to be allocated as residential development for up to 150 houses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 2 second sentence to read “... over the Plan period, excluding military housing requirements, ...”</li> <li>• Land west of Sandon Road is not of sufficient scale to be identified as a Strategic Development Location but will be considered as part of the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies DPD</li> </ul>
RPS for Barratt West Midlands Ltd (DP1047)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting use of land north of Baswich for 35 new houses, and new allotments for community use in line with PPG17, deliverable now with no constraints except being on the protected route of Eastern Distributor Road, which is challenged due to lack of credible or justifiable evidence of retention.</li> <li>• Key Objectives 1 – object to phasing of development reliant on delivery of road infrastructure as growth provision need to the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted and agree to remove reference to phasing in Key Objective 1, Core Policy 2 &amp; 6.</li> </ul>

	<p>north, east &amp; west.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 11 – lack of explanation regarding phase 1 of Eastern Access Improvement Scheme with greater information on funding, land assembly and deliverability required to meet housing needs.</li> <li>• Core Policy 1 – support guiding principles</li> <li>• Core Policy 2 Development Strategy – to promote a greater number of houses to Stafford town, justified through an up-to-date evidence base of need. Support delivery of ‘at least 500 dwellings per year’ but 2008 projections exclude returning military personnel which are additional provision. Object to development in key settlements via neighbourhood plans or longer term through a Sites Allocations DPD and should be directed to Stafford.</li> <li>• Core Policy 3 – development east of Stafford not linked to delivery of the Eastern Access Improvement Scheme, delete all references. Lack of robust evidence presented on future infrastructure.</li> <li>• Core Policy 6 – supports development east of Stafford with housing numbers increased but not reliant on road infrastructure. Promoting land east of Stafford to meet new housing requirements. Need to provide a plan of the Council’s intended route but very limited progress to date, realistic infrastructure to be identified based on evidence.</li> <li>• Core Policy 26 makes no reference to Eastern Access Improvement Scheme, nor robust evidence for funding via the Staffordshire’s Local Transport Plan.</li> <li>• Detailed justification required for Eastern Access Improvement Scheme including who and when to be provided in line with PPG12 requirements, not provided to date by Stafford Borough Council.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 2 second sentence to read “... over the Plan period, excluding military housing requirements, ...”</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Key Objective 1 to read “... Stafford provided parts of the Western and Eastern Access ...”, amend 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point of Transport &amp; Access section in Core Policy 3 to read “Deliver the Western Access Improvement Scheme and phase one of the Eastern Access ...”, and amend 11<sup>th</sup> bullet point of Core Policy 6 to read “Deliver phase one of the Eastern Access Improvement Scheme ...”</li> </ul>
Trent Vision Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introducing representations on housing sites and proposals for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

(DP1042)	the Trent Valley Corridor	
Barwood Development Securities Ltd (DP1003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introducing land south of Eccleshall Road, Stone as a new housing allocation to meet needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Indigo Planning for Commercial Estates Group (DP1001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoting land east of Stafford for housing development and supporting infrastructure needs.</li> <li>Supports the Plan period from 2011 to 2031 and consider the Regional Spatial Strategy EIP figure of 11,000 dwellings applied at 550 houses per year, excluding any requirement for Ministry of Defence personnel. The housing shortfall since 2006 should also be included in order to meet the growth agenda</li> <li>Object to SHLAA sites being factored into housing provision calculations without planning permission in Appendix A, requested a list of sites used. Request a list of commitment sites applied to discounting.</li> <li>Justification for a higher housing figure for Stafford Borough of 8,693 homes to deliver economic growth fundamental to the strategy as minimum provision, apportioned to Stafford, Stone and other areas.</li> <li>Core Policy 2 – Stafford town to deliver 6,727 homes as a minimum, not including military housing or existing commitments.</li> <li>Core Policy 3 – Support identification of land east of Stafford and linked to Eastern Access Improvement Scheme subject to costs, timescales and details. Support mixed use development and links to existing employers with improved transport provision.</li> <li>Core Policy 4 – Support identification of land north of Stafford but concerned about level of provision capable of delivery due to other uses including roads and open space. Support employment development but further work necessary to justify housing figures based on existing outline planning permission. Ministry of Defence requirements to be addressed separately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 2 second sentence to read “... over the Plan period, excluding military housing requirements, ...”</li> <li>Noted and no change</li> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>



	<p>including identification of a site. Concern of infrastructure timing and delivery approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 5 – Support identification of land west of Stafford but concerned about level of provision and whole scheme delivery due to other mixed uses including roads and open space as well as proximity of Stafford Castle. Further work necessary to justify housing figures presented through a Master Plan.</li> <li>• Core Policy 6 – welcome and support identification of land east of Stafford north &amp; south of Tixall Road but object to the amount of development due to supporting infrastructure required, calling for additional land identified to meet housing and infrastructure requirements, being well located. Land is immediately available and unconstrained, thus object to the medium term phasing.</li> <li>• Clarification is required on the exact route aligned for the Eastern Distributor Road in liaison with Staffordshire County Council due to impact on bringing forward the land for development, the low pressure gas main running across the site and options provided not to deliver the road scheme.</li> <li>• Infrastructure concerns raised regarding road infrastructure delivery, phasing / timing, viability, Supplementary Planning Document and developer contributions approach in the future.</li> <li>• Para 4.6 – support Growth Point status.</li> <li>• Para 4.9 – clarify that the Regional Spatial Strategy is part of the development plan until abolished, yet still take account of EiP evidence base.</li> <li>• Spatial Vision – supported.</li> <li>• Key Objectives for Stafford 1. – Ministry of Defence provision to be excluded from overall housing provision and Key Objectives for Stafford 1 &amp; 4 delete reference to phasing of land north, east and west of Stafford. Support Key Objective Stafford 11.</li> <li>• Core Policy 11 – revised to consider viability of schemes, mitigation and delivery of new services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li>   <li>• Noted.</li>   <li>• Noted with further discussions including Staffordshire County Council on road alignment and approach to development.</li>   <li>• Agree to amend para 4.9 to include the word ‘intention’ to revoke and provide an update in terms of the Localism Act.</li>   <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 2 second sentence to read “... over the Plan period, excluding military housing requirements, ...”</li>   <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 12 – further information required on the Community Infrastructure Levy and implications.</li> <li>• Core Policy 13 – BREAAAM ratings and Sustainable Homes to be considered on a site-by-site basis with further information on proportion of generating on-site energy whilst supporting viability approach.</li> <li>• Core Policy 19 – Support delivery of affordable housing based on considerations of viability and other infrastructure requirements, whilst noting the ‘challenging’ context for land east of Stafford town. It would be useful to identify towns with more than 3,000 population apart from Stafford and Stone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Noted and agree to list settlements with more than 3,000 populations.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP971)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is limited reference to cultural and leisure facilities. There is limited acknowledgement to co-ordinate services across the County and Borough Councils particularly at Stafford</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Draft Publication makes several references to cultural and leisure facilities in the spatial portrait, key objectives, Stafford &amp; Stone Town policies &amp; Core Policy 21. The Plan does not have a co-ordination role for County Council services.</li> </ul>
First City for Mr Booth, Mr Evans, Mr & Mrs Stott (DP788)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the Core Strategy, its locally distinctive Vision and Development Strategy to deliver growth and address key issues with an assessment of soundness re-iterating identification of broad locations for large-scale development at Stafford, choice of options with supporting evidence, justified distribution of development and sufficiently flexible to deliver infrastructure for developments.</li> <li>• Support the evidence base used, the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment.</li> <li>• Support new housing growth in the Borough with the focus on Stafford but acknowledging future development in rural areas beyond affordable housing provision to create sustainable rural communities.</li> <li>• Concern about consistency in the Sustainability Appraisal’s</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted and consider changes to the Sustainability Appraisal to ensure consistency and correct effects assessment. Flooding is considered within the Sustainability Appraisal under key objective</li> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

	<p>Effects over time between Stafford’s Strategic Development Locations. Furthermore Crime to have a positive indicator rather than ?. Sustainability Appraisal to include an objective on current flooding and resilience assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policies 4 to 6 – support identification of the Strategic Development Locations to deliver growth, followed by development at Stone and then rural areas. Support the focus on Stafford for growth.</li> <li>• Support the Plan period to 2031 but object to any phasing which could undermine delivery and infrastructure due to lead-in times. Furthermore object to brownfield priority over greenfield land.</li> <li>• Core Policy 2 – support a minimum of 500 new homes per year for Stafford Borough, with the spread of new development on the periphery of Stafford town. Concern about minor amendments to Residential Development Boundaries undermining this approach through Site-specific Allocations DPD.</li> <li>• Core Policy 6 – Support identification of client’s land for new development and associated infrastructure, provided a Delivery Statement concerning next steps. Prioritise Strategic Development Locations over smaller scale greenfield and object to brownfield preferences. Seeking further information on the Council’s Developer Contributions / tariff.</li> <li>• Core Policy 7 – Support the scale of development at Stone with rural areas to meet local needs only, in the context of North Staffordshire’s conurbation.</li> <li>• Core Policy 9 – Support amendments to existing Residential Development Boundaries in rural areas as well as infill development with a focus on rural hubs supported by facilities and services. New peripheral sites in selected settlements needed for modest expansion, not just affordable exception sites which have failed to deliver to date. A hierarchy of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 &amp; 3 to remove reference to phasing development at Stafford.</li> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words ‘Therefore only’ in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: “Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is insufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations.”</li> <li>• Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2</li> </ul>
--	--	--

	settlements should be identified beyond Stafford and Stone such as Eccleshall, Gnosall, Great Haywood and Hixon for future growth, in conformity with the Borough's spatial strategy.	
Anonymous response (DP779)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 2 - Concern raised about loss of greenfield farmland to overdevelopment and inadequate use of brownfield, lack of resources to existing communities</li> <li>• Core Policy 5 - West of Stafford. Concern with loss of existing hedgerows / trees and impact on Castle setting, impact on existing Doxey community and lack of services, preserve green space areas</li> <li>• Purple orchid next to football pitch – investigate</li> <li>• Support strictly controlled development in the countryside and use of existing buildings. Support a range of policies included in the Draft Publication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendment to Core Policy 2 with text “Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is insufficient previously developed land to meet new provision.”</li> <li>• Provision is made for allotments in Stafford and Stone to grow local foods</li> <li>• Staffordshire Wildlife Trust to investigate</li> <li>• New development is required in Stafford and appropriate policies across the Borough</li> </ul>
Homes & Communities Agency (DP778)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HCA to be identified as a key partner in delivering housing and sustainable communities.</li> <li>• Note the overall housing allocation of 7,000 new homes and the Borough target of 10,000 houses over the Plan period is less than the former Regional Spatial Strategy target.</li> <li>• Support expression of the Spatial Strategy for Stafford Borough's area.</li> <li>• Draft National Planning Policy Framework to identify an additional 20% housing land supply over the 5 year land supply requirement.</li> <li>• Support provision of specialist housing types and affordable housing within Stafford Borough.</li> <li>• Support reference to retrofit and use of empty homes to make best use of existing housing stock.</li> <li>• Reference new Affordable Rent within the Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and reference to HCA through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> <li>• Noted and no change, subject to final National Planning Policy Framework.</li> <li>• Noted and amend para 2.14 to read “Less than 1.5% of the existing housing stock is empty for more than 6 months.”</li> <li>• Noted and amend para 8.187 to read “... includes social rented, affordable rent and intermediate housing ...”</li> </ul>

Mrs J Kingsland (DP736)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 5 - Object to land west of Stafford and proposed employment area with loss of recreation space, green area, increased employment traffic and existing re-use of buildings.</li> <li>• No evidence of justification for new housing proposed, to meet commuter not local needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove proposed employment allocation due to protected open space, used by local community, increased traffic generated close to existing housing and lack of need for offices at this location rather than in Stafford town centre. Maintain housing allocation at land west of Stafford.</li> </ul>
Centro (DP759)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan's principles and reference to public transport with an emphasis on it as a preferred mode of transport to support economic and housing growth through a modernised network.</li> <li>• Core Policy 1 support improved accessibility, brownfield development, varying modes of transport and housing focused on sustainable locations. Core Policy 3 support for Stafford town centre hub and public / sustainable transport.</li> <li>• Core Policy 26 supported and encourages future development to be accessible by public transport including cross-boundary improved services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
The Coal Authority (DP746)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface coal reserves not unduly sterilised by new development. Majority of coal reserves located in Green Belt areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend para 2.37 with new text "Within the Stafford Borough area there are approx. 3 recorded mine entries with no other recorded coal mining related hazards. The areas of potential risk are in the Green Belt."</li> </ul>
Brocton Parish Council (DP741)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 2 - Concern with scale of development due to empty homes and under-used industrial units. Concern with development strategy due to impact on existing road infrastructure.</li> <li>• Core Policy 6 - Concern with lack of access to health centres &amp; shops to east of Stafford, improve public transport</li> <li>• Welcome protection of the AONB &amp; Green Belt</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add reference to quantity of empty homes in the Borough of over 6 months (para 2.13) and empty industrial units (para 2.17), appendix A.</li> <li>• Primary Care Trust re. Health provision east of Stafford</li> </ul>

Mrs B Metcalf (DP739)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome reduced housing provision and queries levels of future demand. Core Policy 19 - Reference to intermediate housing. Focus more housing in rural areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments noted. Intermediate housing referenced to Core Policy 19.</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd (DP734)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting land north of Beaconside for residential development of approximately 62 hectares opposite the Parkside estate and close to employment areas. The 'Beaconside Vision for a Sustainable Future' Design Statement has previously been submitted and 18 hectares of the land is allocated for housing within the Stafford Borough Local Plan 2001 with outline planning permission granted subject to Section 106 agreements.</li> <li>• Spatial Vision – supported with priority at Stafford for major development and infrastructure.</li> <li>• Key Objectives – supported with high quality homes in the short term north of Stafford.</li> <li>• Core Policy 1 – Supported but concern at preference for previously developed land before greenfield with last bullet point to be amended linked to suitability.</li> <li>• Core Policy 2 – Object to the lower annual housing rate of 500 new homes which should be 550 in line with the RSS Panel Report. Concern that provision for military personnel are included in the overall housing figures, to be separately identified as well as gypsies. Support annual rate not being a maximum and support for the focus on Stafford town delivered through Strategic Development Locations, to be included within existing Residential Development Boundaries to avoid conflict with countryside policy.</li> <li>• Core Policy 3 – Higher housing figures to be considered at Stafford and not expressed as maximum level of 5,500 new homes. Support land north of Stafford as least constrained by highway infrastructure, through a comprehensive framework.</li> <li>• Core Policy 4 – Support further identification of land north of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: "Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations."</li> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 2 second sentence to read "... over the Plan period, excluding military housing requirements, ..."</li> </ul>

	<p>Stafford for housing development above 2,700 houses and linked to other developments. Outline planning permission granted on part of land. Concern about deliverability west and east of Stafford due to major new road infrastructure, impact on local road networks, lack of funding and impacts on natural environment designations. Concern about fragmented approach to growth north of Stafford with further land allocation needed, the requirement for a Supplementary Planning Document for the whole area slowing development coming forward. Support testing through a viability assessment, request further detail on the development tariff and neighbourhood plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 10 – Strategic Development Locations to be included within Residential Development Boundaries.</li> <li>• Core Policy 11 &amp; 12 – seeking clarification on viability testing if contributions render development unviable and a flexible approach to payment of Community Infrastructure Levy with more details.</li> <li>• Development Management Policy 1 – Object to setting social infrastructure priorities in advance of the Community Infrastructure Levy process.</li> <li>• Core Policy 13 – concern about policy is unduly restrictive with viability implications to be considered as well as other regeneration benefits.</li> <li>• Core Policy 14 – policy to be sufficiently flexible to allow non-compliance if outweighed by other factors</li> <li>• Core Policy 18 - policy to be sufficiently flexible to allow non-compliance if outweighed by other factors</li> <li>• Core Policy 19 – support financial viability test to balance affordable housing against other costs, with a target figure based on economic viability study. Para 8.187 to refer to affordable rent.</li> <li>• Core Policy 23 – concern about duly restrictive approach for CABE Silver Standard and Building for Life Assessment which</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li>   <li>• Noted and delete Development Management Policy 1.</li>   <li>• Noted and no change</li>   <li>• Noted and amend para 8.187 to read “... includes social rented, affordable rent and intermediate housing ...”</li> </ul>
--	---	--

	<p>may change over time. Request viability testing on design requirements if development rendered unviable and outweighed by other factors.</p>	
Milwich Action Committee (DP649)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about national changes to the planning system damaging rural communities and countryside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Link to Parish Plans included in Evidence base</li> </ul>
Mid Staffordshire NHS FT (DP554)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support identification of health centres to deliver long term clinical care rather than acute hospital setting. Amend para 2.52 to read Stafford Hospital</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend para 2.52 to Stafford Hospital</li> </ul>
Mr P Kingsland (DP463)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 5 - Concern about new housing for commuters due to lack of new jobs provided, traffic gridlock in Stafford, suggested new Jct13a at Doxey and object to new employment at Castlefields due to existing empty property and Castleworks nearby.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. New housing required as demonstrated by 2008 household projections together with new employment. Consider new employment area at Castlefields and not possible to deliver a new M6 motorway junction.</li> </ul>
Creswell Parish Council (DP455)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of the whole Plan in the context of Creswell Parish and Stafford town's development. Concern about lack of substance included to justify major new neighbourhoods and scale of growth. Concern about lack of transport infrastructure evidence particularly for Eastern Distributor Road and the Infrastructure Strategy being out-of-date. Concern about Government's presumption in favour of sustainable development in favour of developers.</li> <li>Support a master plan to provide details of new developments north of Stafford as a whole area but concern about number of developers involved in delivery and existing outline planning consent. New 'Community Park' north of Stafford Common.</li> <li>Disappointed about the lack of commitment to deliver the Eastern Distributor Road due to the local need for increased traffic capacity around Stafford, cross border co-operation linked</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan when prepared.</li> <li>Noted.</li> <li>Noted and refer to the Draft Stafford</li> </ul>



	<p>to M6 congestion and impacts of closures. Currently significant delays on the road network north of and through Stafford with significant impacts on town centre viability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current scheme in the Plan will not assist traffic flow via the Eastern Access Improvement Scheme as a ‘no through’ road. Concern about the message from the Infrastructure Strategy (July 2009) that the Eastern Distributor Road is not required to deliver growth at Stafford. Concern about impact on town centre developments due to poor quality transport links. Now is the opportunity to deliver the complete road due to the scale of development, including widening of the Beaconside road. Joint working is essential between the County and Borough Council.</li> <li>• Further details are required about the access onto A34 Foregate of Western Access Improvement Scheme and the new employment north of Stafford.</li> <li>• Infrastructure should be in place first before growth.</li> <li>• Protected routes need to be identified within the Core Strategy document to be taken into account for future plans and Government funding. If excluded road opportunities in the future will be missed.</li> <li>• Chapter 2 - It is important to be realistic about future car movements into and out of Stafford for work and retail activity.</li> <li>• Chapter 3 - There is a lack of new highway provision identified to meet growth needs. Support a range of uses on employment areas for diversity.</li> <li>• Chapter 4 - Lack of cross border co-operation is leading to further housing growth north of Stafford.</li> <li>• Spatial Vision – supported if road infrastructure is provided alongside new developments.</li> <li>• Key Objectives – supported if road infrastructure and new services / facilities delivered but concern about lack of funding provided for new communities</li> <li>• Core Policy 1 – Concern about traffic and public transport</li> </ul>	<p>Integrated Transport Strategy prepared by Staffordshire County Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and include protected routes from Staffordshire County Council as part of the Publication version of the Plan for Stafford Borough.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
--	---	--

	<p>provision. Infrastructure provided first. Concern about no out of centre retailing preventing new neighbourhood centres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 2 – Support for a master plan approach for Strategic Development Locations for delivery. Encourage further development south of Stafford. More information is required about infrastructure to justify the scale of new developments proposed.</li> <li>• Core Policy 9 &amp; para 7.5 - Concern about increased traffic generated from Ladfordfields Recognised Industrial Estate expansion, impact on road network</li> <li>• Para 8.12 - Support enlarged Stafford Common and green infrastructure north of Stafford, with details</li> <li>• Para 8.22 Support town centre boundary identified.</li> <li>• Para 8.23 - Concern about lack of detail regarding new urban villages / neighbourhood centres.</li> <li>• Core Policy 4 – support a master plan approach, concern over delivery of housing from multiple developers, re-consider a new road north of Stafford to parallel Beaconside linked to employment areas, provision of new bus routes, access details to new development areas, support overnight parking for Heavy Good Vehicles within new employment areas but no mention of Park &amp; Ride, support extended housing development north of Stafford and new employment area subject to the comment below.</li> <li>• Concern about lack of land owner commitment to deliver new employment land north of County Council’s area to be removed from the Plan.</li> <li>• Core Policy 5 – Concern about access of Western Access Improvement Scheme to A34 Foregate, wish to see the master plan for 2,200 new houses</li> <li>• Core Policy 6 – Support the Eastern Distributor Road to be provided and wish to see a Master Plan of 600 new houses. Clarify the extent of the new route.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li>   <li>• Noted and refer to Core Policy 4 &amp; 5 concerning retail provision as part of the Strategic Development Locations.</li>   <li>• Query impact on road network with Staffordshire County Council.</li>   <li>• Consider with Staffordshire County Council as part of transport solutions / options north of Stafford.</li>   <li>• Query with Staffordshire County Council –</li> </ul>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 9 – Concern about development beyond Creswell Grove’s road into Stafford will impact on traffic congestion including growth at Ladfordfields.</li> <li>• Core Policy 11 &amp; 12 – wish to be consulted on Community Infrastructure Levy and revenue used.</li> </ul>	Property concerning future planning application.
Mrs S Knight (DP397)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 5 - Object to new employment area at Castlefields due to existing empty property, loss of open space, traffic pressures and conversion of Castleworks from industry to housing. Concern about new housing with insufficient employment, traffic pressures and loss of green areas permanently.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. New housing required as demonstrated by 2008 household projections together with new employment. Consider new employment area at Castlefields and appropriate location.</li> </ul>
G & C Leese Bros Ltd (DP347)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting a scrapyard site for potential re-location and re-development to meet economic pressures, wishing to have clarity regarding future use of site. Note that waste is addressed by Staffordshire County Council.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Farmery (DP322)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to scale of housing and lack of clarity in details provided to land east of Stafford.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to Infrastructure Delivery Plan &amp; subsequent master planning of areas.</li> </ul>
Cannock Chase AONB Partnership (DP304)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 15 - Support inclusion of policies for Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</li> <li>• Core Policy 6 &amp; para 8.43 - concern about Eastern Access Improvement Scheme and welcome involvement in developing this scheme.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree role of AONB Partnership in assessing the impact of the Eastern Access Improvement Scheme.</li> </ul>
Pegasus Planning for The Stobart Group (DP238)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting land at M6 Jct 15 to be excluded from the North Staffordshire Green Belt for new development</li> <li>• Spatial Vision restricts development in the Green Belt, to be amended due to extensive areas in the Borough and restricting the rural economy as well as leading to greater commuting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>

	<p>distances. Consider development if not adversely affects local character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objectives areas outside Stafford &amp; Stone 19 – supported and to be considered in Green Belt areas.</li> <li>• Core Policy 2 – object to overly restrictive approach for protecting the countryside for its own sake. Future development in the Green Belt should not be prevented if benefits of growth are demonstrated.</li> <li>• Core Policy 9 – support growth in rural areas and should include countryside locations in Green Belt.</li> <li>• Para 8.87 – encourage further identification of Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt and affordable rural housing sites if openness not affected.</li> <li>• Core Policy 17 – Green Belt boundaries should be reviewed if objectives are not being met and sites identified for new development. Support the encouragement of commercial or recreation uses as well as residential uses in the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Promoting land to be excluded from the Green Belt or identified as a Major Developed Site to support the rural economy and reduce commuting distances as the site will soon be unviable as a haulage depot. Considered in the context of PPG2 Green Belt purposes, the site now being appropriate for re-use, to be declassified from Green Belt. The site does not provide for continued openness of Green Belt.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land at M6 Jct 15 is not of sufficient scale to be identified as a Major Developed Site. Green Belt boundaries will be considered as part of the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document (DPD)</li> </ul>
The Moore Family Trust (DP185)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 2 – Object to lack of housing allocated in rural areas and require further explanation for this change in approach, justify how rural areas will support themselves, local need not being met, rural employment undermined. Concern about ‘local democracy’ ignoring identified need and Council relying on Localism and Neighbourhood Plans. Concern about how Principal Settlements will develop as local service centres. Re-consider the rural strategy, include changes in the Vision and Key Objectives,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. The Council’s approach is to focus new development at Stafford and Stone which are key sustainable locations for services and facilities. The strategy for rural areas is to provide some growth of 1,000 new houses and employment land but no allocations. Local communities are being given the opportunity to deliver new Neighbourhood Plans and</li> </ul>

	meet the rural area's needs, allocate land at Little Haywood for housing & green areas.	provide for needs. Local need can be met through rural exception sites and supporting local service centres developing their own facilities.
Highways Agency (DP184)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note the greatest potential impact on the Strategic Road Network at Stafford M6 junctions 13 &amp; 14 including severance issues and Non-Motorised User enhancements. Further modelling work is required to ensure a robust evidence base is delivered.</li> <li>Supports Core Policies 3 to 6 in reducing carbon emissions and minimise traffic congestion.</li> <li>Core Policy 1 &amp; 13 to promote sustainable transport.</li> <li>Core Policy 11 &amp; 12 requires further information on future contributions and management of funds.</li> <li>Core Policy 26 strengthened to include sustainability criteria alongside proximity to primary and strategic road corridors where development can be accommodated, based on further evidence work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and further discussions with the Highways Agency and Staffordshire County Council concerning evidence based work.</li> <li>Noted and no change.</li> <li>Core Policy 1 amended to include a new objective "Opportunities for access by sustainable modes of transport."</li> <li>Core Policy 26, bullet point 6 amended to "...strategic road network, do not have a negative impact on existing junctions, and should have capacity ..."</li> </ul>
Tetlow King Planning (DP96)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction to representation including support of references to provision of social / affordable housing across the Borough area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Mr T Collins (DP51)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 5 - Concern about new housing development at Burleyfields due to transport implications on the existing road network and inadequate future plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Staffordshire County Council has developed a Draft Stafford Transport Strategy to address new housing areas.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 2 - Lack of clarity concerning housing provision for the Borough areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to make changes to Core Policy 2 including detailed contained in Appendix 1.</li> </ul>

Maximus Strategic (DP860)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 2 &amp; 4 - Concern about soundness of the Plan linked to delivery (para 4.45 of PPS12) and increase housing numbers on client's site, supported by evidence based studies and appraisals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Delivery of land north of Stafford to be complemented by other Strategic Development Locations at Stafford and Stone.</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association - West Midlands (DP803)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction to the Country Land and Business Association and welcome opportunity to comment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Stone Rural Parish Council (DP428)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to wind turbines in the River Trent Valley, support maximising use of brownfield land, careful consideration of amendments to Residential Development Boundaries, concern about development north of Stafford towards Stone, query additional supermarket provision at Stone and support Stone Town Centre boundaries, land west of Stone has good drainage but south of Stone linking towards Stafford, support energy efficiency, note hydropower identified on River Trent, support affordable housing and smaller units but not 'car free' development, query rural exception sites without local employment, object to new cycling routes, low impact rural development supported.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted comments but no changes.</li> </ul>
Mrs Wakeman (DP232)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 4 - Object to new development north of Stafford due to increased housing and population, increased traffic congestion, lack of jobs leading to commuting, loss of greenfields when brownfield land to be used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Davies (DP4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 1.2 - Question that Stafford Borough has a 'high quality of life'.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
A Beardmore (DP38)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 7 - Question expansion of Stone Business Park as the Council's Employment Land Review only indicates growth in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stone Business Park has been identified as a sustainable location for new employment, to</li> </ul>

	finance / business to be focused on town centre office developments with a fall in distribution jobs leading to empty industrial units.	provide a portfolio of future employment land, existing sites have been developed or with permissions, longer lead-in times to delivery.
Mr C Tibbitts (DP2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 7 - Concern about expansion of Stone Business Park due to existing noise from traffic, light pollution and lack of landscape screening, concern about highway safety on A51, new employment not required due to existing empty units, Meaford is preferred location or north of Stafford. Landscaping must be improved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Landscaping and good design is required through Core Policy 23 with specific provision at land south of Stone.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP452)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 1.10 - Question whether plan will deliver biodiversity enhancement &amp; restoration as Sustainability Appraisal gives a neutral status. Further ecological survey work required on new development areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to require developers to provide up-to-date ecological surveys for new development areas at Stafford and Stone.</li> </ul>
Davies (DP5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions to be identified in larger print.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council – Environmental & Health Service (DP1076)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2 - Para 2.40 amended to include reference to Stone’s Household Waste Recycling Centre. Consider impact of air quality on new road infrastructure provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend paragraph 2.40.</li> <li>Local Transport Plan related to air quality.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP972)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2 amended to make greater reference to the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. An objective to enhance local character required for Stafford as well as Stone. Include reference to historic landscape as well as cultural resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to make changes to para 2.10 for the Cannock Chase AONB.</li> <li>Agree to new objective for Stafford.</li> <li>Agree to mention historic landscape at para 2.22.</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP648)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2 - Support spatial vision. Reference to private rented affordable housing &amp; Small Medium Enterprises.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Refer to Core Policies 18, 19 &amp; 20 with minor amendments for Core Policy 20.</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP870)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2.1 - Historic Landscape and Extensive Urban Survey with text amendments for para 2.22 with West Midlands Farmsteads</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend paragraphs 2.22, 2.24, 2.25, 2.26 &amp; 2.27 as well as update information for</li> </ul>

	and Landscapes Project. Update paras 2.24, 2.25, 2.26 & 2.27 using latest 2011 information	Extensive Urban Survey and other studies.
Farmery (DP324 & DP325)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.2 &amp; 2.4 - Query the household figures &amp; population statistics as well as the trend based analysis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend section 7.1 to include 2008 household projection information from Appendix 1 of the Draft Publication.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.10 - Stafford to be designated a Green Belt urgently.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Council has agreed to maintain existing Green Belt boundaries.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP464)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.16 - Add reference to forestry, nature conservation and tourism as sources of employment with examples of Cannock Chase, Shugborough &amp; Local Nature Reserves.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree amendments to para 2.16 regarding other sources of employment with examples</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP465)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.16 - Note information contained in the spatial portrait, land uses and Ministry of Defence at Stafford.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP132)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.16 - Welcome recognition of Ministry of Defence sites in Stafford Borough.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP466 & DP469)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.18 - Make reference to Sites of Biological Importance and Biodiversity Alert Sites together with details of site area, % cover, priority habitat types. No mention of rivers &amp; canals, wildlife habitats, landscape and recreation, Green Infrastructure and water resources including Water Framework Directive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend para 2.18 for Biodiversity Alert Sites.</li> <li>• Add an Appendix listing SBI details.</li> <li>• Add a reference to Water Framework Dir.</li> <li>• Reference is made later in the section and document to rivers &amp; canals, wildlife habitats, landscape and recreation, Green Infrastructure and water resources.</li> </ul>
Woodland Trust (DP288)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend para 2.20 to make reference to 'ancient and semi-natural woodlands'.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend para 2.20.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP473)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.21 is a poor reflection of species status in the Borough, to be updated and provide reasons.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.21 of limited value, to be deleted.</li> </ul>



Environment Agency (DP822)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.29 - Support reference to the water environment. Further clarification required for different levels of water quality regarding the Water Cycle Study, General Quality Assessment and the Water Framework Directive (WFD) classifications linked to ecological characteristics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to include further details concerning the Water Cycle Study, General Quality Assessment and the Water Framework Directive (WFD) classifications linked to ecological characteristics.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP481 & DP483 & DP475)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.29 &amp; 2.30 - Concern about no reference to the Water Framework Directive. Add reference to river water quality to identify problem areas and seek solutions.</li> <li>• Para 2.32 – reference to schools, colleges, libraries and university campus required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to include further details concerning the Water Framework Directive (WFD) classifications linked to ecological characteristics by revamping para 2.29-2.30.</li> <li>• No change. Refer to Stafford town section.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP 119)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.33 - 2.35 to provide clarity regarding the Borough's current provision, quantity, quality and access with surpluses and shortfalls. Para 3.20 to provide further information on the types of deficiencies to address.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to add further details from the PPG17 Assessment to enhance para 2.35 and 3.20. Further discussion with Sport England and SBC Leisure is required.</li> </ul>
The Theatres Trust (DP239)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.33 - Concern about lack of reference to cultural facilities and role of Stafford to provide for the rest of the Borough and visitors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend para 2.54 to make reference to the role of Stafford town's facilities for the rest of the Borough and visitors.</li> </ul>
Mr J Pert (DP487)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.34 - Concern about the quality of sports provision in the Borough and the deficiency in quantity of space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP490)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.36 update with solar panel installation data and monitor progress, make reference to wind energy and overall energy usage &amp; sources including % of renewable energy used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and ask SBC Climate Change team for further information and annual measures.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.42 - Identify location of new waste disposal plant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change. Refer to SCC Waste Strategy.</li> </ul>

English Heritage (DP872)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sections 2.2 &amp; 2.3 to include an introductory paragraph on historic character using Stafford Extensive Urban Survey information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed.</li> </ul>
Stowe by Chartley Parish Council (DP90)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 2.44 - Concern about traffic flow problems into Stafford from work to Blackheath Lane / A518 junction and proposed new housing development at the east.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, to be considered as part of the development brief East of Stafford.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 2.44 - Insufficient consideration given to traffic problems and movements around Stafford with congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted with consideration alongside SCC Stafford Transport Strategy approach.</li> </ul>
Farmery (DP326)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 2.50 - Query about ongoing use of MoD Stafford base.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and further discussions with MoD and planning permission granted for HQ site.</li> </ul>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP133)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome para 2.50 with specific wording changes to be included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed wording changes as proposed.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP494)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 2.52 - Provide further information on current health professionals and future new facilities required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to Infrastructure Delivery Plan for further data.</li> </ul>
Farmery (DP327 & DP328)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 2.52 - Query Stafford Hospital capacity for new households</li> <li>Para 2.53 - Query capacity of schools in Stafford due to new development and wider impacts for the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and update para 2.52 confirming Stafford Hospital has sufficient capacity.</li> <li>Refer to SCC Education for school capacity.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP496 & DP497)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 2.54 - Include details of Local Nature Reserves</li> <li>Para 2.55 - Illustrations to be labelled as agreed plans to avoid being misleading</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed to include an appendix listing Local Nature Reserves, Sites of Biological Importance and Biodiversity Alert Sites.</li> <li>Delete Stafford town centre illustrations.</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP874)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2.3 with greater reference to potential niche and speciality retailing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and refer to Stone town policy CP7.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP499)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2.3 - There is no information on the environment or biodiversity in and around Stone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and refer to para 8.63 to 8.70</li> </ul>

English Heritage (DP875)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 3.18 welcomed referring to respecting local character and distinctiveness.</li> <li>• Para 3.19 to emphasis conserving the historic environment in support of sustainable development and quality of life objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agreed to update para 3.19 to read “... irreplaceable assets are conserved, protected, enhanced and managed to support sustainable development and quality of life objectives, not least to ...”</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP317 & DP336 & DP321 & DP311)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3, para 3.1 &amp; 3.2 - Welcome reference to climate change with the document to prioritise a low carbon economy and an era without cheap oil / post peak oil due to fossil fuels being a finite resource, leading to recessions. Future energy will be scarcer and more expensive.</li> <li>• Query further growth and traffic generation due to depleted resources, climate change and energy. Query whether further growth in villages is better.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and include a new sentence in para 3.4 to refer to cheap oil and future guiding principles.</li> <li>• Noted and no change to strategy approach for Stafford Borough due to focus on the sustainable settlements of Stafford &amp; Stone.</li> </ul>
Farmery (DP330)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 3.2 - Further information required on new supporting infrastructure, delivery, funding and timescales</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for more details.</li> </ul>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP134)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 3.2 - welcome reference to support MOD personnel returning from Germany.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Mr P Boston (DP46)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 3.3 - Query flood defences / systems in Stafford centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the SWMP / WCS evidence base. Environment Agency manages flood defences in Stafford.</li> </ul>
Mr F Biard (DP75)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 3.8 - Concern about lack of recognition given to significant development and land use required over the Plan period, within the Key Issues para 3.8.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to subsequent Core Policies and justification text concerning the future development strategy.</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP323)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 3.9 - Support future provision of new gypsy caravan sites to meet the GTAA evidence based work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>

Mr J Pert (DP495)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 3.10 - Affordable housing is a key issue in rural areas and must be delivered to maintain balanced future communities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Mr M Gardner (DP92)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 3.11 - Query the future provision for an ageing population through the Plan period with closed care homes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Refer to SCC Extra Care Strategy Development Management Policy 13.</li> </ul>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP135)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 3.12 to make reference to MOD importance in the local economy as a significant employer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to change para 3.12.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 3.12 to note the limitations of M6 motorway due to heavy traffic and frequent accidents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd (DP246)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 3.13 amended to support Stafford as a strategic location for warehousing, storage &amp; distribution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to include a sentence in para 3.13 referring to Stafford's strategic location on the M6 motorway for warehousing, storage &amp; distribution.</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP349)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 3.15 - Object to another supermarket in Stafford undermining local retailers and market traders as well as restricting choice. Concern about increased lorry traffic and carbon emissions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 3.15 - Concern about impact on Stafford retailing due to inadequate parking facilities and congested roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to SCC Draft Stafford Transport Strategy.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP973)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 3.18 – Support reference to concern of new development not respecting local character and distinctiveness. To be addressed by detailed policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP876)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 4 – Support commitment to Historic Environment Character Assessment within the LDF.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Mr G Benn (DP282)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 4.3 – Query if reference to climate change and energy includes the end of cheap / peak oil.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and refer to amendment in para 3.3.</li> </ul>

Farmery (DP331)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 4.8 – Query the plans, locations and equality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to area based policies with the Strategic Development Locations.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP123)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about protection of open space, sport and recreation in the context of Neighbourhood Plans and not having a Borough-wide approach which would undermine protection in urban areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to move objective r of the Spatial Vision to the Borough-wide section with deletion to Neighbourhood Plans. Green Infrastructure &amp; PPG17 evidence base</li> </ul>
Barwood Development Securities Ltd (DP1004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 4.9 – the Regional Strategy currently part of the Development Plan and its underpinning documents remain in place. RS Phase 2 and Growth Point are material considerations for the spatial strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agreed.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP588)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 4.9 – the Regional Strategy currently part of the Development Plan and its underpinning documents remain in place. Unclear about transitional arrangements but RS Phase 2 and Growth Point are material considerations for the spatial strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agreed.</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP441)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 4.9, second sentence is incorrect as the RSS will not be revoked until completion of Environmental Assessments. A material consideration for the Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend para 4.9 to include the word ‘intention’ to revoke and provide an update in terms of the Localism Act.</li> </ul>
Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd (DP247)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 4.9, second sentence is incorrect as the RSS will not be revoked until completion of Environmental Assessments. A material consideration for the Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend para 4.9 to include the word ‘intention’ to revoke and provide an update in terms of the Localism Act.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP121)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 4.12 – welcome ‘Outcome 2’ of the Staffordshire Strategic Partnership for improved health and well-being.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Aragon Land & Planning (DP783)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cross boundary issues with South Staffordshire District need to be explained and work identified through the Regional Spatial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to changes in Key Objective 10 and paragraph 7.9</li> </ul>

	Strategy to be prepared in order to deliver new housing provision on land south of Stafford.	
Milwich Action Committee (DP654)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 4.14 – evidence base to refer to Parish Plans and Design Statements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to link Parish Plan web-page to the LDF evidence base.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP533)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 4.14 - There is a lack of ecological evidence prepared to inform decisions on each Strategic Development Location to ensure sufficient land area is identified to deal with habitat and species mitigation with further work required to meet NERC Act 2006, PPS9 &amp; Circular 06/2005 requirements. Further survey work is required and access to existing information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agreed. Contact the respective developers to ensure up-to-date survey work has been completed and can be published through the LDF evidence base web-pages.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 4.14 – The Development Plan to be prepared in line with the Local Transport Plan for delivery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agreed. Refer to relevant Transport sections of the document.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council – Environmental & Health Service (DP1077)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision to include provision of high quality affordable housing in a range of tenures &amp; sizes. Support bullet points b, c &amp; q.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to split Spatial Vision bullet point a to create a new bullet point reading “Deliver a range of housing types and tenures to meet the local needs of all communities , the ageing population, gypsies and travellers.</li> </ul>
Trent Vision Trust (DP1043)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the Spatial Vision for Stone and Key Objectives 16 &amp; 17 with clarification required for the town centre. Trent Valley enable development to meet recreation and community use aspirations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and consider the wording of Key Objective 17 to differentiate the opportunities for marina &amp; commercial development.</li> </ul>
Barwood Development Securities Ltd (DP1005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision for Stone supported with amended text to include market, affordable &amp; specialist housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP974)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to lack of reference to improved accessibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed to include a new objective to read “Improve accessibility to services and facilities</li> </ul>

		by providing safe, attractive and convenient sustainable connections from and to new developments.”
Maximus Strategic (DP861)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision supported but reference to natural environment to cover the whole Borough, not just the rural areas. The Spatial Vision should include reference to Neighbourhood Plans in the context of local delivery and the Localism Act.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to include new sentences on Neighbourhood Planning into paragraph 4.8 of Section 4. Consider adding a new criteria to read “Community supported Neighbourhood Plans in place.”</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP839)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision to be amended concerning biodiversity enhancement, para 8.100 intervention zones &amp; opportunity mapping in Core Policy 14.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and arrange a meeting with Natural England.</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP650)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the Spatial Vision with emphasis on affordable housing through private rented accommodation and specialist industries focused on Small and Medium sized Enterprises.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP136)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision supported with reference to meeting local needs of all communities and role of MOD to strengthening the local economy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
British Waterways (DP663)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision supported with preserving &amp; enhancing local character of canal side vistas and reference to the Trent and Mersey Canal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP539)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 5.1 concern about no reference to biodiversity or green infrastructure, except in rural areas, with a robust ecological network for Stafford and Stone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed to move Key Objective m from the Borough’s rural areas to Stafford Borough.</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP352)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision should refer to peak oil and low carbon economy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to include reference to ‘carbon</li> </ul>

	linked to Key Objective d.	emissions’ and ‘support renewable energy where appropriate.’
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP1048)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision supported but housing to be separated from designing quality developments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed to create a new Key Objective concerning housing, as detailed above.</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP877)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision amended to include a Key Objective for Stafford town regarding town character.</li> <li>• Amendment to Key Objective j to read ‘conserved and enhanced’ rather than preserved.</li> <li>• Amendment to Key Objective m.</li> <li>• Amend penultimate paragraph to refer to historic environment rather than built heritage</li> <li>• Final paragraph to include AONB and its setting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amendments listed.</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP856 & DP853)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Objectives supported and move Objectives m and r to cover the Borough area.</li> <li>• Final paragraph amended to include a positive outcome as detailed in the response.</li> <li>• Strongly support Key Objectives 3, 5 &amp; 6.</li> <li>• Key Objectives 10 &amp; 11 – some concerns raised.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amendments listed</li> </ul>
Grainger PLC (DP793)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Objective o amended to refer to housing adjoining villages for local need.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change but consider in the context of Draft NPPF &amp; the main villages.</li> </ul>
Houghton Parish Council (DP755)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the Spatial Vision and Key Objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
McDyre & Co for Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd (DP682)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the Spatial Vision and support Spatial Objective p. Spatial Objective o amended to refer to housing adjoining villages for local need.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change but consider in the context of Draft NPPF &amp; the main villages.</li> </ul>
Milwich Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Objective o to refer to ‘with local support.’</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and include a new Spatial Objective</li> </ul>



Committee (DP652)		concerning Neighbourhood Plans.
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP596)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Spatial Objective b to refer to an adequate and continuous supply of land for housing. Split Spatial Objective b from high quality design</li> <li>• Spatial Objective h to refer to market, affordable and specialist housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to Spatial Objective b amendments as detailed previously.</li> <li>• No amendments to Spatial Objective h.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP540)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision to include reference to no net loss of biodiversity and continued loss is unsustainable with habitat areas to be identified in the Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change – Spatial Objective m.</li> </ul>
McDyre & Co for J F Bostock Settlement (DP413)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Objective o amended to refer to housing adjoining villages for local need.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change but consider in the context of Draft NPPF &amp; the main villages.</li> </ul>
Mr J Pert (DP508)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Objective b to make specific reference to employment for local needs.</li> <li>• Spatial Objective g to include reference to educational attainment at all levels, not just graduates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree amendment to Spatial Objective g.</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP477)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights the current changing national and regional policy context for preparing the new Plan, which should be explained further together with the calculation of housing numbers.</li> <li>• Concern about the scale of development in the Plan due to the current economic circumstances and a weak housing market, with implications for affordable housing and CIL contributions.</li> <li>• Supports the Spatial Vision and spatial objectives on design, access to services and facilities in rural areas and delivery of housing but concern about achieving affordable housing provision.</li> <li>• Further development should be supported at service centres /</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to make amendments to update Section 4 of the Plan concerning the latest national and regional policy position, specifically expanding para 4.4 &amp; 4.9.</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> <li>• Agree to amend Spatial Objective c to read 'key settlements' rather than 'key locations'</li> </ul>

	main villages based on the Revised Settlement Assessment and criteria based approach.	Agree to update Core Policy 2 with criteria to support development at key settlements.
Berkswich Parish Council (DP467)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the Spatial Vision but query the delivery of affordable housing at 30%, elderly provision, delivery of additional services &amp; facilities through Section 106 agreements, achieving a reduction in out of town retail and consultation on new development in rural areas to meet local needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Fisher German for Mr Thomas (DP449)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the Spatial Vision focused on Stafford as the County Town and growth point area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP564)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the Spatial Vision but the document to provide further analysis of new development related to population projections.</li> <li>• Greater emphasis on delivery of employment and leisure opportunities for older people in the Plan</li> <li>• Para 2.40 - refer to proposal for a waste-to-energy incinerator at Four Ashes, South Staffordshire.</li> <li>• Para 2.49 – make positive statements about future investments benefiting the Borough’s employment.</li> <li>• Para 2.50 – Borough’s infrastructure must be ready for troops returning from Germany by 2015.</li> <li>• Para 2.54 – Increase provision for allotments.</li> <li>• Important to define the boundary of Stafford town and protect the countryside between Stafford &amp; Stone, with consideration of new Green Belt designated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to incorporate Appendix A into the main document through additional text.</li> <li>• Noted and no change – refer to Core Policies</li> <li>• Noted and no change – refers to the County’s Waste Core Strategy.</li> <li>• Agree to amend paragraph to refer to new investments and improved prospects.</li> <li>• Noted and amend para linked to MoD text.</li> <li>• Noted and no change – refer to CP 25.</li> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Fisher German for Inglewood Investment Company Ltd (DP420)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the Spatial Vision meeting market and affordable housing needs in rural areas based on existing settlements with services and facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 2 with new criteria to guide new development in rural areas to the key settlements.</li> </ul>
Akzo Nobel UK Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the Spatial Vision’s focus on Stafford town for significant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>

(DP414)	new development and infrastructure, including land north of Stafford.	
Mr R Oldfield (DP387)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision amended to prioritise ecological objectives, renewable energy and climate change.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Providence Land Ltd (DP392)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the Spatial Vision but Key Objective 18 amended to read 'at villages' to enable development beyond tightly drawn Residential Development Boundaries, particularly at local service centres.</li> <li>• Core Policy 2 acknowledges circumstances to go beyond RDBs although current strategy unnecessary influenced by objections from village residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Key Objective 18.</li> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 with new criteria to guide new development at key settlements including reference to size and function of the settlement's facilities.</li> </ul>
Strawsons Property (DP312)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the Spatial Vision with Stafford focus and include SBLP2001 allocation at Jct 14 of M6.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP125)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Query inconsistency of protecting high quality recreation, open space &amp; sport provision differs between urban &amp; rural areas, neighbourhood plans.</li> <li>• Query how to improve less high quality areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to move Spatial Objective r to cover the whole Borough and delete reference to Neighbourhood Plans.</li> <li>• Improve areas through delivery of CP25.</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP194)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial Vision to include a commitment for road infrastructure to overcome traffic issues. New development must deliver the 'Sow Valley Link Road' from Beaconside to bottom of Baswich Lane.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Dr J Essex (DP117)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about loss of valuable recreational facilities for Doxey due to the Burleyfields development, to be compensated including access to Doxey marshes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change – refer to CP25 and area based policies.</li> </ul>
Tetlow King Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the Spatial Vision and reference to affordable housing &amp;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>

(DP97)	accommodating the elderly.	
Mr J Power (DP53)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about the Spatial Vision giving contradictory objectives for Stone between preserving character and new development. Local democracy is non-existent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP14)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New housing in villages to be subject to local democracy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council – Environmental & Health Service (DP1078)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key objective 1 amended to refer to affordable housing across different tenures and housing for communities including Gypsies and Travellers.</li> <li>Support Key Objectives 22 and 23.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Key Objective 1 to read “...between 2011-2031 across a range of tenures including for gypsies and travellers, accommodation for an ageing...”</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend Key Objective 1 to refer to housing delivery across a range of sites and delete reference to phasing of land west and east of Stafford.</li> <li>Amend Key Objective 3 to delete the word ‘any’ in relation to adverse impacts on the Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and amend to read ‘all development appropriate addresses flood risk’.</li> <li>Amend Key Objective 4 to ensure employment development mitigates against significant adverse impacts of the SAC, refers to a range of sites and delete reference to phasing.</li> <li>Amend Key Objective 18 to enable Residential Development Boundaries to be altered to permit new development as required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Key Objective 1.</li> <li>Agree to amend Key Objective 3 and create a new objective concerning flood risk.</li> <li>Agreed to amend Key Objective 4.</li> <li>Agree to amend Key Objective 18 to read ‘...development at existing villages with Residential Development Boundaries ...’</li> <li>Work relating to the evidence for the Habitats Regulations Assessment is ongoing and expected to be finalised spring 2011. The policy will be amended in the publication document if required.</li> </ul>
Barwood Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Objective 12 should be amended to delete phasing of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Key Objective 12 to remove</li> </ul>

Securities Ltd (DP1006)	development at Stone to the medium term, due to lack of justification, unbalanced growth and current levels of commuting.	the words “In the medium term ...”
Natural England (DP855 & DP854)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 23 amended to refer to habitat maintenance, restoration and creation together with protecting designated sites, not just the SAC.</li> <li>• Key Objective 17 to be separated into environmental and commerce / enterprise themes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Key Objective 23 to read “Support increased habitat maintenance, restoration and creation and the ... whilst also protecting designated sites including the Special Area of Conservation.”</li> <li>• Agree to remove reference to marina and commercial developments in Key Objective 17 and create a new Key Objective to address this issue.</li> </ul>
Environment Agency (DP823)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 3 to be separated into SAC issues and avoiding development in flood risk areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to remove reference to flood risk in Key Objective 3 and create a new Key Objective to address this issue.</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP651)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of affordable housing in rural areas is incompatible with a move from private cars to public transport, which is not viable in rural areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP195)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 5 supporting green infrastructure is crucial for leisure activities and a sense of well-being. Key Objective 11 to deliver the Sow Valley link road. New Key Objective for areas outside of Stafford and Stone to divert large commercial vehicles away from minor B, C &amp; D roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
British Waterways (DP674 & DP671)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 5 to make reference to the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal as a valuable multi-functional green infrastructure resource.</li> <li>• Key Objective 17 is supported. A New Marina Unit helps to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Key Objective 5 to read “...including green links, such as the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal, from the surrounding open countryside ...”</li> </ul>

	<p>facilitate successful marina developments to balance competing demands and address water resource &amp; supply, safety and environmental issues.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
G & C Leese Bros Ltd (DP353)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Objective 22 amended to support delivery of new affordable homes on rural exception sites using recycled land not necessarily adjacent to villages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Manby Steward Bowdler (DP435)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Objective 18 amended to provide for new housing development within, adjacent and outside of Residential Development Boundaries on merits.</li> <li>Key Objective 22 amended to provide a mix of market and affordable housing on sites adjacent to the Residential Development Boundaries, not just restricted to affordable housing schemes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and consider changes to Key Objectives 18 &amp; 22 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2.</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP354)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Objectives to consider future energy supply and demand including rising costs and oil prices.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to additional sentences included on cheap / peak oil.</li> </ul>
Mr G Benn (DP280)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Real time bus information to be sent direct to personal mobile numbers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP129 & DP127)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Objective 2 amended to refer to new built sports facilities including indoor sport provision.</li> <li>Key Objective 5 &amp; 6 to make reference to built outdoor facilities as well as open space, sport and recreation provision at formal &amp; informal level.</li> <li>Key Objectives for Stone. Query whether current provision is adequate and of quality for future needs of indoor and outdoor recreation. Query the housing proposal at Stone Rugby club removing playing field provision and whether in line with the PPG17 study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend Key Objective 2 to include reference to open space, sport &amp; recreation provision.</li> <li>Delete reference to sport &amp; recreation in Key Objective 5.</li> <li>Amend Key Objective 6 to include reference to sport as well as open space facilities.</li> <li>Add a new Key Objective for Stone to read "New open space, sport and recreational facilities, including indoor and outdoor provision, to meet future needs of the</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional sports facilities for the community to be linked with school provision to reduce running costs.</li> </ul>	community.”
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP137)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Objective 1 is supported due to reference to accommodation provision for military personnel.</li> <li>Key Objective 9 supported with a suggested amendment to public sector organisations as the MOD is not a public sector agency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend Key Objective 9 to refer to public sector organisations.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP1049)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the Spatial Objectives and Key Objective 18 &amp; 19, particularly provision of housing within existing villages. Query the structure of no key objectives specifically linked to Stafford Borough. Developer promoting land at Mill Lane, Great Haywood to maintain existing village facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP975)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Key Objective 23 with additional references included for Stafford &amp; Stone Key Objectives of green infrastructure protected and enhanced through habitat creation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to add reference to habitat creation in Key Objectives 5 (Stafford) and 17 (Stone).</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP879)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to the lack of reference in the Key Objectives to the Borough’s historic environment and heritage assets linked to respecting local character and distinctiveness. Specific Key Objectives provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to add the following Key Objectives: Stafford – “Deliver the conservation and enhancement of Stafford’s heritage assets, including the character and appearance of the town centre conservation area.” Stone – “Conserve and enhance the historic character and heritage assets of Stone and secure the sustainable use and management of its historic buildings.” Areas outside Stafford &amp; Stone – “Encourage the sustainable management of heritage assets, especially those identified as at risk, and deliver development which respects local character and distinctiveness.”</li> </ul>

<p>Maximus Strategic (DP862)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support Key Objective 1 to deliver new housing development north of Stafford and support Key Objective 9 for MoD expansion plans.</li> <li>• Concerned about Key Objective 1 &amp; 11 for development east and west of Stafford due to dependence on the eastern and western access improvement scheme which, if not delivered, undermine the Core Strategy.</li> <li>• Greater recognition required in the Key Objectives for strategic priorities listed in Draft NPPF, specifically climate change mitigation approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change to Key Objectives 1, 9 &amp; 11. All three Strategic Development Locations required to deliver the Core Strategy, associated with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan approach.</li> <li>• Amend Core Policy 1 bullet point 7 to read “Deliver development which addresses climate change mitigation measures, reduces carbon emission and avoids areas at risk from flooding including locations vulnerable to surface water flooding.”</li> </ul>
<p>Grainger PLC (DP794)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 18 amended to refer to new housing development within and adjoining Residential Development Boundaries in order to support new services and facilities as promoted in Key Objective 19. Such an approach of rural village expansion is advocated in Draft NPPF and existing Planning Policy Statement 3. Support growth at Great Bridgeford.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and consider changes to Key Objectives 18 &amp; 22 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2.</li> </ul>
<p>Houghton Parish Council (DP756)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the Key Objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
<p>McDyre &amp; Co for Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd (DP687)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Key Objectives 20 &amp; 21. Support expansion of the Raleigh Hall estate and the biomass unit to provide heat and electricity to new development. Support de-allocation of employment land at Hixon and prefer development at Raleigh Hall rather than Ladfordfields due to its sustainable location to Eccleshall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
<p>Milwich Action Committee (DP665)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the conflict between Key Objectives 18 &amp; 22 regarding new housing development in rural areas within or adjacent to village boundaries. Require a proper definition of Rural Exception Sites. Key Objective 18 amended to reflect Core Policy 2 on minor amendments to Residential Development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and consider changes to Key Objectives 18 &amp; 22 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2.</li> </ul>



	Boundaries through neighbourhood plans or a Site-specific DPD based on local need and existing facilities retaining presumption against development	
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP606)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Key Objective 1 for new development at Stafford to the west but delete reference to phasing and linked to delivery of the Western Access Improvement Scheme.</li> <li>• Key Objective 2 – work on going to identify components of a new district centre west of Stafford</li> <li>• Key Objective 3 – evidence to be provided on visitor impacts and mitigation measures for the Cannock Chase SAC and concern about the Zone of Influence. Open space provision to be included in the Development Plan to enable proper testing. Amend Key Objective to refer to development is not at high risk of flooding.</li> <li>• Key objective 4 new development at Stafford to the west is supported but delete reference to phasing and linked to delivery of the Western Access Improvement Scheme.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to delete reference to phasing but retain reference to Western Access Scheme.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted and agree to provide a new Key Objective including flooding &amp; climate change.</li> <li>• Work relating to the evidence for the Habitats Regulations Assessment is ongoing and expected to be finalised spring 2011. The policy will be amended in the publication document if required</li> <li>• Agree to delete reference to phasing but retain reference to Western Access Scheme.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP541)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key objectives for Stafford &amp; Stone to expand and link existing designated wildlife sites as part of green infrastructure. Development at Kingsmead and Riverside to protect &amp; enhance habitats linked to the urban landscape and river restoration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to add reference to habitat creation and enhancing green links in Key Objective 5 and Key Objective 17.</li> </ul>
Mr J Pert (DP521)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 20 concern about limited employment provided by renewable energy schemes and what is meant by sensitive new tourist attractions in a high quality environment. Mixed employment required across the Borough to avoid traffic movements to Stafford &amp; Stone but limited at existing industrial estates to light engineering operations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Key Objective 20 to delete the words ‘national and regional’ and re-order renewable energy schemes as well as include reference to agricultural and livestock businesses.</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP479)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about Key Objectives focusing the majority of growth to Stafford, reliant on major infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and consider changes to Key Objectives 18 &amp; 22 following Member consideration of</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Key Objectives in areas outside of Stafford &amp; Stone but reconsider amendments to Residential Development Boundaries to enable growth, particularly at Eccleshall due to existing facilities.</li> </ul>	Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2.
Berkswich Parish Council (DP468)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accept the Key Objectives but query wider provision of green infrastructure and concern about protecting Cannock Chase in light of the Eastern Distributor Road and new developments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and add reference to land south of Stafford in South Staffordshire District for Key Objective 10.</li> </ul>
Fisher German for Mr Thomas (DP454)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Key Objectives and note growth west of Stafford in the medium term. Reference to maximising brownfield land in sustainable locations prior to greenfield development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and refer to Core Policy 1 &amp; 2 with amended policy text to read “Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations.”</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP437)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to Key Objectives for Stone as development is restricted to the medium term and new housing development West of Stone. Support high quality housing to mitigate adverse impacts and Stone being a substantial urban area for development. Object to unnecessary constraints to the supply of housing. Provision of 500 new homes at Stone is insufficient for sustainable development. Stone has already had new housing growth in the west and therefore land to the east should now be developed for 100 new houses, which is unconstrained by the West Coast mainline railway.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend Key Objective 12 to remove reference to ‘In the medium term’. Scale of development proposed east of Stone to be considered through the Sites and Allocations Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>
Mr R Oldfield (DP423)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to lack of reference to climate change and biodiversity protection in the Key Objectives.</li> <li>Key Objective 1 for growth is incompatible with climate change and biodiversity, rather emphasis on re-using and adapting existing housing stock.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 7 for retailing to be focused on local production &amp; distribution rather than global market.</li> <li>• Key Objective 11 objections to concessions on private motor transport which is incompatible with reducing travel and combating climate change.</li> </ul>	
Fisher German for the Inglewood Investment Company (DP431)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objectives supported but question Key Objective 18 housing within existing villages with a commitment to reviewing Residential Development Boundaries to meet local needs included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and consider changes to Key Objectives 18 &amp; 22 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2.</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP565)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the Key Objectives for Stafford area.</li> <li>• Include reference to live-work housing.</li> <li>• Support focus of new retail, leisure and cultural activities at Stafford town centre Key Objective 7.</li> <li>• Key Objective 20 to include emphasis on employment in agriculture and livestock as well as non-agricultural businesses.</li> <li>• Support adapted homes to encourage disabled people of all ages to live independently.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> <li>• Agree to amend Key Objective 20 to refer to agriculture and livestock employment.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd (DP415)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Key Objectives for Stafford and housing development north of Stafford, promoting growth at Akzo Nobel UK Ltd land holdings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Mr J Power (DP54)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objectives for Stone with concern about scale of growth impacting on the town's character which is contrary to the earlier Vision statements. Concern about democratic accountability with existing communities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Providence Land Ltd (DP394)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective to Key Objective 18 focusing development within villages which may be less sustainable than sites outside the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and consider changes to Key Objectives 18 &amp; 22 following Member consideration of</li> </ul>

	<p>envelope well located to facilities. Core Policy 21 supports and enhances local service centres with key services and facilities for rural hinterlands which should be reflected in the Vision and Key Objectives. The current strategy is at odds with the Draft NPPF approach for sustainable economic growth for meeting the country's needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 22 to enable local communities to determine level of growth and reflect Draft NPPF para 112.</li> <li>• Object to rural exception sites solely delivering rural housing needs but apply a more flexible approach using a mixture of affordable and market housing.</li> </ul>	<p>Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with a more flexible approach to mixture of affordable and market housing.</p>
Mr J Holt (DP285)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree with Key Objective 18 focus on housing growth within villages. Residential Development Boundaries to be amended at sustainable settlements across the Borough to provide for housing requirements and deliver the Core Strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and consider changes to Key Objectives 18 &amp; 22 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2.</li> </ul>
Strawsons Property (DP313)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Key Objectives and identification of land west of M6 Junction 14 for development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP130)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objectives to consider indoor and outdoor sport and recreation requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Key Objective 2 &amp; 5.</li> <li>• New Key Objectives for Stone and areas outside of Stafford &amp; Stone.</li> </ul>
Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd (DP248)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Key Objective 21 and remove ambiguity to expand existing industrial area at Ladfordfields.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Key Objective 21 to read: "Deliver new employment land for the expansion of existing industrial areas ..."</li> </ul>
National Farmers Union (DP187)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 20 supported provided renewable schemes and agricultural buildings use are within environmental and infrastructure capability limits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 21 - industrial estate expansion not to remove good quality food productive land.</li> <li>• Key Objective 22 – concern about affordable housing undermining character of rural areas and increasing commuting rather than provide homes for rural workers. Consider re-use of existing buildings.</li> <li>• Key Objective 23 support habitat creation provided not at the expense of agricultural production.</li> </ul>	
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP147)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 18 supported but also consider Town Design Statement for controlling development.</li> <li>• Key Objective 19 – support additional facilities.</li> <li>• Key Objective 20 – object to further rural employment due to increased traffic issues.</li> <li>• Key Objective 21 – object to further expansion of Raleigh Hall due to lack of public transport and increased pressure on the existing road network.</li> <li>• Key Objective 22 – concern about inappropriate development of rural exception sites at villages.</li> <li>• Support Key Objective 23.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Inland Waterways Association (DP113)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the Plan and non inclusion of land south of Stafford for new housing development and a road. Development areas identified will not directly impact on the canal system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Mr B Apps (DP78)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 18 supported and consider Town Design Statement for any new development.</li> <li>• Key Objective 19 – support additional facilities. Very poor public transport and insufficient walking and cycling due to narrow country roads.</li> <li>• Key Objective 20 – object to further rural employment due to increased traffic issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 21 – object to further expansion of Raleigh Hall due to lack of public transport not to progress without separate access from the M6.</li> <li>• Key Objective 22 – concern about inappropriate development of rural exception sites at villages.</li> <li>• Support Key Objective 23.</li> </ul>	
Rev A Jeffries (DP15)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Objective 7 to be clarified concerning non car transport, Stafford town centre bus station and car parking provision to maintain viability.</li> <li>• Key Objectives 18 &amp; 22 – any development in the villages to be very small scale, subject to democracy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Knight Solicitors LLP (DP1002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7 Development Strategy - promoting land at Northwood Lane, Clayton for mixed housing and open space development. The site lies in the Green Belt, close to major roads and employment areas. Exceptional circumstances exist to remove from the Green Belt, referring to National Planning Policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Site to be considered through the Sites &amp; Allocations Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP1000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7 Development Strategy – duty to provide sufficient supply of school places through additional provision or a new school to meet growth in need. New residential development at Stafford will require new secondary and primary school capacity, with current schools having limited extra supply. Land north of Stafford = new primary school and additional secondary school capacity, as identified through the recent planning application. Land west of Stafford = new primary school and additional secondary school capacity. Land east of Stafford = new primary school and additional secondary school capacity. New residential development at Stone will require new secondary and primary school capacity, with current schools having limited extra supply. Land west of Stone = improvements to Manor Hill primary school and additional secondary school capacity. Areas outside of Stafford and Stone, unable to identify educational</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to work closely with Staffordshire County Council on provision of future education requirements for the Borough arising from new developments.</li> </ul>

	<p>requirements due to limited information about exact location of developments alongside existing housing commitments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support working with Stafford Borough Council on the Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule to meeting educational needs alongside the existing Section 106 agreement approach.</li> </ul>	
Mr B Hunt (DP801)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7 Development Strategy – Residential Development Boundary at Aston-by-Stone amended to include Briar Hill house and environs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Amendments to Residential Development Boundary to be considered through Sites and Allocations Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>
Barlaston Parish Council (DP263)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7 Development Strategy – Support producing a Neighbourhood Plan for Barlaston through the Localism Bill to direct policies on planning, development &amp; sustainability in the context of the Borough’s Plan and potential impact on the Parish from new developments at Meaford.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
A H Lawton (DP193)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7 Development Strategy – Infrastructure delivered before new developments, housing related to industry requirements and vice versa, industry and housing focused on Stafford town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council – Environmental & Health Service (DP1079)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 1 to include reference to tenure and delivery of affordable housing and employment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to other Core Policies.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP1050)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 1 support sustainable development principles but concern about the brownfield first approach as contrary to current National Planning Policies and insufficient brownfield land available in the rural areas of Stafford Borough for housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words ‘Therefore only’ in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: “Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate</li> </ul>

		greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations.”
Trent Vision Trust (DP1044)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 but object to 9<sup>th</sup> bullet point preventing all out of centre developments as contrary to PPS4 and the Draft NPPF approach as being acceptable subject to criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to delete the word ‘all’ from the 9<sup>th</sup> bullet point of Core Policy 1.</li> </ul>
Barwood Development Securities Ltd (DP1007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 1 object to final bullet point to re-use previously developed land before greenfield as the sequential approach is not identified in National Planning Policies for sustainable development. Greenfield development at Stone has benefits over multiple brownfield land coming forward.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words ‘Therefore only’ in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: “Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations.”</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP976)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 focus on protection of rural countryside, high quality design and distinctiveness.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP863)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 1 to include a new guiding principle for mitigating the effects of and adaption to climate change by encouraging renewable energy and the low carbon economy to support sustainable development.</li> <li>Core Policy 1 to provide further support to new development in rural areas to meet the needs of local communities, access to services &amp; facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend 7<sup>th</sup> Guiding Principle to read “Deliver climate change mitigation measures and adaptations for a low carbon economy, reduces carbon emissions and avoids areas at risk from flooding including locations vulnerable to surface water flooding”</li> <li>Following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2.</li> </ul>



<p>Environment Agency (DP824)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Core Policy 1 on flood risk and presumption in favour of brownfield over greenfield but improving green infrastructure to be clearer.</li> <li>• Justification text to provide further details of key objectives and guidance from the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plans which can be delivered through new development.</li> <li>• Core Policy 1 to be specific about commitment to no WFD water body suffering detrimentally from new development and improve the situation.</li> <li>• Support Core Policy 2 phased delivery of Strategic Development Locations linked to necessary infrastructure and environmental requirements with suggested justification text working regarding foul drainage and water supply issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree a new paragraph in the justification text after para 7.5 on the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plans.</li> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 1 to read “in line with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) proposals must not adversely affect the ecological status of a water body and wherever possible take measures to improve ecological value in order to help meet the required status.”</li> <li>• Agree to add the following text to para 8.29 “Discussions should be undertaken with the water company on a site specific basis where concerns have been raised in the Water Cycle Study with regards to wastewater treatment works or sewerage infrastructure (i.e. foul drainage networks) capacity.”</li> </ul>
<p>Walton Homes (DP789)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to Core Policy 1 and the focus on Stafford and Stone rather than housing in large rural settlements. Greenfield sites should be encouraged due to viability and delivery issues on brownfield land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with a more flexible approach to mixture of affordable and market housing</li> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words ‘Therefore only’ in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: “Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is insufficient previously developed land available in</li> </ul>

Ranton Parish Council (DP653)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 1 key Guiding Principles are use of brownfield land and avoiding flood plain development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
G & C Leese Bros Ltd (DP357)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 with suggested amendment to the final bullet point to maximise brownfield land development within and outside of settlements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP421)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to lack of sustainable development definition in the Plan and inherent contradictions between delivering growth and protecting the environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to Section 4.</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 1, 9<sup>th</sup> bullet point revised to reflect PPS4 approach to out of centre development including clear evidence of adverse impacts.</li> <li>Support the final bullet point with brownfield land to be prioritised in first phases of development, in sustainable locations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to delete the word 'all' from the 9<sup>th</sup> bullet point of Core Policy 1.</li> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point.</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP881)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 and references to locally distinctive character and heritage assets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP852 & DP841)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 Guiding Principles particularly for high quality design, enhancing the Borough's natural environment, avoid flood risk areas and maximising the use of brownfield sites.</li> <li>The Plan to include a cross-cutting policy for brownfield land and biodiversity interests.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 1 final bullet point to include the words "... villages taking into account ecological value, to reduce..."</li> </ul>
Mr G Lotay (DP457)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High priority given to using brownfield land and only use greenfield land in exceptional circumstances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>

Grainger PLC (DP795)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 1 object to final bullet point prioritising brownfield land before greenfield areas due to some unsustainable location and supply of brownfield land undermining delivery of greenfield sites, the strategy as well as contrary to PPS3. Suggesting the identification of brownfield land targets and greenfield delivery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: "Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations."</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP762)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 1, final bullet point amended to refer to ecological value of brownfield sites to be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 1 final bullet point to include the words "... villages taking into account ecological value, to reduce..."</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP757)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the Borough's development priorities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
McDyre & Co for Mr G Edwards (DP750)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 but final bullet point to be amended to include reference to viability in maximising use of brownfield land as the current economic climate prevents delivery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point.</li> </ul>
McDyre & Co for Raleigh Hall Properties (DP698)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 but note that brownfield land may not be sufficient to meet new development requirements for the Borough. Support the development of greenfield land at Raleigh Hall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: "Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations."</li> </ul>
Milwich Action Committee (DP666)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenfield land should only be released when there is proven local housing need and agreed by the Parish Council / residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>

McDyre & Co for J F Bostock Settlement (DP625)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 but final bullet point to be amended to include reference to viability in maximising use of brownfield land as the current economic climate prevents delivery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP607)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 1, first bullet point amended to delete reference to high density within or close to town centres as contrary to design-led, market-led approach for housing delivery.</li> <li>Core Policy, object to final bullet point prioritising brownfield land before greenfield areas due to some unsustainable location and supply of brownfield land undermining delivery of greenfield sites and therefore the strategy as well as contrary to PPS3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: "Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations."</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP555)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 but concern about limited number of brownfield sites constraining residential development on greenfield sites to meet housing needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: "Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available."</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP470)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 particularly maximising brownfield land and avoiding flood risk areas but concern about previous development at The Meadows.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Fisher German for Mr Thomas (DP456)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 with development focused on Stafford and priority on brownfield for housing before greenfield sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to</li> </ul>

		read: "Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations."
Manby Steward Bowdler (DP439)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 aim to maximise use of brownfield sites but greenfield sites considered on merits, character of area and location.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Mr R Oldfield (DP426)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 1 to focus on protecting ecological systems and combat global warming with no new development but better use of existing stock. Object to continued economic growth and support preventing all out of centre developments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP566)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 preventing out of town retail and maximising use of brownfield. Consider Green Belt designation between Stafford and Stone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Fisher German for The Inglewood Investment Company (DP432)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 with the majority of new development at Stafford and Stone but growth is also required in villages to be more sustainable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2.</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd (DP416)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 but object to final bullet point prioritising previously developed sites before greenfield as contrary to Draft NPPF. Provide clarity that only where brownfield land in sustainable locations will be considered before greenfield sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: "Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in</li> </ul>

		sustainable locations.”
Mr J Power (DP55)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about Core Policy 1 leading to significant new development at Stone undermining the existing character and object to use of greenfield sites. Protect the Green Belt around North Staffordshire.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
A Kratz (DP350 & DP329)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1, first bullet point to be expanded to require all new housing to include solar panels in order to support the environment. Support use of brownfield before releasing greenfield sites in order to avoid new development at Burleyfields.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy13</li> </ul>
Strawson Property (DP314)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 and identify omission site of land west of M6 Junction 14 for new development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP131)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 1 to make reference to open space, sport and recreation provision and delivering future requirements at Stafford and Stone as well as protecting existing assets. Refer to PPG17 Strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 1, fourth bullet point to read “... health, leisure, open space, sport, recreation (informal &amp; formal) and housing.”</li> </ul>
Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd (DP250)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 but final bullet point amended to refer to expansion of industrial areas onto greenfield sites where insufficient brownfield land in sustainable locations is available, in line with PPG13.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words ‘Therefore only’ in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: “Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations.”</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP196)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 1 should include a commitment to providing an adequate road network for Stafford town before new development occurs including the Sow Valley Link Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>

Seighford Settled Estate (DP172)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with Core Policy 1 and support for maximising use of brownfield land but this should also be permitted outside of towns and villages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: "Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations."</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP148)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the Guiding Principles in Core Policy 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Tetlow King Planning (DP98)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the Guiding Principles in Core Policy 1 but question the scope of delivering new housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Mr B Apps (DP79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about new retail and housing development on A34 at Stone impacting on traffic flows and undermining viability of the town centre. It should be noted that Eccleshall town centre floods and new development should address this issue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP16)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Core Policy 1 reference to out of centre retailing and maximising use of brownfield sites in order to protected greenfield land. Concern about the living space provided in new houses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council - Environmental & Health Service (DP1080)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with Core Policy 2 and should be supported by a rural affordable housing exception site policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP1051)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to Core Policy 2 not providing sufficient development of 550 new homes per year in line with the West Midland RS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for</li> </ul>

	<p>Examination Panel report. Key rural settlements to have amended Residential Development Boundaries to provide for new housing based on criteria regarding access for all, capacity of the local highway network and not adversely affecting residential amenity. Promoting land at Mill Lane, Great Haywood.</p>	<p>new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2</p>
<p>Seddon Homes (DP302)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to Core Policy 2 overall figure of 10,000 new dwellings to 2031, 500 new homes at Stone, phasing development at Stone later in the Plan period and only identifying one Strategic Development Location at Stone. Promoting land at Nicholls Lane, Trent Road and Newcastle Road, Stone.</li> <li>• Housing figure increased to 550 per year and include an allowance for the shortfall of 400 in recent years. Object to the apportionment of new housing with only 7% to Stone to be increased to 15% due to the town's economic and demographic profile. It is impractical to delay new housing delivery at Stone undermining developer confidence and increase the number of strategic sites identified. Other SHLAA sites to be considered in line with PPS1 and PPS3 to provide for future sustainable communities. A mix of sites to be provided to deliver new housing, with para 8.45 confirming insufficient land within Stone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to remove reference to phasing development at Stone.</li> <li>• Noted. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery. Further consideration of Stone Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Sites &amp; Allocations Development Plan Document. The three sites identified are not considered to be Strategic Development Locations.</li> </ul>
<p>Barwood Development Securities Ltd (DP1008)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to Core Policy 2 overall figure of 500 new homes per year to 2031, making insufficient provision at Stone, and phasing development at Stone later in the Plan period as not justified, increasing commuting patterns, not in line with the West Midlands RS Examination Panel, contrary to Draft NPPF approach and undermining delivery of homes to meet housing shortages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to remove reference to phasing development at Stone.</li> <li>• Noted. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery. Further consideration of Stone Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Sites &amp; Allocations Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>



<p>Maximus Strategic (DP864)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 2 amended to refer to separate housing provision to accommodate MoD requirements. 500 new dwellings per year for the general population.</li> <li>• A clearer strategy and apportionment for delivering housing requirement is needed across the Borough.</li> <li>• The first two sentences under Key Urban Centres heading of Core Policy 2 to be moved to under the Spatial Strategy heading as this refers to development at Stafford, Stone and the rural areas.</li> <li>• 500 new homes per year should exclude MoD provision in line with 2008 Household projection modelling of resident &amp; foreign armed forces as well as the West Midland RS Examination Panel Report.</li> <li>• Appendix A of the Draft Plan provides an apportionment figure for Stafford, Stone and rural areas which should be incorporated into the policy to improve monitoring and review of housing delivery.</li> <li>• Support the phasing approach of Strategic Development Locations favouring delivery to the north of Stafford in the short term due to constraints at the west and east with lack of evidence to show delivery in these locations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 sentences to reflect the Spatial Strategy and Key Urban Centres approach.</li> <li>• Agree to re-locate Appendix A to support Core Policy 2 in the main document and consider including the specific housing provision for Stafford, Stone and areas outside of Stafford &amp; Stone within the Policy</li> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
<p>Country Landowners Association (CLA) West Midlands (DP804)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern has been raised that the policy is unduly restrictive which could result in the fossilisation of rural areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
<p>Walton Homes (DP790)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that there is an over emphasis on strategic development locations within Stafford and Stone towns and no development allocated to main village settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

<p>Hixon Parish Council (DP787)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to further expansion of the RIEs in Hixon and requests that the Pasturefields boundary is redrawn to match existing line of Bri-Stor development</li> <li>• Requests more clarity for housing developments outside Stafford and Stone. Specifies that point 8.88 on page 70 is very vague</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 2 amended to clarify that boundary amendments will be considered through the Sites &amp; Allocations Development Plan Document.</li> <li>• Paragraph 8.88 delete sentence “depending on the number of new houses suggested to areas outside Stafford and Stone, it is considered that there is sufficient land available to provide for new requirements”</li> </ul>
<p>Stoke on Trent City Council (DP786)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern has been raised that the wording of Development management policy 15 would allow B1a office is anywhere in the plan area which would harm Stoke and Newcastle's Joint Core Strategy in relation to economic development.</li> <li>• Request that the Creda (Hadleigh Park) Site be retained as a major developed site within the green belt</li> <li>• Support the housing strategy in the Draft Publication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Development Management Policy 15 criteria a to exclude B1a offices.</li> <li>• Core Policy 18 amended to refer to Hadleigh Park (former Creda works Limited) Blythe Bridge and continue to identify as a Major Developed Site within the Green Belt.</li> </ul>
<p>Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council (DP782)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern has been raised that the wording of Development management policy 15 would allow B1a office is anywhere in the plan area which would harm Stoke and Newcastle's Joint Core Strategy in relation to economic development.</li> <li>• Request that the Creda (Hadleigh Park) Site be retained as a major developed site within the green belt</li> <li>• Support the housing strategy in the Draft Publication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Development Management Policy 15 criteria a. to exclude B1a offices.</li> <li>• Core Policy 18 amended to refer to Hadleigh Park (former Creda works Limited) Blythe Bridge and continue to identify as a Major Developed Site within the Green Belt.</li> </ul>
<p>Seighford Parish Council (DP562)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No development should be allowed to take place until the necessary infrastructure is in place.</li> <li>• Public transport services to rural areas should be increased and a park and ride facility should be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

<p>Hopton and Coton Parish Council (DP560)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The council does not agree that the quantum of new development is required</li> <li>• Development should not take place outside current RDBs to the north and east of Stafford Town, as it will affect greenfield areas and associated environmental degradation. Also would like to see north and eastern locations should be phased late in the plan period.</li> <li>• Concern has been raised in relation to traffic congestion</li> <li>• Any proposals should be of high quality and have a community feel and spirit within these developments along with the associated facilities such as community facilities, open spaces and greenfield areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to future master plans for Strategic Development Locations at Stafford in relation to proposed on-site facilities</li> <li>• Proposed transport improvements are set out in the Draft Stafford Borough Integrated Transport Strategy published by Staffordshire County Council.</li> </ul>
<p>Legal and General Life Fund Limited Partnership (DP551)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission promoting the former Creda site at Blythe Bridge for employment use. An indicative masterplan has been submitted with the representation.</li> <li>• Suggest that a Green Belt review should be undertaken and that the Creda site should be removed from the Green Belt</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. No amendments to Green Belt boundaries are proposed in the Core Strategy</li> </ul>
<p>Mr C G Maddox (DP405)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern has been raised that the proposed development at Raleigh Hall encroach on unspoilt countryside destroying prime farmland</li> <li>• Site access will require major infrastructure provision</li> <li>• There are still unused sites on the present industrial estate and some of the units are not fully utilised</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Core Policies 9 and 23 relate to landscaping and good design.</li> </ul>
<p>Strawsons Property (DP310)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representations being made in relation to outstanding allocation T2 adjacent to the M6 Jn 14 for a mixed use development in a future Site-specific Policies &amp; Allocations Development Plan Document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. To be added to the SHLAA if the site fails to get planning permission for the proposed mixed-use scheme.</li> </ul>

<p>Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP138)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern has been raised that the single combined housing figure will not take account of the military housing requirement, thereby preventing the development of Service Family Accommodation (SFA) should the Borough's housing requirement be met through other developments.</li> <li>• A separate housing figure for military housing should be provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> </ul>
<p>St. Modwen Developments (DP1018)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern has been raised that the proposed housing numbers fail to take account of the 2008 household projections.</li> <li>• There should be a separate figure for military housing over and above existing provision</li> <li>• The overall supply of new housing should be increased to increase the supply of affordable housing and to support the delivery of new infrastructure.</li> <li>• The plan should review current settlement boundaries within villages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> <li>• Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>

<p>English Heritage (DP882)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern has been raised that there is insufficient support for the sustainable use and re use of historic farmsteads across the Borough</li> <li>• The West Midlands Historic Farmsteads and Landscapes project evidence base and supporting tools offer a locally tailored approach to the conversion of rural buildings across the Borough</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 10 by adding “This should be assessed in the context of the character and significance of the farmstead, its sensitivity in terms of landscape setting and its potential for change. Proposals should have regard to the West Midlands Farmstead and Landscapes Project or successor documents when making such assessments.”</li> <li>• Amend paragraph 8.109 and Core Policy 24 to include reference to the West Midlands Historic Farmsteads and landscapes project.</li> </ul>
<p>Natural England (DP842)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern has been raised about development location to the east of Stafford Town and the associated road improvements due to its proximity to the SAC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
<p>Grainger Plc (DP796)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection has been raised that there is an undue focus on Stafford and Stone towns and very limited development to rural villages to maintain local services and facilities.</li> <li>• Concerns raised that without some market led development there will be limited affordable housing as developments within boundaries are typically below the affordable housing threshold. This will thus increase affordability problems in these areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Core Policy 2 specifies that new development in rural areas will be through the neighbourhood planning process or the Site-specific Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>
<p>Haughton Parish Council (DP758)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support shown for the spatial strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

<p>McDyre and Co for J F Bostock and Co (DP630)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the word minor should be deleted under sub heading Existing towns and villages</li> <li>• Concern has been raised that leaving development to neighbourhood may result in no development even where there is a clear need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the word ‘minor’ in Core Policy 2. Following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>
<p>Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP611)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response specifying that Stafford West should be delivered first.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove phasing references in Core Policy 2.</li> </ul>
<p>Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP609)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the level of new housing should be 550 per year as set out in the RSS panel report and an additional 1,000 for returning military personnel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery</li> </ul>
<p>Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP556)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that more growth should be directed at Eccleshall through RDB amendments as it has a large range of services and facilities</li> <li>• Concerned that the over reliance on larger sites could increase delivery risk</li> <li>• The plan should adopt a wider definition of sustainable development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
<p>Berkswich Parish Council (DP471)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Councils should be fully consulted where there are proposals to accommodate gypsies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

Mr Thomas for Fisher German (DP458)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that land north of the Crescent, Doxey is included in development site to the west of Stafford Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document</li> </ul>
Mandy Steward Bowdler (DP440)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that some limited development should be allowed to spill over outside current RDBs as reliance on neighbourhood planning and site specific allocation is wholly inadequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP438)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision for gypsies and military personnel should be over and above the existing provision.</li> <li>• Stone should not be phased later in the plan period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> <li>• Noted and remove phasing references in Core Policy 2</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP567)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with the strategy but specifies that there should be consultation with South Staffordshire District regarding land south of Stafford for future development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree amendments to Key Objective 11 referring to the land south of Stafford.</li> </ul>

Fisher German for the Inglewood Investment Company Ltd (DP434)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern has been raised that the absence of future development options on the edge of villages will hamper delivery of affordable housing and funding for local facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd (DP417)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that the housing number should be that set out by the RSS panel report and that a separate housing figure for the military and gypsies should be provided</li> <li>Agree that Stafford is the main focus for development, as it is the most sustainable settlement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1 site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> </ul>
Mr J Power (DP56)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that such large scale housing at Stone is necessary.</li> <li>Steps should be taken to ensure that the town's character is retained whilst building large numbers of new houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and refer to household projections.</li> <li>Landscaping and good design is required through Core Policy 23.</li> </ul>
Bellway Homes (DP408)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that key rural settlements can deliver growth over the plan period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and remove the word 'minor' in Core Policy 2. Following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>
Providence Land Limited (DP395)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that there should be RDB amendments to facilitate housing growth in rural areas to maintain existing services and facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>



Mr J Holt (DP287)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be greater distinction between settlements in the hierarchy</li> <li>• Suggested that RDBs be amended at Eccleshall to provide more housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core policy 21 for town centre hierarchy.</li> <li>• Following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP359)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that household population projections have not been fully taken account of in drawing up housing numbers.</li> <li>• Concerned that military personnel are not reflected in household projections</li> <li>• Suggest increasing the volume of market is necessary to deliver the required supply of affordable housing.</li> <li>• Suggest that growth in housing should be 600 per year going forward as completion rates have decreased below 500 per year due to economic down turn.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> </ul>
Mr M Lunn (DP298)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the RDBs should be made to enable smaller housing units to be built</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>
Strawsons Property (DP315)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with the spatial strategy for the Borough</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr G Benn (DP284)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The addition of a dial a ride service would help many occupants in rural areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

Sport England (DP199)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan fails to address the infrastructure requirements derived from the Sports England facilitator calculator.</li> <li>• Account should be taken on the requirement for new facilities on each of the SDLs</li> <li>• The strategy needs to recognise the important role of the countryside in recreation and sport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to amendments in Core Policies 3, 7, 9 &amp; 26.</li> </ul>
Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd (DP251)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the reference to 8 hectares of employment land is too restrictive and that any constraint on employment provision should be removed from the core strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP197)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the spatial strategy provided that all areas outside RDBs are classified as countryside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP153)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that RDBs could be amended where there is local support and interest through the neighbourhood planning process.</li> <li>• Suggest that the rural exceptions policy should only be applicable to residents of Eccleshall parish</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery</li> </ul>
Tetlow King Planning (DP99)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the figure for returning military personnel and gypsies and travellers should be in addition to the 500 dwellings per year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery. Development Management Policy 15 makes provision for gypsies and travellers</li> </ul>

Rev A Jeffries (DP17)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to such large numbers of housing being built in Stafford and surrounding areas.</li> <li>• Considers that rural exceptions housing should be only for those involved in farming, forestry and rural based enterprise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr J Power (DP57)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries whether sustainable growth can be facilitated in a manner that reflects the character and role of each settlement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP442)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to only one Strategic Development Location being located in Stone</li> <li>• Object to phased delivery of Stone in the later part of the plan period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> <li>• Noted and remove phasing references in Core Policy 2</li> </ul>
A Kratz (DP333)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagrees that substantial new housing development will be required over the plan period</li> <li>• Suggests that most new houses will be occupied by commuters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> </ul>
Farmery (DP332)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries the scale of growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> </ul>
A Kratz (DP351)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries whether Stafford will grow this much and whether there will be the employment to sustain the number of new households</li> <li>• Queries whether public sector employment will provide substantial future employment given that the public sector is undergoing considerable restructuring.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> </ul>
Mr B Seville (DP76)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that each site should have designated boundaries to prevent greenfield encroachment.</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be more housing to the south to enable easier access to the M6 as opposed to north and east developments which will create more traffic congestion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The supporting text to Core Policies 4, 5, 6 &amp; 8 include boundary maps for the Strategic Development Locations.</li> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>

Mr G Lotay (DP459)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that increased housing and employment will increase traffic congestion without substantial infrastructure improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
Mrs G Langlois (DP35)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries the need to build additional housing land on agricultural land when there are many empty houses and insufficient jobs to sustain them</li> <li>• Suggests that more house building will have significant traffic implications for existing road infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Add reference to quantity of empty homes in the Borough of over 6 months (para 2.13)</li> <li>• Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy concerning new schemes</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the quantity of new homes for Stafford Town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Farmery (DP334)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that some of the Stafford town allocation should be in South Staffordshire District rather than being discounted just because it's in a different administrative area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree amendments to Key Objective 11 referring to the land south of Stafford</li> </ul>
Mr C Hall (DP365)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the proposed employment allocation on Newport road would undermine the role of the town centre and damage the amenity of residential properties through activities associated with employment uses</li> <li>• Housing proposals should be limited to brownfield land and not encroach on greenfield land at Burleyfields</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Noted but no change</li> </ul>

A Kratz (DP344)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries the evidence in the document requiring more housing</li> <li>• Objects to the employment location at the current rugby club</li> <li>• Development should be on brownfield first</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted but no change</li> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point and include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: "Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations."</li> </ul>
Farmery (DP335)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries why development to the East is not linked to the implementation of the full eastern access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy concerning new schemes</li> </ul>
Dr J Essex (DP116)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More development at Burleyfields will increase traffic congestion in Doxey at peak times, which will make the lives of residents more difficult.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy concerning new schemes</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP443)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries the statement that the west of stone is more deliverable than the east as development to the east would require bridging of the west coast main line</li> <li>• Suggests that a modest sized development at Aston Lodge Park of 100 dwellings would be deliverable without bridging the west coast mainline.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr R Meyers (DP150)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the strategy in relation to no development to the east of Stone due to access difficulties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Mr F Biard (DP64)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The level of new housing is too low for Stone and will create affordability problems in the future; thus driving locals out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr J Pert (DP527)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that greater detail should be available for the 1,000 houses to be delivered in the rural areas at some future consultation as these could have substantial impact on local communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>
Mr F Biard (DP65)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the provision of 1,000 houses in the rural areas but suggests that it could be higher to meet demand in light of provision of housing in these areas in recent years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>
Mrs G Langlois (DP37)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries whether the existing millennium way will be as attractive for walkers and cyclists if is routed through a large housing estate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr J Power (DP58)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries how the council is going to engage with local communities before any development takes place as the document fails to take account of local views or needs of existing residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Mr J Holt (DP301)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that amendments to existing RDBs in rural areas for sustainable settlements outlined in the SHLAA should be considered in the core strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>

Rev A Jeffries (DP19)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be no amendments to local boundaries unless there is an identified local need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd (DP252)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the allocation at Ladfordfields for new employment development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mrs G Langlois (DP36)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries the sustainability of making an allocation for new employment in Ladfordfields. New employment development needs to be in towns so it is accessible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs Summers (DP1073)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the road infrastructure is inadequate for current traffic, particularly HGVs, and that the suggested improvements will not cater for increased traffic</li> <li>• Concerned that the proposed development will damage their rural outlook and reduce their property value</li> <li>• Suggest that they should receive benefits that result in being part of a town</li> <li>• Queries whether developers will be required to improve / provide services to the adjacent existing properties</li> <li>• Suggest that the RDB should encompass their property</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy concerning new schemes</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> <li>• Developers will be required to provide infrastructure and / or improve existing infrastructure through CIL / S106.</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mrs C Edgecomb (DP1069)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the road infrastructure is inadequate for current traffic, particularly HGVs, and that the suggested improvements will not cater for increased traffic</li> <li>• Concerned that the proposed development will damage their rural outlook and reduce their property value</li> <li>• Suggest that they should receive benefits that result in being part of a town</li> <li>• Queries whether developers will be required to improve/ provide services to the adjacent existing properties</li> <li>• Suggest that the RDB should encompass their property</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy concerning new schemes</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> <li>• Developers will be required to provide infrastructure and / or improve existing infrastructure through CIL / S106.</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

A Kelly (DP1068)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the road infrastructure is inadequate for current traffic, particularly HGVs, and that the suggested improvements will not cater for increased traffic</li> <li>• Concerned that the proposed development will damage their rural outlook and reduce their property value</li> <li>• Suggest that they should receive benefits that result in being part of a town</li> <li>• Queries whether developers will be required to improve/ provide services to the adjacent existing properties</li> <li>• Suggest that the RDB should encompass their property</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy concerning new schemes</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> <li>• Developers will be required to provide infrastructure and / or improve existing infrastructure through CIL / S106.</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP999)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the Borough produce a Supplementary Planning Document for trees and development to ensure that adequate protection is given to these ecological, amenity and visual assets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council – Environmental & Health Service (DP1081)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that reference is included to a diverse night time economy and ensure adequate provision for taxis through appropriate taxi places</li> <li>• Specifies that key transport links must supplement development and not add to congestion</li> <li>• Adequate car parking must be included in Stafford Town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amendment to Core Policy 3</li> <li>• Noted. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy concerning new schemes</li> <li>• Refer to car parking standards in Appendix B</li> </ul>
John Chivers Commercial (DP1067)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the land to the east of Stafford town is dependent of the delivery of the eastern distributor road</li> <li>• Suggests that allocation sites should be spread around the town and be of a scale that can be more easily implemented</li> <li>• Promoting a site at Ashflats Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP977)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that Archives and Libraries, and the Museum and Shire Hall gallery are included in the list of tourism attractions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 22, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point</li> </ul>



<p>English Heritage (DP884)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 3 amended to read “archaeological interest and historic street pattern, and encouraging the sustainable use and management of heritage assets and their appreciation and enjoyment”.</li> <li>• Add a new bullet point to read “Ensure high quality and well designed new buildings respect the character of the townscape and skyline and conserve sightlines to historic buildings and their setting”</li> <li>• In para 8.18 the term heritage asset should be used as opposed to historic environment asset</li> <li>• Suggest that reference is made to the Extensive Urban Survey in the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 3 amendments as set out.</li> <li>• Amend paragraph 8.18 to refer to heritage assets</li> <li>• Core Policy 3 to make reference to the Extensive Urban Survey.</li> </ul>
<p>Westgate Solar Control (DP858)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested sites for consideration on Homestead Court and on the corner of Verulam and St Albans Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and include sites within the SHLAA</li> </ul>
<p>Environment Agency (DP825)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider including reference to Kingsmead and Riverside schemes in the Sustainability Appraisal with sustainable design solutions.</li> <li>• Indicate that the eastern and western improvement schemes should be compliant with the sequential test.</li> <li>• Suggest that there may be an opportunity to provide new flood defences to commercial properties in the Greyfriars area and residential properties along Doxey Road; thus this should be considered as a part of wider community benefit as part of the proposed new road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<p>Walton Homes (DP791)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to Core Policy 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

<p>Transition Town Stafford (DP776)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with the provision of 10,000 new homes over the plan period</li> <li>• Queries why 2 -3 bedroomed housing is not more explicitly mentioned</li> <li>• Suggests that long term there should be more housing in villages for them to remain viable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Amend supporting text to Core policy 18 to refer to requirements for 2 &amp; 3 bedroomed housing.</li> <li>• Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>
<p>British Waterways (DP680)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal towpaths be considered for recreation activities such as walking and cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend paragraph 8.12 to refer to canal towpaths as recreational areas for walking and cycling.</li> </ul>
<p>Ranton Parish Council (DP655)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the River Sow is becoming choked with weeds which impacts on the rivers ability to take away flood water as well as the visual appearance of the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
<p>Transition Town Stafford (DP433)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries how increasing and enhancing the provision of educational, health and community facilities for increased growth including for the elderly population can be achieved in the current economic climate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 11 on Community Infrastructure Levy / S106.</li> </ul>

<p>Transition Town Stafford (DP370)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries how housing sites within the urban area of Stafford can have good accessibility when the necessary transport infrastructure is not present</li> <li>• Queries why so much development is necessary in Stafford Town centre when existing units are vacant</li> <li>• Queries how a diverse range of service can be delivered in the town centre in the prevailing economic climate.</li> <li>• Suggests that a park and ride facility should be implemented as well as a new bus station</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be more emphasis on sustainable transport means such as buses, more cycling lanes and appropriate parking measures near transportation hubs such as the rail station.</li> <li>• Suggests that more real time information should be available for buses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy concerning new schemes.</li> <li>• Add reference to quantity of empty homes in the Borough of over 6 months (para 2.13)</li> <li>• Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery</li> <li>• Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy concerning new schemes</li> </ul>
<p>Hyde Lea Parish Council (DP406)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify that no new development should be undertaken unless the necessary infrastructure is in place</li> <li>• The reduction in car parking spaces in the town centre should be compensated by the introduction of a park and ride facility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Refer to Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the new Core Policy 11.</li> <li>• Noted. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy concerning new schemes.</li> </ul>
<p>Seddon Homes Limited (DP403)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the annual housing target should be increased 550 in line with the RSS and an allowance made to provide for any shortfall between the years 2006-2011</li> <li>• Promoting the Aston farm site as a strategic site</li> <li>• Suggests that smaller sites would better integrate with existing communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document</li> </ul>

Sport England (DP220)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries why the section on sports and recreation does not address the need for indoor sports facilities, artificial turf pitches and playing pitches.</li> <li>• Queries why the Stafford Town Centre section makes no reference to additional sports facilities</li> <li>• Requires clarification whether the new Stafford Common Community Park will have any role in providing sports facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to amendments in Core Policy 3.</li> </ul>
The Theatres Trust (DP240)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the town centre section does not reflect PPS 4 with regard to the evening economy nor the importance of cultural facilities</li> <li>• Suggests that theatres and performing arts facilities should be given protection to ensure that they are continually used as performance spaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Dr and Mrs S and P Dasgupta (DP223)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the necessary infrastructure (roads, public services, health and schools) will not be capable of sustaining such large increases in housing</li> <li>• Concerned that the designated employment area along Newport Road is unnecessary given that a large proportion of existing sites are vacant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy.</li> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> </ul>
Mrs J Ashford (DP183)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees that the Northern and Eastern direction of growth would have limited impact on traffic and could be accommodated with minor infrastructure improvements</li> <li>• Expresses concern about the Western direction of growth and the possible traffic implications for local residents.</li> <li>• Suggests that the Southern direction of growth would be more appropriate location for future development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy concerning new schemes and the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy.</li> </ul>

Mr G Hancox (DP151)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there is no justification for the level of housing growth proposed.</li> <li>• Suggests that any brownfield must be used up first before greenfield is encroached upon</li> <li>• Concerned that there will be inadequate employment levels to support such housing number increases</li> <li>• Specifies that the town's road infrastructure will not cope with any more cars.</li> <li>• Suggests that better and cheaper public transport, improved cycle lanes as well as a bus stations is needed to entice people out of their cars</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 1 to remove the words 'Therefore only' in the last bullet point</li> <li>• Refer to the Stafford Borough Employment Land Review 2010 and proposed allocations.</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP139)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at the inclusion of a single housing figure for military and non-military personnel</li> <li>• Welcomes the support of the Council for MOD Stafford</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> </ul>
Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd (DP39)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the encouragement given to development of Stafford Town centre</li> <li>• Suggest amending bullet point 4 to begin with 'Strengthen'.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Amend Core Policy 3, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point to replace consolidated with strengthened.</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support that the main focus of development is on Stafford town</li> <li>• Object to land north of Stafford Town</li> <li>• Suggest that amendments should be made that specify some development could be delivered in the west through existing infrastructure and localised improvements.</li> <li>• Suggest that the western access improvement scheme should be recognised as a strategic scheme delivering wider improvements to the town and district.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

Staffordshire County Council (DP978)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that any development at Kingsmead should take into account any potential impacts on the Local nature reserve</li> <li>• The western access improvement scheme should build in protection of the Doxey and Tillington marshes SSSI and incorporate reinstatement of past damage to the site</li> <li>• Suggested amendment under transport and access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted with appropriate mitigation measures to be considered as part of the Western Access Improvement scheme.</li> <li>• Amend Core Policy 3 Transport and Access section 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point to remove the words ‘that have significant transport implications’</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP917)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the quantum of development for Stafford town but consider the MOD as an addition</li> <li>• Support the option to the North of Stafford town whilst concerned is expressed that some commitments in the town centre may not be completed</li> <li>• Concern expressed about the deliverability of schemes to the east and west</li> <li>• Concern raised that tourist opportunities should exclude the Cannock Chase AONB as it would conflict with Core Policy 15 &amp; 16</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP857)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the support for sustainable transport alternatives to the private car</li> <li>• Propose that the environment and tourism section are separated out into two sections</li> <li>• Support the references to Cannock Chase SAC and GI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 3 with sections - Tourism and Environment</li> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

<p>McDyre and Co for Mr G Edwards (DP753)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the 1,000 homes required for returning personnel should be an addition</li> <li>• The location of the Strategic Development Location to the North of Stafford creates a spatial imbalance</li> <li>• Promotes SHLAA site at Old Croft Hill, Walton on the Hill</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> <li>• Noted. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>
<p>McDyre and Co for J F Bostock Settlement (DP633)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the 1,000 homes required for returning personnel should be an addition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> </ul>
<p>Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St. Modwen (DP616)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that employment in the west will focus on new services to the new community in the form of local facilities, schools and services such as shops.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. To be considered through the strategic framework and master planning process for Burleyfields.</li> </ul>
<p>Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St. Modwen (DP615)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify that development of open space at Stafford cannot be expected to make up for existing shortfall in open space provision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
<p>Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St. Modwen (DP614)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifies that the provision of the western access improvement scheme will provide substantial wider benefits to the town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>

Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St. Modwin (DP613)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that the housing number should be increased to 6,371 houses for Stafford Town plus accommodation for returning military personnel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP542)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support environmental objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Mr J Pert (DP528)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that there should be a priority ranking order for different types of sports and recreation facilities, so that effective targeting can help deliver the planned schemes to the areas of most need.</li> <li>Suggests that buses should stop at the railway station to help facilitate integrated transport and transport plans better</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy.</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP488)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest there is a degree of inconsistency in promoting Cannock Chase as a tourist destination with other policies to limit recreation</li> <li>Queries how viable some of the town centre schemes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 15, 16 &amp; 22 related to Cannock Chase AONB</li> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP472)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest improvements could be made to allotments, children's play areas and provide for more specialist housing</li> <li>Query on who will fund improvements</li> <li>Query why there is no reference to St Chad's Church</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>Core Policy 3 add reference to St Chad's church in the Tourism section</li> </ul>
Fisher German for Mr Thomas (DP460)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that land north of Doxey crescent should be included in land west of Stafford</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Site is included in the SHLAA. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>



Mr J Lefroy MP (DP568)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with the development strategy for Stafford town provided the necessary infrastructure is in place to support such developments</li> <li>• Suggests that para 8.2 should be amended to take account of the need to encourage retired military personnel to settle within the borough as many have high levels of technical expertise.</li> <li>• Suggests that para 8.2 should encourage extra care housing to be built close to existing community facilities so residents can take a full and active role in community life.</li> <li>• Suggests provision should be made for step down beds within the plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend para 8.2 to refer to retired military personnel</li> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Mr R Oldfield (DP427)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be greater adaptation of existing housing stock rather than building more houses</li> <li>• Specifies that the plan should have more emphasis on the green economy</li> <li>• Indicates that roads should be scrapped as road traffic contributes to global warming.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> <li>• Noted and refer to Development Management Policy 2.</li> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 26 and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy.</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd (DP418)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support that the 500 dwelling per year is not a maximum but also suggest that 5,500 for Stafford town should be expressed as a minimum.</li> <li>• Support identification of land north of Stafford for further housing development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Providence Land Limited (DP396)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that land should be released in local service centres to support local services and facilities as delays will inevitably occur in delivering such large scale infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

Farmery (DP337)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries the accuracy in relation to the demand for 10,000 new houses and the delivery necessary infrastructure to support them</li> <li>• Queries the long term commitment of the MoD to staying in Stafford and beyond the plan period</li> <li>• Queries the use of the 2001 census data as much of it is out of date</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Strawsons Property (DP316)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests amendment under bullet point 4 to insert “enhanced local service provision” and “mixed use developments” to impart greater flexibility to the policy.</li> <li>• Agrees with issue specific core policies but would like to see an amendment to Demand Management Policy 21 to include “the scale of the development and the size of the individual units comprising are appropriate for its location and the need it is meeting”</li> <li>• Suggest that the size threshold in the last paragraph is too low</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP221)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the policy should accurately reflect the requirements for community infrastructure that arises from additional growth.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Community requirements to be determined through the planning application stage.</li> </ul>

<p>Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP198)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the Eastern Access Improvement scheme be replaced by the Sow Valley link as the current scheme will only shift traffic congestion to Tixall road and the Sow bridges.</li> <li>• Query where the allotments will be located on the eastern side of Stafford Borough</li> <li>• Concern raised about the increased congestion levels that would accrue from additional housing in the East of Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggest that there should be more car parking spaces in town to attract out of town shoppers</li> <li>• Suggest that improving access to the countryside through means other than the private car will require additional paths and bridleways.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
<p>Rev A Jeffries (DP20)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that transport issues have not been adequately addressed</li> <li>• Suggest bus services are improved and a bus station is built</li> <li>• Suggests that most of those coming to Stafford town to shop will be by private car</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
<p>Mr J Holt (DP303)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that there is undue focus on Stafford Town for new housing and that other settlements such as Eccleshall could provide more housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
<p>Farmery (DP338)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries whether previous editions of Land for New Homes are available for 2009 and 2010</li> <li>• Queries when the SHLAA will be available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Refer to Stafford Borough web pages for the current Land for New Homes and SHLAA and archive editions.</li> </ul>

Rev A Jeffries (DP21)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that if housing numbers were more realistic, housing would not be required on greenfields</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: "Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations."</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP22)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers that new housing is not required given that Stafford is the worst performing authority in relation employment change.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr R Oldfield (DP500)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries the use of sustainability throughout the document as sustainability and economic growth on the conventional model are contradictory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but no change</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to development on greenfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Include a new sentence to Core Policy 2 to read: "Given the amount of development required in Stafford Borough over the Plan period it will be necessary to allocate greenfield land as there is in sufficient previously developed land available in sustainable locations."</li> </ul>
Farmery (DP339)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries whether students really stay in the area after they graduate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Refer to para 8.10 regarding graduate retention.</li> </ul>

Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP140)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the paragraph in relation to the MOD in Stafford but suggests a number of changes are made to paragraph 8.11.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend paragraph as follows : “Beacon Barracks / MOD Stafford is a core site which will be retained for military purposes and is the preferred location for two Signal Regiments returning from Germany. Stafford Borough Council and the MOD will continue to work in close partnership to ensure that future development links in with existing local communities. There are no plans to release any of the MOD land for other uses.”</li> </ul>
Environment Agency (DP826)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that para 8.12 is amended to take account of the promotion of wider river corridors to promote stronger corridors for habitats.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend para 8.12 to read “Green infrastructure and the enhancement of natural river corridors provides opportunity for stronger corridors for habitats.”</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs Dugmore (DP720)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the map of GI does not take account of the woodland on top of Beacon Hill</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP543)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GI map for Stafford Borough is unclear as it has no key to the shaded areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Key to map in the right hand column. Amend title of map to read ‘Stafford town’ not Stafford Borough.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP222)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that para 8.12 should be cross referenced to PPG 17 assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend para 8.12 to cross reference to PPG 17 assessment.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP224)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the content of para 8.13 but more details of the provision needs to be accurately articulated on an area basis to take account of growth in demand arising from housing development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend para 8.13 to refer to destination parks.</li> </ul>

Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP544)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specify that a slight amendment need to be made as Staffordshire Wildlife Trust Ltd carried out the ecological survey</li> <li>Suggest that more detailed site surveys be carried out on site and that ecological survey was just a starting point.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend para 8.14 for clarification</li> <li>Noted. Refer to site specific ecological and species surveys / studies by developers.</li> </ul>
St Modwen (DP1020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that the town centre boundary should be extended to include Sainsbury's and land north of Sainsbury's as it forms part of the primary shopping area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP546)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that it would be helpful to extend the town centre boundaries to other shopping areas as these could be visually improved in terms of their landscaping.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP491)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with town centre boundaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP569)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agrees with the Town centre boundaries and development sites identified as these will enhance the economy of the town centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Mr F Biard (DP66)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that the town centre boundary is too tightly drawn and the boundary should recognise that Tesco, Asda and Sainsbury's are within the town centre</li> <li>Suggests that Greyfriars is effectively within the town centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Amend para 8.22 to refer to the Stafford &amp; Stone Town Centre Capacity Assessment for justification of the town centre boundary.</li> </ul>
Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (DP40)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that Sainsbury's be part of the town centre boundary and the primary shopping area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Amend para 8.22 to refer to the Stafford &amp; Stone Town Centre Capacity Assessment for justification of the town centre boundary.</li> </ul>

Rev A Jeffries (DP24)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries where the new car parking is going to be located if the new town centre developments remove all of the existing town centre parking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the detailed planning applications for Stafford Town Centre developments, particularly additional car parking spaces at Bridge Street and Kingsmead.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP25)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the Local Transport Plan (LTP) will not achieve the desired modal shift as the population is aging rapidly there are less likely to pursue more sustainable modes of transport is unrealistic particularly from walking or cycling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy and Staffordshire County Council cycling strategy.</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs Dugmore (DP725)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the employment and housing sites to the east of Stafford town are too far apart to facilitate easy commuting by sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling</li> <li>• Concern has been raised that the transportation improvements will be inadequate to cope with the increased congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> <li>• Noted. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP26)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries why we need more town centre retail units if the aim is to reduce the need to travel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP545)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest an amendment to para 8.30 that large numbers of impermeable surfaces could be replaced with permeable alternatives, retrofitting Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) as well as rainwater harvesting from roofs.</li> <li>• Suggests that new developments should reduce water run off and demand by including rainwater harvesting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 13 and explanatory text. Further information in the Water Cycle Study and Surface Water Management Plan evidence.</li> </ul>
Farmery (DP340)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries whether storage capacity and the sewerage system is associated with all the suggested locations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy.</li> </ul>

Farmery (DP341)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries how and when new schools will be funded</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy.</li> </ul>
Sports England (DP225)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that school sports facilities are utilised outside of normal school hours to meet growing community needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and make amendment to paragraph 8.32 to refer to use of school facilities outside normal school hours for the benefit of the whole community.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP980)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the second last bullet point Core Policies 4, 5 and 6 be amended to include the following paragraph “An access, transport and travel plan strategy for the Strategic Development Location that maximises travel and accessibility by non-car transport modes via safe, attractive and conveniently designed street, pedestrian and cycling connections within the development and to Stafford town centre, nearby existing and new employment areas. The strategy shall identify access points to the site and between the site and the existing settlement. It shall also identify construction access arrangements that do not disrupt existing residents and improvements to transport capacity along the A34, A513 Beaconside Road and the Redhill roundabout”</li> <li>• Suggest that amendment is made to Core Policies 4, 5 and 6 to include the following in the context of manual for Streets “ There will be an interconnected network of streets serving the development producing discernable and distinctive neighbourhoods and places integrated and linked to existing areas”</li> <li>• Suggest that tariffs in the final paragraph is replaced by S106 / Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contribution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to include relevant amendments to Core Policies 4, 5, 6 &amp; 8 suggested by Staffordshire County Council</li> <li>• Noted and agree to include relevant amendments to Core Policies 4, 5, 6 &amp; 8 suggested by Staffordshire County Council</li> <li>• Noted and agree to include relevant amendments to Core Policies 4, 5, 6 &amp; 8 suggested by Staffordshire County Council Refer to re-worded policy and section on Community Infrastructure Levy / S106</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP979)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the inclusion of options for proposed lorry park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>



<p>Maximus Strategic (DP918)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support inclusion of land north of Stafford for 3,800</li> <li>• Suggest that land north of Stafford Town can be delivered without significant new infrastructure as set out in the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy</li> <li>• Concern that there is very little reasoning for the reduction in the housing number from 3,000 in the Issues and Options to the level in the Draft Publication</li> <li>• Object to a comprehensive master planning approach to the North of Stafford</li> <li>• Object to the last paragraph of this policy in relation to the development tariff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li>   <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policies 4, 5, 6 &amp; 8 to delete the tariff reference. Refer to re-worded policy and section on Community Infrastructure Levy / S106</li> </ul>
<p>Natural England (DP843)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that visitor usage to the Site of Biological Interest (SBI) in the north of Stafford be assessed to establish effect of the proposed housing and to assess the indirect of these proposals on the Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</li> <li>• Specify that an assessment of the capacity of the SBI should inform decisions about the character and extent of open/green space provision.</li> <li>• Welcome the standards / criteria that each strategic site will be required to achieve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and further information to be provided by developers including at the planning permission stage.</li> </ul>
<p>Environment Agency (DP827)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome reference to surface water management to alleviate downstream flooding risk</li> <li>• Recommend para 8.36 reworded to the following “major flood flow attenuation measures both on and off line will be required...”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend para 8.36</li> </ul>
<p>Ranton Parish Council (DP656)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that the best site for development is in the north of Stafford as it has all of the necessary infrastructure in place</li> <li>• An integrated neighbourhood approach is the best solution for developing the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Sport England (DP226)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries whether existing facilities have the capacity to absorb the additional demand from the proposed houses</li> <li>• Queries why there is no reference to indoor sports or artificial turf pitches or why no mechanism is available in the S106 / CIL policy to achieve the requirement for more sports facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and make amendment to paragraph 8.32 to refer to use of school facilities outside normal school hours for the benefit of the whole community. Detailed provision to be delivered through the planning application.</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs Buss (DP264)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about removal of productive land for housing</li> <li>• Concern about increased effect traffic congestion in Beaconside area if more housing goes ahead</li> <li>• The new housing will damage the rural aspect of Hopton</li> <li>• Suggest that greater consideration should be given to non agricultural land for new housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP141)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land north of Stafford will fully enclose the MOD 4site. No significant objections but wish to be informed about development progress to protect MOD interests and operations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs R H & J M Bennett (DP1105)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that more development in the north will increase traffic congestion and pollution</li> <li>• Concern about the loss of good quality agricultural land</li> <li>• Suggest that brownfield development should be utilised before greenfield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1021)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to land north of Stafford as it extends the urban envelope into open countryside and will have an adverse effect on the setting of the County Town</li> <li>• Concern that the land is too remote from the town centre and main services and infrastructure.</li> <li>• Concern that north of Stafford is not supporting any wider infrastructure improvements for the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP558)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for development north of Stafford Borough Council</li> <li>• Suggest that Cannock Chase AONB mitigation will be ineffective and could lead to unnecessary infrastructure costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP474)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries the necessity of a HGV park at the north end of Stafford.</li> <li>• Suggests that steps will need to be taken to alleviate flooding problems associated with Marston and Sandyford Brook</li> <li>• Queries how much the development industry will contribute to local service provision given the current economic climate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP570)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the land north of Stafford as a suitable and sustainable location subject to the necessary infrastructure provision</li> <li>• Suggests that a clearly defined limit on the new development is incorporated into the plan to limit future encroachment into the open countryside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Salt and Enson Parish Council (DP559)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the land north of Stafford but concerned over the scale of the development and the resultant traffic congestion that will accrue from it</li> <li>• Concern that insufficient detail has been supplied regarding traffic issues and site accessibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy. Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd (DP419)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the inclusion of land north of Stafford but suggest that the number of houses should be increased</li> <li>• Object to the exclusion of the eastern portion on Akzo Nobel UK land</li> <li>• Suggests that locations to the east and west of Stafford are not deliverable</li> <li>• Object to a comprehensive master planning approach as well as the need for a SPD and design statements to be agreed by the Council.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

Farmery (DP342)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries why the joining of the two northern developments have not been explored</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP200)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify that the land north of Stafford is suitable for development as the necessary road infrastructure already exists with good links to the M6 and Stafford town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Cllr Winkle (DP84)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that Beaconside road will pose a major barrier to integration between Parkside communities and communities to the north.</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a bypass to the north of any new housing developments</li> <li>• Concerns that new housing should not overlook existing Parkside residents</li> <li>• Suggests that the site should contain services and facilities such as schools, shops and a health centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy. Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Mr F Biard (DP67)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned what affect major housing will have on Marston and Sandyford Brook</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy.</li> </ul>
Mr P Basford (DP33)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to development on the basis that it will increase transport congestion and further specifies that the area does not have the necessary facilities to accommodate such large growth.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP27)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes greenfield development</li> <li>• Concerned that more development will result in more traffic congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy.</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP374)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about increased traffic congestion if more houses are built to the north of the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>

Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP547)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that Green Infrastructure needs to be shown on the map and that ecological surveys will be needed for the allocated sites.</li> <li>• Suggests that compensation and enhancement of habitats should be included within any habitat restoration and creation within and around sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and further information to be provided by developers on relevant studies including at the planning permission stage.</li> </ul>
Mr K Lancaster (DP617)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that proposals are not justified</li> <li>• Objects to the proposed employment allocation at the Rugby club as there are other areas, such as the Castleworks site that would be more suitable</li> <li>• Considers that the quantum of housing is not required nor is there any evidence to support such housing demand.</li> <li>• Concern expressed about increased traffic congestion on the roads should western development take place</li> <li>• Suggests that brownfield should be development before greenfield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
Mr A Eaton (DP1117)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

Mrs G Hughes (DP1116)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Mrs P Bowyer (DP956)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs J & L Thompson and Parry (DP880)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

Mr H E Lloyd (DP954)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
F Caddick (DP1108)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Stafford Bowling Club (DP1115)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that the outline for the current employment allocation on Stafford rugby club encroaches on the Stafford Bowling Club car park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> </ul>

Cllr I Davies (DP1112)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise</li> </ul>
Mr J Caddick (DP1109)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council - Conservation Officer (DP1106)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the Western direction of growth would seriously impact on the significance of Stafford Castle in terms of its historical setting and context</li> <li>• Suggest that an initial assessment of the contribution of the setting and views to the significance of the heritage asset should be made based on the frameworks set out in English Heritage Guidance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agreed. Strategic framework to consider the significance of the heritage asset as part of the master planning exercise and local studies / evidence base.</li> </ul>



Mr S Davies (DP1103)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise</li> </ul>
St Thomas and St Andrew Doxey Parish Church (DP1066)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the originally proposed option for the Western by Pass (Green Option) is implemented.</li> <li>• Concerned that the road that links Doxey to the Castlefields site will encroach on the existing private church pathway which is used as a bridleway and a walkway</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a youth centre, sports hall and facilities for teenagers such as an area for skateboarding, BMX bike and a football field</li> <li>• Specify that the new development should have a variety of facilities to serve the local community such as medical centre, chemist, new primary school and post office</li> <li>• Suggest that any new developments should preserve the uninterrupted views of existing developments as much as possible</li> <li>• Specify that the existing greenway should be maintained with a greenway on each side all the way to Gnosall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Doxey Parish Council (DP557)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests better road access for existing road users and emergency vehicles</li> <li>• Suggest that there needs to be neighbourhood centre for Burleyfields</li> <li>• Suggest that priority be given to green spaces and green routes to the Stafford Newport greenway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise</li> </ul>

Mr M Talbot (DP348)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to employment allocation on the rugby club and the 2,200 houses</li> <li>• Suggests any employment allocation would be better located on brownfield land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP981)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest the 10<sup>th</sup> bullet point is amended as follows “An access, transport and travel plan strategy for the Strategic Development Location that maximises travel and accessibility by non-car transport modes via safe, attractive and conveniently designed street, pedestrian and cycling connections within the development and to Stone town centre, nearby existing and new employment areas. The strategy shall include utilisation and retention of the disused railway line to provide a sustainable connection and shall identify access points to the site and between the site and the existing settlement. It shall also identify construction access arrangements that do not disrupt existing residents and improvements to transport capacity along the A518 Newport Road and its roundabout”</li> <li>• Encouraged by the recognition of the historic environment sensitivity with the scheduled remains of Stafford castle and medieval settlement of Montetville</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to include relevant amendments to Core Policy 5 suggested by Staffordshire County Council</li> </ul>
Mr S Holiday (DP970)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

<p>P.M. and E.S. Loney (DP969)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> <li>• Queries why there are no facilities for pensioners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
<p>Mr T Bennett (DP968)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> <li>• Suggests more meeting places for adults as well as play areas for children</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

<p>G Daddolangois (DP967)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> <li>• Specified that there should be no development on greenfields</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
<p>J Boyden (DP966)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
<p>P Ray (DP962)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

Mr K Burrows (DP 959)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
J F Huxley (DP957)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Mr P Judd (DP953)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

L M Hall (DP950)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Mr R Price (DP944)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
S Baughey (DP942)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

Mrs K Richardson (DP940)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Mr DJ Wilson (DP 934)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Land A Collins (DP931)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

Mr and Mrs C Haigh (DP926)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Mr & Mrs EH and ED Price (DP924)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
S Rider (DP921)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP920)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns with regard to deliverability of sites to the west of Stafford town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>



<p>Mr and Mrs ATJ Howells (DP919)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
<p>M Taylor (DP916)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
<p>Mr L Mottershead (DP915)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

Mr P Robinson (DP912)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
G and A Simpson (DP910)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
G and A Simpson (DP907)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

E Cadogan (DP905)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Mrs S Cartwright (DP902)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
F.M and E.M Gibbons (DP894)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

V A Ray (DP891)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
A Summer Smith (DP890)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
S Main (DP887)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

J R Murphy (DP885)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
M and A Tams (DP883)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
S Lutwyche (DP878)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

Mr and Mrs Brettell (DP873)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Mrs and Mr E and P Skelton (DP871)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
H E Lloyd (DP869)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

Mr and Mrs I Pickard (DP868)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
C Bennett (DP867)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large-scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs K and L Jones (DP 866)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large-scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>

C Newell (DP 865)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large-scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise.</li> </ul>
Play Space for Doxey (DP859)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that there is need for a parish hall with indoor recreation facility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP844)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that assessment of visitor usage of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Local Sites of Biological Interest (SBIs) is undertaken to understand the impact of the quantum of development as well as an associated visitor mitigation strategy</li> <li>• Suggest that any road proposals should be underpinned with a design approach whereby adverse impacts upon Doxey and Tillington SSSIs are avoided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Appropriate Assessment evidence base. Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Environment Agency (DP 828)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that Core Policy 5 should be amended to take account of the fact that the land drains both west into Doxey Brook and east to tributaries of the River Sow. Furthermore, it should also be recognised that a greater portion of the land drains in the easterly direction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and make relevant amendments to Core Policy 5.</li> </ul>
Mr R Gibbons (DP820)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the existing infrastructure will not cope with more traffic</li> <li>• Concerned that over 2000 houses will damage the natural environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>



J Clapp (DP802)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to more housing being built in Doxey as it will damage the natural environment and remove open spaces for recreation</li> <li>• More housing will result in more traffic; more pollution and over population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP657)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that the best site for development is in the north of Stafford as it has all of the necessary infrastructure in place</li> <li>• An integrated neighbourhood approach with on site amenities such as its own retail, education and commercial facilities is the best solution for developing the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP629)	<p>Suggest that core policy 5 is reworded to:  Within the area identified West of Stafford a sustainable, well designed mixed use development will be delivered by 2031. Subject to assessments of viability the development will deliver the following key requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Around 2,200 new homes in a mix of housing types, tenures, sizes and styles;</li> <li>• provision to meet the needs of an ageing population through new extra care and specialist housing provision;</li> <li>• a 'neighbourhood' approach with the provision of a mix of uses including local retail facilities, social and physical community infrastructure, a primary school and public open space;</li> <li>• small-scale local employment opportunities;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point to read 'approximately'</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point to delete the word 'significant'</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point to read 'and a community building including provision for a library'</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read 'New small-scale employment areas incorporated into existing and new housing development areas'</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 8<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read 'low carbon energy solutions including associated infrastructure'</li> </ul>

<p>Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP629)</p>	<p>Continued .... Suggest that core policy 5 is reworded to: Within the area identified West of Stafford a sustainable, well designed mixed use development will be delivered by 2031. Subject to assessments of viability the development will deliver the following key requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maximum accessibility by non-car transport modes to Stafford town centre through walking and cycling connections and to nearby existing and new employment areas,</li> <li>• access points to the development and between the development and the existing settlement</li> <li>• suitable construction access arrangements; and</li> <li>• improvements to transport capacity along the A518 Newport Road and its roundabout;</li> <li>• Support for the delivery of the Western Access Improvement Scheme and associated transport improvements from Martin Drive to Doxey Road;</li> <li>• a clear hierarchy of roads (from distributor to home zones) producing discernable and distinctive neighbourhoods integrated and linked to existing areas.</li> <li>• a network of green infrastructure including natural grasslands and wetlands, play areas, green corridors allowing wildlife movement and access to open space together with necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation including Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace;</li> <li>• conservation and enhancement of historic environment assets including the setting of Stafford Castle and sight lines to St Mary's Church in Stafford town centre;</li> <li>• protection of nature conservation interests including Doxey Brook (Biodiversity Alert Site) and Doxey Marshes SSSI</li> </ul> <p>Development will be permitted provided it would not prejudice implementation of the whole development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 11<sup>th</sup> bullet point 11 to read “Support delivery of the Western Access Improvement Scheme and associated transport improvements specifically providing phase 1 from Martin Drive to Doxey Road.”</li> <li>• Noted and agree two new bullet points, based on previous Staffordshire County Council amendments, concerning an access, transport &amp; travel plan strategy together with an interconnected network of streets.</li> <li>• Noted and no other changes.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

Mr G Lotay (DP659)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the location of new housing and industrial developments as well as the affect it could have on traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs Beach (DP619)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that any development should contain recreational facilities, cycle and foot paths and a green lung</li> <li>• Concerned that more housing will bring more traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Mr R Last (DP610)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Mr J Wilson (DP407)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the loss of green space and the large numbers of houses proposed</li> <li>• Suggests that there will need to be better facilities and schools for new residents</li> <li>• Suggests that there is insufficient room for a new road next to St Thomas and St Andrews Church.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>

Mr and Mrs J Bell (DP401)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that more housing will decrease property values</li> <li>• Concerned that there will be inadequate car parking for future residents</li> <li>• Suggest that it would be more appropriate to develop employment sites near existing employment areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> </ul>
H Smith (DP390)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that there will be insufficient facilities to cope with the increases in housing number proposed</li> <li>• Concern that Doxey has too much social housing which has a negative impact on the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Mrs S Pickervance (DP388)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that there should be better road access to Doxey and Stafford town</li> <li>• Suggests that there should be a centrally located village centre with the necessary services and facilities to accommodate such large scale development.</li> <li>• Specify that the development should include preservation of the greenway, the footpaths currently used by Doxey residents as well as broader pavements for pedestrian access</li> <li>• Suggest that the sewage and drainage in Doxey are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Mrs J Rennie (DP297)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to developments at Castlefields particularly the employment site at the Rugby club</li> <li>• The proposal for 2,200 houses will increase traffic congestion</li> <li>• Concerned that these plans will diminish the quality of life in the area by removing green fields and walkways through large-scale development on greenfields.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>

<p>Mr K Evans (DP286) comment is repeated under DP 305</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed with the development strategy for both the north and east of Stafford town but objects to locating employment at the rugby club in preference to brownfield sites</li> <li>• Concern that the proposed employment allocation will diminish the quality of life of local residents by increased noise and light pollution, barren car parking, overlooking to adjacent properties as well as increased traffic for loading and unloading.</li> <li>• Concerned that more housing will increase fly parking</li> <li>• Suggests that the neighbourhood centre could be nearer to the centre of the development and include facilities such as shops, post office and a school</li> <li>• Concerns were also raised about housing design and densities as well as the design and implementation of the western access improvement scheme.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>
<p>Sport England (DP265)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that there is no reference to indoor sports or ATPs for west of Stafford Borough Council</li> <li>• Suggests that 2,200 additional homes requires 0.24 of a swimming pool - 1 lane - (£560k), 1.5</li> <li>• badminton courts (£890k) and 0.2 of an ATP (£120k)</li> <li>• Concern that there is insufficient existing facilities to absorb the additional demand from large scale housing development in the West of Stafford town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Detailed provision to be delivered through the planning application stage.</li> </ul>
<p>Sport England (DP227)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that 2,200 additional homes requires additional indoor facilities amounting to 0.24 or a pool (1 lane,</li> <li>• £0.5M), 1.5 badminton courts (£0.9M) and 0.2 ATP £120k)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Detailed provision to be delivered through the planning application stage.</li> </ul>

<p>Castlefield Residents Association (DP245)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the proposed employment location is inappropriate and will have an adverse impact of the amenity of the area by removing a valuable green space</li> <li>• Concerned that the employment allocation will create traffic and other problems for residents</li> <li>• Suggests that employment would be more appropriate nearer to the Castleworks site</li> <li>• Concerned that there is insufficient evidence to support the quantum of housing proposed</li> <li>• Suggests that the existing road infrastructure will be unable to cope with the increased traffic volumes.</li> <li>• Suggests that the supply of brownfield land should be exhausted before building on brownfield.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> <li>• Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery</li> </ul>
<p>Concerned resident (DP235)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the quantity of new housing will destroy the large green space</li> <li>• Concerned that the western access route will increase noise and pollution</li> <li>• Queries the military base cannot be extended to accommodate military personnel on base</li> <li>• Concerned that the new developments on the edge of the town centre will decimate the north end of the town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• On-going discussions with MOD to make provision for future needs at Stafford.</li> </ul>
<p>Mr and Mrs Lumley (DP231)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the proposed employment location is inappropriate and will have an adverse impact of the amenity of the area by removing a valuable green space and its rural environment</li> <li>• Concerned that the employment would increase the volume of traffic on Newport road</li> <li>• Suggests that it would be more acceptable to locate employment near to Castleworks or Universal site in Doxey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>

V B Hunt (DP230)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the proposed developments will diminish their privacy and devalue their property</li> <li>Specify that development on open countryside will result in a loss of wildlife</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Play Space for Doxey (DP192)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that should provide additional recreational facilities which can be used by the present residents of Doxey</li> <li>Suggest that the rugby pitches should be preserved as they act as open spaces as well as playing fields</li> <li>Specify that there should be safe access to recreation sites through safe foot and cycle paths from existing residential areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>Further details on open space provision through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs Simpson (DP191)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over housing and employment allocations to the west of Stafford, in particular loss of green area, loss of rugby club, road congestion, integration with existing communities, use of existing employment sites and suitability of land for development</li> <li>Wish to see recreational open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>Further details on open space provision through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Mrs I Mayes (DP188)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over traffic and condition of roads in Doxey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mrs C Bentley (DP186)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over volume of development, existing number of empty homes, loss of open space and views of the Castle</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add reference to quantity of empty homes in the Borough of over 6 months (para 2.13)</li> <li>Further details on open space provision through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage</li> </ul>
Mr E Finnemore (DP182)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the plan will reduce quality of life due to more development, traffic, pollution and population</li> <li>Baseline data contradicts the need for development – such as</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> </ul>

	<p>currently good housing stock with low levels of overcrowding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on road network and increase in traffic</li> <li>• Object to loss of open space at rugby ground for employment use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs Jahn (DP177)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that aspects of the plan will undermine the attractiveness of the Borough, in particular allocations to the west of Stafford and associated impact on the Castle, local area, loss of open space and impact on road network.</li> <li>• If development in this area takes place it should be low density housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details on open space provision through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage</li> </ul>
Mr G Hancox (DP152)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding loss of rugby club and allocation of employment land</li> <li>• Concerns regarding traffic</li> <li>• Should housing go ahead, there should be a school and well designed mix of housing types</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs K Williams (DP93)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the plans on basis of impact on road network, impact on safety at road crossings, loss of open space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites should be used first</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs Wilson (DP88)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to development to the West of Stafford on the basis of visual impact on the estate entrance, road infrastructure implications, problems associated with shops and small late night services, bus services should a new school be built.</li> <li>• Other concerns regarding current level of parking on the estate, loss of green infrastructure and open space.</li> <li>• Should affordable housing be delivered, this will need to be well designed within the scheme</li> <li>• Should employment land be needed in the area, the existing castle works site should be used.</li> <li>• Brownfield sites should be used first</li> <li>• Concern that the plan encourages large retail centres when there are many empty shops in the town centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage</li> <li>• The level of empty shops in the town centre are below national average and the decision</li> <li>• Proposal for small local facilities on strategic sites in order to reduce need to travel elsewhere</li> </ul>
Mr M Turner (DP77)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns with development to the West in relation to vehicle access, especially to Doxey, Infrastructure, in particular services that are already lacking, and impact on greenway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage</li> </ul>
Anonymous (DP50)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries the balance between homes and job creation in Stafford</li> <li>• Concerns over parking, traffic, loss of existing open space and sport facilities, capacity of sewage station, capacity at local schools and doctors surgery's.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage</li> </ul>
Mr A M Poyser (DP49)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to employment allocation and 2,000 houses at end of Martin Drive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>Further details on housing numbers through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Mr E Thompson (DP1104)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding impact of employment land on property prices, loss of greenfield land between Castlefields and M6, parking on Kingsway</li> <li>Suggests providing employment on existing employment land</li> <li>New housing development should maintain existing residential layout</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage</li> </ul>
St Modwen Development (DP1022)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support mixed used development to the West of Stafford</li> <li>Agree with masterplan but that this shouldn't be adopted as an SPD</li> <li>Concern that the policy is contradictory and advocates removing criteria relating to proposals to consider delivery of whole site</li> <li>Affordable housing does not need to be referred to</li> <li>Amendments proposed regarding tariff and concerns regarding onsite renewable energy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and Core Policy 5 remove reference to SPD.</li> <li>No change regarding criteria for applications no prejudicing the delivery of the site. It is vital that the Plan ensures delivery of the site and associated infrastructure. This may be missed with piecemeal developments</li> <li>Agree to remove reference to tariffs as this will be addressed through a new Core Policy on CIL and S106 agreements.</li> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 8<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read 'low carbon energy solutions including associated infrastructure'.</li> </ul>

English Heritage (DP886)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that the scale of development will have an impact on the setting of Stafford Castle</li> <li>• Para 8.18 should make reference to the sensitivity of this area from the Historic Environment Character Assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend para 8.18 for Historic Environment Character Assessment</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP 628)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments relates to relationship between CIL and S106</li> <li>• Remove reference to SPD in policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Amend Core Policy 5 to refer to CIL and remove reference to SPD</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway /St Modwen (DP 626)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove reference to SPD in policy</li> <li>• Local community input required before policy can be finalised</li> <li>• No need to repeat affordable housing requirement</li> <li>• Concern that some elements are onerous such as low carbon energy production, flood management scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Amend Core Policy 5 to refer to CIL and remove reference to SPD</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 8<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read 'low carbon energy solutions including associated infrastructure'.</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read 'A comprehensive drainage and flood management scheme'.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway/ St Modwen (DP 621)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support land to the west of Stafford as a suitable and sustainable location</li> <li>• Development will achieve national and local policy objectives</li> <li>• The plan should not prescribe how to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes</li> <li>• The Comprehensive Flood Risk Scheme criteria is too onerous. The development will need to show no detrimental impact on flood risk either on-site or elsewhere, it doesn't have to be a scheme.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 8<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read 'low carbon energy solutions including associated infrastructure'.</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read 'A comprehensive drainage and flood management scheme'.</li> </ul>

Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP548)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burleyfields Biodiversity Alert Site not mentioned within policy</li> <li>• Space should be set aside for habitat compensation</li> <li>• Great Crested Newts are present around the Castle – updated surveys will be required</li> <li>• GI to be shown on map</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 11<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read ‘Doxey Brook &amp; Burleyfields BAS’.</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage on GI and habitat / recreation areas</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP590)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drainage infrastructure via the Doxey Brook not mentioned in the policy and concern for delivery</li> <li>• Concern with poor transport linkage north south to the A449</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Added the word ‘drainage’ to Core Policy 5, 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point.</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
Jones Lang Lasalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd (DP585)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding to the delivery of sites to the east and west of Stafford</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP 476)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with Western site location but have concerns regarding the safety and impact on Doxey Marshes and traffic alleviation of the western access improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
Mr R Oldfield (DP 429)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that level of development is not in line with sustainability aspirations</li> <li>• Officers and councillors to work together with wider community to develop a sustainable plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 13 and Development Management Policy 2.</li> </ul>
Fisher German for Mr Thomas (DP461)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation promotes site in Stafford which is a SHLAA site, Previously Developed Land and adjacent to the urban area which could be included through increasing the area in the Strategic Development Location</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic.</li> </ul>

Hallam Land Management Ltd (DP389)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation promotes site in Stafford which is currently used by the public for informal open space.</li> <li>• Representation seeks to include the site in the RDB.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic.</li> </ul>
Castlefields Residents Association (DP318)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation lists the views as discussed in an association meeting. These include designating open space for employment use when there is existing empty employment land at Castle Works and concern that the level of housing is not required within the evidence base</li> <li>• Development should focus on Brownfield sites first</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Further details through a strategic framework and the detailed planning application stage</li> <li>• The Plan acknowledges in amended Core Policy 2 there is insufficient brownfield land.</li> </ul>
Mrs M C Leather (DP320)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the strategy is discriminating against smaller settlements where some development could be beneficial to help present local services</li> <li>• Level of development in Stafford and Stone should be looked at again as some sites may not have necessary infrastructure or be developable</li> <li>• Employment land should consider other sites not just Raleigh Hall and Ladfordfields as development here will have impact on road network</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Any alterations or extensions to Recognised Industrial Estate boundaries to be</li> </ul>

		considered through the Site-specific Policies and Allocations DPD.
Sport England (DP268)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The infrastructure requirements do not adequately reflect the needs for sport and recreation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Refer to Core Policy 3 amendments.</li> </ul>
L Parry (DP34)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raises concerns regarding the deliverability of the Western Access Improvement Scheme and questions how much traffic it will alleviate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy Western Access Improvement Scheme is a 3 stage scheme.</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP375)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlights existing parking problems to the west of Stafford and questions whether there is sufficient parking for extra cars</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Refer to Core Policy 26 and Appendix B – Car Parking Standards. Parking fees and other ways to control parking are not dealt with by the planning system.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP 623)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map provided showing amended site plan for the west of Stafford Strategic Development Location. The amendment shows a larger area up to the motorway which would not be developed for housing, but would allow a greater area to be set aside for open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend detailed site boundary associated with Core Policy 5.</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP376)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions impact of road scheme on car parking at the station, the possibility of cycle tracks and park and ride</li> <li>Increased traffic on the A34</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted no change. Park and ride scheme, and cycle tracks considered through the Local Transport Plan and Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
K Jones (DP553)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raises concerns with relation to development to the east of Stafford on the basis of loss of views, impact on amenity, impact on existing congested road network, loss of amenity for the crematorium, impact on schools and school places, loss of green areas and their habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>Further details through a design brief and detailed planning application stage</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider development to the north of Stafford to be a better option</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend Core Policy 6 with a new bullet point to read “Sufficient future provision is made for the existing crematorium including appropriate landscaping to adjacent housing”.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council - Environmental & Health Service (DP1082)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Essential that transport networks are in place before development in this part of Stafford begins</li> <li>Development should incorporate screening due to the adjacent crematorium</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy. Further details through a design brief and detailed planning application stage</li> <li>Amend Core Policy 6 with a new bullet point “Sufficient future provision is made for the existing crematorium including appropriate landscaping to adjacent housing”</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP982)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports measures to ensure protection and enhancement of heritage assets</li> <li>Any applications in this area may require scheduled monument consents and should contact English Heritage to discuss proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. English Heritage consulted on the Draft Publication and associated Sustainability Appraisal.</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP922)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objections to growth to the east of Stafford but concerns over deliverability</li> <li>Questions the requirement of a development tariff and Masterplan SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and Core Policy 6 remove reference to SPD.</li> <li>Agree to remove reference to tariffs as this will be addressed through a new Core Policy on CIL and S106 agreements.</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP658)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the A518 Weston Road would be the main route into Stafford town centre and will be unable to handle increase in traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>

Mr Elsey (DP552)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to development to the East of Stafford on the basis of loss of green space/countryside, increase in traffic, lack of public transport and cycling provision, schooling,</li> <li>• Should use vacant housing to reduce need to build new housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy for education &amp; transport issues</li> <li>• Add reference to quantity of empty homes in the Borough of over 6 months (para 2.13) which overall is low in the Borough. Greenfield development will be required</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs McComiskie (DP393)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that development to the east will impact on local environment and views</li> <li>• Raises questions about road network, traffic risks to children and older adults, and compensation for the loss property value.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy. Further details through a design brief and detailed planning application stage</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs Madders (DP 355)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation relates to alternative sites to the east of Stafford to be included within the strategic development location. This land is to the south of Tixall Road and is a SHLAA site (number 159). The site is 2.37 hectares and could deliver 70 dwellings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic.</li> </ul>
Mr R Bolton (DP 391)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises concerns relating to development to the east of Stafford due to impact on road network, flooding from run off, level of existing empty homes and need for housing in current economic situation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy. Further details through a design brief and detailed planning application stage</li> <li>• The Plan will cover the next 20 years and therefore cannot be based on current economic situations. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> <li>• Add reference to quantity of empty homes in the Borough of over 6 months (para 2.13), which is insufficient to meet housing needs.</li> </ul>



Farmery (DP 343)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns relating to development to the east based on impact on local environment and wildlife, congestion of the road network, pollution and overcrowding of schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy for education &amp; transport issues</li> <li>Further details through a design brief and detailed planning application stage</li> </ul>
Residents of Hampton Gardens (DP 308)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development to the east on the grounds of loss of property value, loss of countryside and views, noise and air pollution from proposed new road link, impact on crematorium, impact on road network, impact on local nature reserve at Kingston Manor.</li> <li>Should development take place, a different road layout suggested</li> <li>Concern that residents weren't personally notified on the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy for education &amp; transport issues</li> <li>There is no mechanism within the planning system for compensation to property values</li> <li>Various consultation exhibitions, letters and e-mail notifications to over 3000 people and organisations. Details now included for other people for the next consultation stage.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP 266)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Looking at the sports calculator, 600 houses would generate need for 0.1 swimming pool, 0.4 badminton court, 0.04 ATP – is there evidence that this could be met?</li> <li>The policy does not reference indoor sports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Amendments to Core Policy 3, detailed provision to be delivered through the planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Mr S Machin (DP262)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that due to the topography of land to the east of Stafford will have an impact on Beacon Hill, which is an important local landscape feature. This could be reduced if the boundary is altered and careful consideration is given to the height of development</li> <li>Where is the justification for the figures?</li> <li>Beaconside Road is already very congested along with Sandon Road junctions</li> <li>Brownfield sites within Stafford should be used first</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> <li>Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> <li>Refer to Core Policy 1 &amp; 2 amendments as there are insufficient brownfield sites within Stafford town</li> <li>Core Policy 23 aims to achieve high building standards that reduce impact on the</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design of development needs careful consideration so it is not a continuation of what is already there</li> <li>• Concern that development at Prime Point will not employ large numbers of people compared to the land take</li> </ul>	<p>environment, consider privacy and space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr R Clarke (DP237)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support 20 hectares of employment land</li> <li>• Land lies immediately south of the land in the representees ownership. The boundary should extension westwards so that it is contiguous with the existing RDB and would provide further 11 hectares of land. Site plan provided to show land in question.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> <li>• Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document</li> </ul>
Mr M Gardner (DP 149)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions the route of the eastern distributor road, road alterations along Weston Road, cost of sewerage works, expansion of the crematorium</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and include protected route for Eastern Access Improvement Scheme in the Publication document.</li> <li>• Amend Core Policy 6 with a new bullet point to read "Sufficient future provision is made for the existing crematorium including appropriate landscaping to adjacent housing".</li> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP 142)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOD have no objections to the employment allocation but would like to be kept to date with progress to ensure it does not conflict with MOD interests and operations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Mr N Bostock (DP126)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries the cost and route of EDR and would wish to see cooperation between SBC and SCC on transport issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>

Mr D Turner (DP 122)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions whether the level of housing to the east is required when there are a number of empty homes and number of family homes occupied by single people.</li> <li>• People should be given the opportunity to sell to a housing group to free up needed housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Add reference to quantity of empty homes in the Borough of over 6 months (para 2.13), which is insufficient to meet housing needs</li> <li>• Policies in the Plan assist with the delivery of a range of housing, not just for families.</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs Miller (DP94)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to development to the east on the grounds of impact on existing road network, inadequate sewerage system and impact on Stafford hospital capacity.</li> <li>• One solution would be to widen Tixall Road to prevent traffic jams towards Stafford in the morning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
Mr E Houghton (DP82)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like the area to the east of Stafford to protect the environment, provide open space and play areas, high quality dwellings and no traffic access onto land facing the fire station.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy.</li> <li>• Further details through a design brief and detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Mr M Gardner (DP52)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads need to be improved before development takes place, taking into the cumulative impact of traffic from recent developments</li> <li>• Land to the east is grade 2 agricultural land and unsuitable for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy.</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP2023)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support development to the east of Stafford subject to the boundary being extended to include land north of Milford Lane</li> <li>• Questions the need and viability of producing a masterplan, phasing criteria, the requirements for on site and low carbon and renewable energy, affordable housing requirement contained in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic.</li> </ul>

	the policy and development tariff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Amend Core Policy 5 to refer to CIL and remove reference to SPD</li> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 5, 8<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read 'low carbon energy solutions including associated infrastructure'</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP888)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy should refer to heritage assess rather than historic environment assets and refer to the setting of St Thomas's Priory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 6.</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP845)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern has been raised about development location to the east of Stafford Town and the associated road improvements due to its proximity to the Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Mr and Mrs Dugmore (DP731)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development should be screened by planting, similar to Telford where industry is screened by 20 metre wide shrub belts</li> <li>Would not wish to see sudden landscape change from employment to open agricultural land – providing housing next to the employment land would assist with this</li> <li>The housing and employment sites locations do not currently provide suitable walking/cycling access and would lead to increase in short distance car travel which the LDF is trying to avoid</li> <li>Would wish to see housing allocation adjacent to employment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Detailed landscaping provision to be delivered through the planning application stage.</li> <li>Noted. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic</li> </ul>
Jones Salle Lasalle for Akzo Nobel (DP 595)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question the deliverability of land to the east and would wish to see focus growth to the north of Stafford town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy &amp; the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP498)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that development to the east will not have connection to the south of Stafford</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>

Berkswich Parish Council (DP478)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development to the east will have an impact on Berkswich Parish, in particular that Branscote Pumping station will need updating and impacts on local areas such as St Thomas's Priory, Blackheath Covert and Kingston Covert</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 6 concerning the setting of St Thomas' Priory.</li> <li>• Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP573)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support land to the east as a sustainable and suitable location for employment</li> <li>• Road infrastructure and careful consideration of the level of housing in this area essential</li> <li>• The route of the EDR should remain clear of development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> <li>• Noted and include protected route for Eastern Access Improvement Scheme in the Publication document.</li> <li>• Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy.</li> </ul>
Mr R Oldfield (DP 430)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The word 'sustainable' cannot be used in the context of large scale building projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Farmery (DP345)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions sustainability of the east of Stafford location on the basis of traffic, education, impact on wildlife, range and tenure of housing, impact on crematorium</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> <li>• Amend Core Policy 6 with a new bullet point to read "Sufficient future provision is made for the existing crematorium including appropriate landscaping to adjacent housing".</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP267)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy does not adequately address sport and recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Detailed provision for open space to be delivered through the planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP201)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration must be given to providing land for crematorium extension</li> <li>• Development would have a visual impact due to the topography</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Core Policy 6 with a new bullet point to read "Sufficient future provision is made for the existing crematorium including</li> </ul>

	<p>of the land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that provision of eastern access improvement scheme is not adequate and a Sow Valley Link should be provided prior to development taking place. This link would bypass Blackheath Land and the winding section of Baswich Bridges</li> </ul>	<p>appropriate landscaping to adjacent housing”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend Core Policy 6 to make reference to landscape character, not just landscape</li> <li>Noted and include protected route for Eastern Access Improvement Scheme in the Publication document.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP28)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries the density of housing and potential run off to adjacent areas such as St Thomas’ Priory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> <li>Further details through a design brief and detailed planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP377)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic on residential roads and impact on safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP777)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GI to be shown on strategic location map</li> <li>Further ecological surveys are needed on allocated sites to ensure their findings are incorporated into masterplanning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Green Infrastructure Further details through a design brief and detailed planning application stage.</li> <li>Developers to provide detailed ecological surveys to support delivery of Core Policy 6.</li> </ul>
Farmery (DP 346)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries the route of the EDR and Eastern Access Improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 8.43 and include protected route for Eastern Access Improvement Scheme in the Publication document.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council - Environmental & Health Service (DP1083)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with statement to cut congestion</li> <li>Policy should provide provision for allotments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Trent Vision Trust (DP 1045)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing development at Stone to be reconsidered</li> <li>Unclear how retail floorspace will be met within town centre – if this is to be at Westbridge Park it needs to be made clear with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and delete the words ‘deferred to later in the Plan period’ and ‘in the longer term beyond 2021’ in Core Policy 7.</li> </ul>

	<p>justification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports GI Strategy for Stone</li> <li>• Areas considered for development with low flood risk should be removed from the GI map</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 8.68 delete the last sentence with regards to specific location of mixed use development</li> <li>• No change to the Green Infrastructure map</li> </ul>
Barwood Development Securities (DP1009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of housing development to Stone should be higher</li> <li>• Development to the South of Eccleshall land should be considered for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. There are a number of housing commitments in Stone.</li> <li>• Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP983)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make reference to Stone Extensive Urban Survey</li> <li>• Suggest amendment to read “ensuring that new developments are capable of providing safe, attractive and convenient access by foot, cycle, public and promote transport addressing the access needs of all, including those with disabilities”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend para 8.51.</li> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 7 – Transport section, 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point.</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP 923)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not wish to make comments in relation to CP 7,8, or 9</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP889)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over the scale of development in Stone which could undermine the role as a market town</li> <li>• Policy to make reference to historic buildings, street-pattern and archaeological interest and encouraging the sustainable use and management of the towns heritage assets and their appreciation and enjoyment.</li> <li>• 8.51 and 8.70 both deal with the historic environment should be combined and make reference to the EUS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 7 – Environment section, 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point.</li> <li>• Agree to amend para 8.51 and combine 8.70 into the same paragraph.</li> </ul>

Environment Agency (DP 829)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration should be given to redevelopment of The Malthouse in terms of flood risk and conservation aims</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to remove reference to The Malthouse in para 8.56.</li> </ul>
British Waterways (DP690)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Canal should be acknowledged as a valuable multi-functional community resource which can serve as a variety of roles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend para 8.58.</li> </ul>
Hallam Land Management for Davidsons (DP 549)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support allocation at Stone</li> <li>• Certainty over deliverability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr J Rhodes (DP 404)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to development at Stone on the basis of principle, scale, infrastructure, impact on wildlife and site selection due to it being considered 'rounding off' and easier</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Evidence prepared concerning site selection process and deliverability.</li> </ul>
Mr M Preston (DP 189)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support development strategy for Stone</li> <li>• Allocation should have landscaping condition</li> <li>• Support development strategy for development in the countryside</li> <li>• Support GI Strategy for Stone</li> <li>• Would not wish to see any other amendments to Stone RDB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Mrs J G Bull (DP236)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pleased to see proposal for new employment land</li> <li>• Object to the number of houses in Stone</li> <li>• Questions upgrade of sewage systems, increase in school places, existing planning permissions and impact on road network</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy including for sewage and education provision and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Existing planning permissions have been taken into account through Plan preparation</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP576)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stone is not in my constituency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support aim to enhance Stone as market Town</li> <li>• Concern over phasing, identifying only 1 site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and delete the words 'deferred to later in the Plan period' and 'in the longer</li> </ul>



(DP444)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wish to see a second allocation to the east of Stone</li> </ul>	<p>term beyond 2021' in Core Policy 7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to existing commitments and scale of development in Stone one site is considered appropriate for a range of housing types.</li> <li>Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic.</li> </ul>
Mr J Power (DP59)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries how conservation can happen with expansion, how office space and commercial premises will be met in the town centre</li> <li>Queries how some objectives will be met</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend Development Management Policy 20 to read "Within town centres support will be given ..."</li> <li>Plan policies and Community Infrastructure Levy to deliver the key objectives.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd – Interests at Stone (DP 362)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports aims of Stone</li> <li>Questions the phasing for Stone and the level of housing, based on existing 310 commitments in Stone. Provision should be higher than 500</li> <li>Plan provided showing additional site for Stone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and delete the words 'deferred to later in the Plan period' and 'in the longer term beyond 2021' in Core Policy 7.</li> <li>Due to existing commitments and scale of development in Stone one site is considered appropriate for a range of housing types</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP445)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Endorse 8.44 which states Stone being appropriate for significant development but do not consider 500 dwellings to be significant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP446)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasons provided are not adequate to justify only one SDL in Stone</li> <li>Other site should be considered alongside – this would not impact on the green belt</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Due to existing commitments and scale of development in Stone one site is considered appropriate for a range of housing types.</li> <li>Further consideration of Residential</li> </ul>

		Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations & Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic
WM Morrisons Supermarkets plc (DP821)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for the Stone Town Centre Boundary be extended to include Morrisons Supermarket</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Amend para 8.56 to refer to the Stafford &amp; Stone Town Centre Capacity Assessment for justification of the town centre boundary.</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP577)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stone is not in my constituency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Mr F Biard (DP 68)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stone town centre boundary is drawn too tightly and does not address what is likely to occur in the next 20 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Amend para 8.56 to refer to the Stafford &amp; Stone Town Centre Capacity Assessment for justification of the town centre boundary</li> </ul>
British Waterways (DP700)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with identification of the canal in the GI map but it is important to recognise the multifunctional benefits inland waterways offer.</li> <li>Would not want to see policy which sought to limit to prevent appropriate waterway related development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend para 8.58 to refer to multi-functional community resource. Policy Development Management 23 aims to encourage canal-related developments.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP 269)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.66 does not reference indoor sport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Hallam Land Management (DP 550)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support strategy and locations for Stone</li> <li>Have carried out the following pieces of work to support housing allocation: Landscape appraisal, landscape capacity assessment, arboriculture assessment, ecology surveys, draft masterplanning, flood management, surface and groundwater drainage, transport appraisal</li> <li>Support delivery of appropriate infrastructure requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Developer studies to be made public as part of the LDF evidence.</li> </ul>

<p>Dr M O’Sullivan (DP 300)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the allocation at Walton, Stone on the basis of pollution, environmental, landscape and amenity impacts, infrastructure pressures,</li> <li>• Areas to the east of Stone would be more appropriate for housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy</li> </ul>
<p>Mr P J Amison (DP 180)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over the proposals for Stone based on education, local services (recent closure of Walton post office), drainage and road network.</li> <li>• Concern that due to nature of employment and loss of manufacturing, Stone will continue to be a commuter town</li> <li>• Extending the employment area would be reasonable, only with improvements to the road infrastructure</li> <li>• Concern that sustainable transport aims are only aspirational</li> <li>• Raises question of a by-pass for Stone which should not be turned down based solely on cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy concerning education provision and waste water. Staffordshire County Council Transport section involved in traffic flows &amp; future improvements to the system.</li> <li>• Core Policy 7 to deliver employment and housing for Stone, to reduce out commuting</li> </ul>
<p>Mr A H Wright (DP95)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object on the grounds that 500 dwellings on one site is too many for Stone, there will be site access issues and road impacts and lack of facilities, in particular doctors surgeries. Concern is also raised that there is no enforcement of starter homes, which have been seen in Stone sold off to housing associations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy.</li> <li>• Core Policies 18 &amp; 19 to provide a range of housing types and tenures.</li> </ul>
<p>Mr J James (DP 84)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions whether existing infrastructure is sufficient to meet needs of 500 homes. Development to the west is not the most suitable location due to existing traffic problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy</li> </ul>
<p>Staffordshire County Council (DP 984)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CP 8 should include the following point: “An access, transport and travel plan strategy for the SDL that maximises travel and accessibility by non-car transport modes via safe, attractive and conveniently designed street, pedestrian and cycling connections within the development and to Stone town centre, nearby existing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 8 to include amendments as a new bullet point. Agree to amend final paragraph regarding Community Infrastructure Levy and tariffs.</li> </ul>

	<p>employment areas. The Strategy shall identify access points to the site and between the site and existing settlement'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Query tariffs</li> </ul>	
McDyre and Co for Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd (DP 703)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Query the scale of employment allocation at Stone when there are other sites in and around Stone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Existing employment commitments considered in requirement</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP593)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree with 2 locations in Stone being grouped as 1 Strategic Development Location</li> <li>• Land to the east should also be considered a sustainable location for future development</li> <li>• Transport assessment provided for land to the east</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy.</li> <li>• Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP578)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stone is not in my constituency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd – interests at Stone (DP 364)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No objection for employment allocation at Stone</li> <li>• Consider land south of Eccleshall Road more logical for housing that to the north</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP 270)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reference is made to need for indoor sport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Detailed provision to be delivered through the planning application stage.</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP 154)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider recent developments such as the Aldi store to have a negative impact on the road network</li> <li>• Housing development on the old research site on B5026 is unrelated to any settlement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy.</li> </ul>

Mr B Apps (DP80)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider recent developments such as the Aldi store to have a negative impact on the road network which would be further impacted from new development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy.</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP448)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development to the east of Stone is a preferable location for new development in the sequencing of locations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP774)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green Infrastructure should be shown on the land west of Stone included in the site boundary</li> <li>Further ecological surveys will be needed. There is Site of Biological Importance nearby and adequate buffering will be required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Developers to provide survey details. Detailed provision to be delivered through the planning application stage for habitat implications.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1084)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural housing needs surveys should be used to affordable housing need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to DM Policy 12.</li> </ul>
Fisher German (DP1072)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern regarding the policy as it will not allow development outside of RDB's.</li> <li>Promote a site south of Eccleshall, outside of the RDB</li> <li>Concern in extending only two employment areas outside of Stafford and Stone, particularly at Raleigh Hall where the council allowed a previous extension due to it being considered a special case and that further development would no occur</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery</li> <li>The Council considers it appropriate to identify sites for employment expansion in for the rural area. Further consideration of Recognised Industrial Estate amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP 1052)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites outside Stafford and Stone should be identified, in particular at Mill Land, Great Haywood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic.</li> </ul>
Baden Hall Enterprises / JT & DC Goucher (DP1040)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development at Cold Meece would support many aims within the plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP 986)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extensive Urban Survey for Eccleshall and Church Eaton should be used to inform policy</li> <li>Policy should make greater reference to the role of the historic environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Refer to Core Policy 24 and updated paragraphs including with Section 2 – Spatial Portrait.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP985)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document comprehensively addresses landscape issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP892)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New bullet point should be added to make reference to HECA, CAA to inform development</li> <li>Comments on CP2 relating to historic farmsteads also apply here</li> <li>Refer to PPS4 in supporting text</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Refer to Core Policy 24 and updated paragraphs.</li> <li>Consider amendments in line with National Planning Policy Framework. It is not appropriate to add PPS4 in the document</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association - West Midlands (DP 805)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residential development must be allowed in rural areas to maintain employment, services and local facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing</li> </ul>

Walton Homes (DP 792)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to CP9. The Plan should clearly state which settlements will have development</li> <li>• It is unclear how allocations at Raleigh Hall and Ladfordfields support the spatial strategy as they do not relate to settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery</li> </ul>
Mr S Hobbs (DP784)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy would benefit from stating what classes as appropriate scale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP 780)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote site at Mill Lane, Great Haywood which is identified as a SHLAA site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 660)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Job opportunities on small industrial estates and conversion from agricultural buildings is to be encouraged, however rural transport will be a problem</li> <li>• Any developments on small settlements should not proceed without demonstrable local need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr R Woodford (DP684)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation is promoting a 3.63 hectare site in Gnosall, west of Knightley Road.</li> <li>• The site is considered 'developable' in the SHLAA</li> <li>• Gnosall RDB is considered to be at capacity</li> <li>• Gnosall Housing Needs Survey supports need and acceptance of new housing and there is a lack of Registered Social Landlord housing in Gnosall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic.</li> </ul>

G & C Leese Bros Ltd (DP 367)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support CP 9 but suggest adding the recycling of sites not adjacent to RDB's in order to encourage previously developed land sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic.</li> </ul>
Mr J Holt (DP 306)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy reads that it would not be possible to develop outside RDB's until after 2031.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Core Policy 9 refers to Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document and the Neighbourhood Planning process</li> </ul>
Sandon and Burston Parish Council (DP 228)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The council agrees with the approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP 202)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy does not refer to Ingestre or Tixall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 9 lists settlements with a Residential Development Boundary. Core Policy 10 is relevant for smaller settlements</li> </ul>
Baden Hall Enterprises / JT and Goucher (DP1039)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support approach in CP 9 to deliver 1,000 new homes in the rural areas.</li> <li>Wish to promote site at Cold Meece to meet policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic</li> <li></li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1024)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the policy however there may be need to develop outside RDB's. References to Great Haywood should refer to Little and Great Haywood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing</li> <li>Great Haywood, and Little Haywood and Colwich are two separate settlements</li> </ul>



Grainger PLC (DP 797)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with CP9 in that it seems contradictory and should allow some expansion for market and affordable housing at villages.</li> <li>Some settlements such as Great Bridgeford would be appropriate for expansion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Noted and following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery. Reflect in CP9.</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP 760)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with question 14</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Milwich Action Committee (DP692)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following sentence should be added to CP9 to ensure it is consistent with 7.13: "These villages could be suitable for a small amount of new development facilities by minor amendments to the RDB's through the neighbourhood planning process or a subsequent Site-specific allocations and policies DPD where local need arises to support rural sustainability and maintain local services"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend CP9 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>
Mr R Thomas (DP 669)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Query the omission of previous Local Plan allocation. Understand a consultation event by agents on the site is due to take place in November</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
McDyre and Co for J F Bostock (DP 639)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the list of settlements in CP9, in particular Hyde Lea but consider the policy should allow housing on the edge of village settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend CP9 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone.</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 574)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wish to know capacity within RDB's as if there is little capacity, the policy would not help local services remain viable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Further information within the SHLAA. The SHLAA2011 identified capacity (deliverable, developable and not currently developable) within RDB's, and taken into account within the Plan.</li> </ul>

Mr J Pert (DP 530)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'or' should be changed to 'and' regarding occupancy clause on dwelling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP 480)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will aims of the policy be achieved with services being cut?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be a mechanism to ensure infrastructure and services are delivered.</li> </ul>
Manby Steward Bowdler (DP 447)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with policy approach and identification of Haughton, however limiting to within RDB's is restrictive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy9 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery</li> </ul>
The Inglewood Investment Company Ltd (DP 426)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with policy approach, however limiting to within RDB's is restrictive.</li> <li>• There is local need for 27 affordable houses at Great Haywood, Little Haywood and Colwich</li> <li>• Plan provided showing location where development could meet this shortfall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend CP9 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery</li> <li>• There is an option to pursue this site as a rural exception site with the Parish Council.</li> </ul>
Bellway Homes (DP409)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essential that RDB's are reviewed, particular for settlements like Gnosall.</li> <li>• Settlements constrained by Green Belt should be further down the hierarchy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend CP9 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery which includes consideration of the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp;</li> </ul>

		Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic
Mr J Power (DP 60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will local needs be established?</li> <li>• How will rural network be supported when proposals could lead to an impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Development Management Policy 12 for local need approach and Core Policy 26 for transport.</li> </ul>
Mr J Holt (DP 307)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy does not provide sufficient detail in terms of housing delivery in the longer term or set a settlement hierarchy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend CP9 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery which includes consideration of the Green Belt.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP 271)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More clarity is needed regarding improving quantity and quality of open space, sport and recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP 203)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with policy subject to adequate road links avoiding small country roads</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Seighford Settled Estate (DP 173)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with policy and the commitment to review RDB's. Existing allocations should also remain</li> <li>• Agree with additional employment land at Ladfordfields</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policy and restriction on rural development</li> <li>• Accept RDB could be extended to allow for minor development</li> <li>• Development should have regard to public transport and improve quality of open space, which are lacking in Eccleshall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Tetlow King Planning (DP 100)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with CP9</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Mr B Apps (DP 86)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developments in the rural area should be strictly controlled. Minor amendments in certain settlements such as Eccleshall and Croxton should assist local people and provide open space and sport facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr F Biard (DP 69)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment sites across the Borough vary in their use. Would an individual policy be possible to set ground rules for such sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Development Management Policy 15 for more details.</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP 29)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy seems to contradict strategy and political commitment to no development in rural areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. The plan allows for appropriate development for local needs in the rural areas through Core Policy 2 &amp; 9.</li> </ul>
McDyre and Co for Raleigh Hall Properties (DP 709)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should a choice between Ladfordfields or Raleigh Hall be required, consider Raleigh Hall to be the most sustainable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 661)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree it would be suitable for further development but would not want to see warehousing or transport companies. Ideally the site would be used for high technology companies which provide high value jobs to the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross developments (DP 575)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support expansion of Ladfordfields</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP581)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with expansion but would urge the County Council to improve the bends on the B5405 between Great Bridgeford and the estate and review the speed limit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and transport issue to be considered by Staffordshire County Council - Highways.</li> </ul>
Seighford Parish Council (DP 561)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion would only be suitable if roads in immediate area are upgraded. They are not suitable for HGV's.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and transport issue to be considered by Staffordshire County Council - Highways.</li> </ul>

<p>Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd (DP 253)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorse expansion to the north of Ladfordfields, it would support the plan, national strategy and local economic plans and growth for the longer term</li> <li>• Expansion to the north would not be as visually prominent</li> <li>• The land has not been in productive arable land for some years</li> <li>• Access can be obtained by simple extension of central access road and not creating a new access road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
<p>Seighford Settled Estate (DP 174)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support extension of Ladfordfields but do not consider land to the north to be the most suitable. Land to the east and south should be considered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Further justification text included at Core Policy 9 concerning new employment allocations at Ladfordfields &amp; Raleigh Hall.</li> </ul>
<p>McDyre and Co for Raleigh Hall Properties (DP 712)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support land west of Raleigh Hall as a suitable and sustainable extension. Regarding current access and possible improvements, an extract from a report submitted to the council states “geometry, vehicular visibility, background traffic and traffic generation have all been considered and the proposed development of the site for either residential dwellings or for an employment centre could be delivered”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
<p>Ranton Parish Council (DP 662)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree it would be suitable for further development but would not want to see warehousing or transport companies. Ideally the site would be used for high technology companies which provide high value jobs to the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
<p>Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 482)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support expansion of Raleigh Hall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<p>Mr J Lefroy (DP 582)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable to my constituency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Eccleshall Parish Council (DP 156)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believe it is difficult to justify expansion of the site without improvements to public transport and highways</li> <li>• Expansion to the north west would be visible from the A519. Development along the Swynnerton Road would be appropriate to existing use along it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Transport issue to be considered by Staffordshire County Council – Highways. Further justification text included at Core Policy 9 concerning new employment allocations at Ladfordfields &amp; Raleigh Hall.</li> </ul>
Tetlow King Planning (DP101)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support subject to definition of ‘small scale’</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Mr B Apps (DP87)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions the sustainability of rural employment sites and expansion to Raleigh Hall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. The Sustainability Appraisal - public transport to be improved.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council - Environmental & Health Service (DP1085)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New developments in the countryside would be supported by a design statement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 23 – Design to apply to all developments.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP 987)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should minimise impact on historic landscape character and be informed by local vernacular styles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 24 to apply to all developments.</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association West Midlands (DP 806)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A flexible approach to development in the countryside is required and pleased to see conversion for re-use will be allowed.</li> <li>• Broadland access in rural areas is important</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Policy Core Policy 20 to make reference to broadband access</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP 742)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any commercial re-use should be in line with rural setting – i.e. not for uses more appropriate to an industrial site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 664)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been experience of dwellings being constructed in gardens due to it classing as previously developed land. This has an impact on the character of areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Government policy classifies ‘Garden land’ as greenfield land. Refer to Core Policy 23 – Design to apply to all developments</li> </ul>

G & C Leese Bros Ltd (DP 361)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support policy but seek clarification on new development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 10, first sentence with the word 'new' before development.</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1025)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support policy but seek clarification on what classes as countryside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Countryside is all areas outside of any Residential Development Boundary or Recognised Industrial Estate boundary.</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP925)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support policy. The government have intimated that there may be greater flexibility in relation to rural reuse for dwellings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Further consideration in line with National Planning Policy.</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP893)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater reference to historic farmsteads required in policy wording</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 10 with a new criteria on built vernacular &amp; heritage assets and updated paragraph 8.106.</li> </ul>
Grainger PLC (DP 798)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support policy with some amendments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 10 criteria a with the words 'rural businesses'</li> <li>Agree to amend Core Policy 10 3<sup>rd</sup> section and criteria a with the words 'it has been'.</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel (DP 610)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request Strategic Development Locations (SDL's) are identified within Residential Development Boundaries (RDB's) to avoid conflict with countryside policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Strategic Development Locations on proposals map.</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP510)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support approach, in particular providing range of housing in the rural area to meet ageing population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP 583)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree questions 17, 18, 19 and 20</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

Berkswich Parish Council (DP 485)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with protecting green belt and historic interest but would not apply to approved development</li> <li>• Concern about security and crime</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Core Policy10 includes crime measures</li> </ul>
Mr J Power (DP 61)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should also prevent increases in traffic levels and road safety</li> <li>• Queries how developments can show vibrancy to local area – may cause problems for development management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 26 – Transport.</li> <li>• Policy aims to address vibrancy by not permitting development that would have a negative impact on viable agricultural operations or result in economic development going to residential use without meeting certain criteria</li> </ul>
Mr J Holt (DP309)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eccleshall RDB to be amended to allow for longer term provision in line with the site put forward through the SHLAA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Further consideration of Residential Development Boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document as the site is not strategic</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP 272)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally support policy but could undermine sport facilities on the urban fringe.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy10 first paragraph and criteria b.</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP 204)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP 157)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr B Apps (DP 89)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr F Biard (DP 70)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries how policy will be used, in particular existing settlements and local services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>



Mr J Power (DP 62)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries how historical interest is determined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend paragraph 8.106 with additional information.</li> </ul>
Cross (DP6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link to SHLAA does not work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
McDyre and Co for J F Bostock Settlement (DP462)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider it unreasonable to prevent changes of use if services have ceased trading. Solution is to encourage additional housing development which will bring expenditure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Mr J Power (DP 63)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan should go hand in hand with the LTP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 26.</li> </ul>
Mr J Pert (DP 531)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quiet Lanes Initiative would be welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend paragraph 8.99 as Quiet Lane not now contained within the Staffordshire Local Transport Plan</li> </ul>
Fulford Parish Council (DP 360)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quiet Lanes Initiative would be welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend paragraph 8.99 as Quiet Lane not now contained within the Staffordshire Local Transport Plan</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP 273)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 8.102 do not address needs arising</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP 274)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 8.103 do not address needs arising</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Sport England (275)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 8.104 A new indoor sports centre has been provided at Stafford College – does this address need for further provision?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP 989)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.106 should recognise historic landscape character outside Stafford and Stone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend paragraph 8.106 with additional information</li> </ul>

Country Landowners Association West Midlands (DP807)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full consultation required on infrastructure funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agreed. Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1086)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries consistency between threshold in planning obligation policy and core policy 19 for affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP 1053)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally support policy subject to requirements meeting circular 05/2005 as included within the CIL regulations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs.</li> </ul>
Barwood Development Secutaries (DP 1010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Policy 11 &amp; 12 is unnecessary as the Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule will be required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs.</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP895)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlight opportunities for addressing potential impacts on historic environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and to be considered in CIL preliminary draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 667)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Woodland Trust (DP289)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add Green Infrastructure to Core Policy 11</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs, including green infrastructure</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1026)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important CIL and Planning Obligations do not conflict with each other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>

Maximums Strategic (DP27)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with SPD</li> <li>Council should concentrate on production of CIL and charging schedule</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> </ul>
Grainger PLC (DP 799)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not clear S106 will apply to commercial development</li> <li>Policy needs to be in conformity with national policy and primary legislation</li> <li>Viability of policy important along with interaction with CIL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 745)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree subject to GI being included</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs, including green infrastructure</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP 743)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed subject to site-specific protection provided by Neighbourhood Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP 631)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rapid progress on CIL is required and planning obligation guidance is unnecessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd (DP608)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seek clarification on viability testing and flexible options towards CIL and Planning Obligations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 507)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over the viability of planning contributions/tariff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>

Berkswich Parish Council (DP486)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with planning obligations and community safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP450)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that there is contradiction between planning obligations and CIL Policy</li> <li>• Both need to take viability into account</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Bellway Homes (DP410)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certainty required to ensure flexibility in policy and no duplication between CIL and Planning Obligations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP 366)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statutory tests in relation to planning obligations should be reflected in the policy</li> <li>• Concern over duplication with policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP 276)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see clear contributions for indoor sport and recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP 205)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP 158)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with policy, particularly as there are flooding issues in Eccleshall</li> <li>• Development should also take into account deficiencies with local play space and sport and recreation facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>

Tetlow King (DP 102)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with Core Policy 11 as it is overly restrictive and does not make exception for 100% affordable housing developments</li> <li>Relationship between planning contributions and CIL is unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> </ul>
Mr B Apps (DP 91)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding Eccleshall there is a need to address requirement for a bowls green, public space and flooding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1087)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements for CIL should be outlined in an SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP 1054)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the use of CIL to replace Planning Obligations but would wish to comment on the details</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP928)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council should begin work on the charging schedule as soon as possible</li> <li>CIL is not intended to provide new infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP846)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support proposal to draw up charges, in particular for parks, open space where additional capacity needs to be funded.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP761)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

British Waterways (DP707)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Canals and their towpaths should be considered as infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 754)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood defences to be changed to flood management</li> <li>• Clear plan is needed regarding delivery of GI through CIL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Fulford Parish Council (DP 363)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see provision of good broadband speeds as key use for CIL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP 277)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity for CIL for Stafford would be welcomed, in particular delivery of sport and recreation facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP929)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy DM 1 was not within the Draft Core Policies consultation in February 2010. Would be useful to include a more detailed infrastructure policy covering physical, social and green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to delete Development Management Policy 1. Replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 668)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree but would wish to see local consultation on infrastructure needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd (DP612)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not consider it appropriate to set out social infrastructure requirements in advance of CIL charging scheduled</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to delete Development Management Policy 1. Replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs.</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 592)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding viability, inflexibility.</li> <li>• Cannot support policy until details are published.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Mr J Pert (DP 532)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and replace Development Management Policy 1, Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs.</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP 489)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree policy and community safety element</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and replace Development Management Policy 1, Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> </ul>
Creswell Parish Council (DP 462)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to comment on the effectiveness of the CIL without the charging schedule</li> <li>• Question whether developments will be able to fund necessary infrastructure using example of eastern distributor road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule.</li> </ul>

Sport England (DP 278)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree but need to clearly define ‘Community infrastructure’ and ‘social infrastructure’. Would also be useful if the extended schools ethos is encouraged as this would allow for sport and recreation where appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and replace Development Management Policy 1, Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Noted and agree to encourage the use of schools and community.</li> </ul>
The Theatres Trust (DP 241)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of social infrastructure and community buildings required – definition provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree definition added to the glossary.</li> </ul>
Tetlow King Planning (DP 103)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Until there is a charging schedule we cannot agree with the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Development Management Policy 1, Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> <li>• Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule.</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association West Midlands (DP 808)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with Core Policy 13 - plans should include mitigation of surface water and use of sustainable drainage systems but the policy should not be restrictive for sustainable design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council Conservation Officer (DP1107)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modern methods of insulation can cause significant harm to the historic fabric</li> <li>• Recommend sentence added to state that some methods will not be appropriate for some existing buildings of traditional construction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to add a new sentence to Core Policy 13 to read “Where proposals affect a building of traditional construction, energy efficiency will be expected to be improved as far as possible without prejudicing the character of the building or increasing the risk of long term deterioration of the fabric.”</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with statement regarding sustainable construction.</li> <li>• Affordable housing should be developed to at least the same</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>



(DP1088)	<p>standard as market housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be viability issues</li> </ul>	
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP 1055)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the aspirations but consider the policy repeats national policy</li> <li>• Code Level should be determined on a site by site basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Barwood Development Securities (DP1011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the use of SuDs where possible but suggest “where practicable” is added</li> <li>• Environmental performance of new homes is already covered by building Regulations and the policy should no duplicate this.</li> <li>• No evidence of viability testing carried out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> <li>• Evidence based study on affordable housing viability assessment has considered viability on Code for Sustainable Homes.</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP930)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policy but would wish to see climate change included as one of the key objectives and guiding principles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to add a new criteria in Core Policy 1 for climate change.</li> </ul>
Environment Agency (DP 830)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommended a summary of Level 1 and 2 Surface Water Management Strategies are included in the supporting text and policy includes requirements for developers to look to site specific findings of the SWMP</li> <li>• Would welcome reference to CIRIA C697 SuDS Manual</li> <li>• Sewage to replace the word sewerage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amendments in Core Policy 13 and new paragraphs as well as paragraph 8.132.</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 672)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with intent of the policy, particularly for Stafford which is prone to flooding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Bellway Homes (DP411)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a requirement to repeat building regulations through the planning process?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Consider reasonable and appropriate to clarify national targets</li> </ul>
Woodland Trust (DP290)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome SuDS in relation to protecting and enhancing wildlife but would like to see specific reference to native woodland</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy Core Policy 14 amended read “A variety of green spaces and habitat networks”</li> </ul>

<p>St Modwen Developments (DP1027)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider elements of the policy, in particular mitigation strategy for contaminated land, infiltration test, BREEAM and Code ratings duly onerous</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 13 concerning BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes to read “if it is considered to be unviable evidenced through an independent economic viability assessment.” Consider reasonable and appropriate to clarify national targets</li> </ul>
<p>English Heritage (DP896)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implications for historic buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to add a new sentence to Core Policy 13 to read “Where proposals affect a building of traditional construction, energy efficiency will be expected to be improved as far as possible without prejudicing the character of the building or increasing the risk of long term deterioration of the fabric.”</li> </ul>
<p>Natural England (DP840)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly support policy. Recommend climate change policy includes subject of adaptation of natural systems</li> <li>Regarding flood risk, recommend flood waters be accommodated by creating natural flood water sinks</li> <li>Refer to Staffordshire Landscape Character Assessment when considering locations for renewable energy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
<p>McDyre and Co for J F Bostock Settlement (DP644)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding the viability and achievability of meeting the code</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 13 concerning BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes to read “if it is considered to be unviable evidenced through an independent economic viability assessment.” Consider reasonable and appropriate to clarify national targets</li> </ul>

Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP 632)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding the viability and achievability of meeting the policy</li> <li>Concern the policy duplicates national policy</li> <li>Section under sustainable construction should be deleted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 13 concerning BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes to read “if it is considered to be unviable evidenced through an independent economic viability assessment.” Consider reasonable and appropriate to clarify national targets</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP 634)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest adding words ‘where practicable’ in relation to SuDs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd (DP 618)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern the policy is restrictive and viability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 13 concerning BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes to read “if it is considered to be unviable evidenced through an independent economic viability assessment.” Consider reasonable and appropriate to clarify national targets</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 535)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not support development in the floodplain</li> <li>Policy on solar parks would be useful</li> <li>Reducing CO2 can be met through increased use of timber in buildings and increased forestry planting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Mr R Oldfield (DP 526)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy should be separated</li> <li>Specific reference to oil</li> <li>Need to make strong commitment to climate change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to add a new criteria in Core Policy 1 for climate change.</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 512)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broadly support policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

Berkswich Parish Council (DP492)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the policy alone will not address water problems in the Borough</li> <li>Will the Council support the Riverway Link Canal Project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Core Policy 13, updated national policy and infrastructure delivery will meet SuDs requirement to reduce surface water run off.</li> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP 378)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree but believe the policy will be difficult to achieve</li> <li>Will commercial developments need to meet same standards?</li> <li>No mention of oil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> <li>New paragraphs added to Section 4 regarding peak oil</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Interests at Stone (DP384)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy should be amended to reflect viable target rather than minimum target</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Interests at Stone (DP383)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over duplication with national policy and building regs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 13 concerning BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes to read "if it is considered to be unviable evidenced through an independent economic viability assessment." Consider reasonable and appropriate to clarify national targets</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP 30)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pollution from increased road users and traffic queues need to be considered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 536)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the policy</li> <li>Plan should highlight areas where retrofitting SuDS will be targeted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and Core Policy 13 amended to read "Developers are advised to refer to the guidance on SuDS contained in the Southern Staffordshire Water Cycle Study."</li> </ul>

Environment Agency (DP831)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support early consideration of SuDs</li> <li>• Document should mention the SuDs approval board which will play a part in adoption and approval of SuDs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to add new paragraphs concerning the Water Cycle Study, Surface Water Management Plan and approval Board.</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP932)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with policy DMP2, supports Core Policy 13</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association - West Midlands (DP 809)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council should adopt Merton Rule, welcome renewable energy developments, including range of different types</li> <li>• Well managed approach to wind turbines required</li> <li>• Energy crops should be welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Merton Rule policy is now outdated and the proposed policy is more up to date. Amended paragraph 8.140 to greater types of renewable / low carbon energy</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 673)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of low carbon energy sources is to be encouraged but concerns raised regarding different types such as loss of food production</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP 636)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy DM 2 should take a more positive approach to installation of major renewable energy where is easier and more effective than carbon savings on new development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Consider national policy regarding off setting of carbon reductions</li> </ul>
Mr W Cash MP (DP 190)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constituents have raised concern regarding minimum distance between wind turbines and dwellings. Would wish to see this set at 1000 metres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. The minimum distance would result in no renewable energy schemes for wind energy coming forward, contrary to the approach advocated in national planning policy. The policy as worded allows each application to be considered on its own merits.</li> </ul>
Mr P Shaw (DP 181)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree with the policy as worded as it does not contain a minimum distance threshold for wind turbines and dwellings. A distance of 1000 metres should be set within policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. The minimum distance would result in no renewable energy schemes for wind energy coming</li> </ul>

		forward, contrary to the approach advocated in national planning policy. The policy as worded allows each application to be considered on its own merits.
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP 143)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOD would wish to be consulted on all applications for wind turbines that are 11 metres or higher or that have blades that are 2 metres or more in length</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP897)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend heritage assets to historic assets</li> <li>• Recommend a specific reference to the setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Development Management Policy 2, bullet point 1 to read "... significance of heritage assets and their setting ..."</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 537)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications should also avoid significant impacts to important species</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Protected species considered through other legislation.</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 514)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policies for climate change, low carbon and renewable energy policies which are consistent with prevailing national and European standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP 493)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree, it is essential that valuable trees are protected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP584)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree subject to 1000 metre distance between dwellings and wind turbines</li> <li>• Questions the value of energy from biomass due to loss of food production</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. The minimum distance would result in no renewable energy schemes for wind energy coming forward, contrary to the approach advocated in national planning policy. The policy as worded allows each application to be considered on its own merits.</li> </ul>

Transition Town Stafford (DP 379)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policy but would like to see targets and strong intention to fulfil them.</li> <li>• The policy conflicts with increase in emissions from traffic increase</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Sandon & Burston Parish Council (DP 229)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council consider there should be a minimum distance of 1000 metres between a dwelling and wind turbine</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. The minimum distance would result in no renewable energy schemes for wind energy coming forward, contrary to the approach advocated in national planning policy. The policy as worded allows each application to be considered on its own merits.</li> </ul>
Seighford Settled Estate (DP 175)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the policy is insufficiently positive towards renewable energy</li> <li>• Unclear what status the map has</li> <li>• There will always be harm from a wind turbine, the policy should state how much harm can be tolerated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Policy supports renewable energy schemes subject to criteria, allowing each application to be considered on its own merits.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 538)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What % of the boroughs power is generated by renewable means</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend paragraph 8.142 to read “Currently approximately 2.5% of the Borough’s energy demand is supplied from renewable energy sources.”</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP 988)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seems to be some conflict with the GI map and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan areas and does not take into account biodiversity mapping, ecology or soil conditions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1089 and 1091)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support statements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP 1056)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the Council's intention but needs to be made clear that not all new developments shall be required to produce a detailed management plan. Assume this would only apply to those in the network.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 14 with the words "where appropriate"</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP933)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP847)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly support the policy</li> <li>Would like to see linkage between this has CP 13.</li> <li>Would also wish to see greater emphasis on adaptation to climate change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Environment Agency (DP 832)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend word change to read 'the Borough's rivers and extensive canal system'.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 14 to read "... extensive rivers and canal system;"</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association - West Midlands (DP 810)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan should recognise the role of the rural community and land managers in enhancing and maintaining biodiversity and landscapes</li> <li>It is important to keep local green spaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
British Waterways (DP722)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports aims of policy</li> <li>Multi-functionally of the canal network to be recognised</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 675)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Woodland Trust (DP291)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.85% of Stafford Borough is covered by ancient woodland</li> <li>Support third bullet point</li> <li>Wish to see specific reference to ancient or veteran trees</li> <li>Wish to see specific reference to native woodland</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend paragraph 2.20</li> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 14, bullet point 3 to read "ancient and veteran trees;"</li> <li>Policy Core Policy 14 amended read "A variety of green spaces and habitat networks"</li> </ul>



Mr M Gardner (DP 115)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions management of the River Sow due to current condition and suggests investigation by a river restoration centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. River maintenance carried out by Stafford Borough Streetscene.</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1028)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final bullet point not reasonable, relevant or practicable – ‘where appropriate’ should be added</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 14 with the words “where appropriate”</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP 990)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy is in line with national guidance and supported but would wish to see requirement for consultation with Historic Environment Record (HER), similar to Core Policy24.</li> <li>• Opportunity Mapping is produced by Staffordshire Biodiversity Partnership not Natural England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to include a new criteria to read “Refer to the Staffordshire Ecological Record to ensure natural habitats and species in the locality are protected.”</li> <li>• Delete the words ‘produced by Natural England’ in the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point Core Policy 14</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP898)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend more detailed wording for local landscape and heritage features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to add three new criteria to Core Policy 14.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 681)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the policy</li> <li>• Wish to see wording amended to read mitigate AND compensate</li> <li>• Up to date data required for all sites and habitats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 14, 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read “..mitigate and / or ...”</li> <li>• Ecological data available on sites to be made available to the public</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP 635)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standards for open space provision need to be set out in the plan – this should be contained in the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to add an Appendix setting out the PPG17 Standards.</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel (DP 620)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy should be flexible and recognise where non-compliance would be outweighed by other social, economic or regeneration benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr R Oldfield (DP 529)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More use of word ecological rather than environmental would give a stronger sense</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

Mr J Lefroy MP (DP 586 and 587)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree questions 22, 24, 25, 26 and 27</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP 380)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with mitigation but concern that other elements of the plan, such as Western Access Improvement Scheme will threaten Doxey Marshes SSSI.</li> <li>• Does recycling apply to all kinds of development?</li> <li>• Will porous services and sustainable drainage be insisted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 14 for mitigation and enhancement arising from new development for habitats.</li> <li>• Staffordshire County Council – Transport considers impact of Western Access Improvement Scheme</li> <li>• SuDs is addressed in Core Policy 13.</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP 279)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GI defined as including playing fields and outdoor sports but does not reflect its role in formal sports, only formal recreation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 14 to read “Networks of open spaces for formal and informal recreation, natural corridors ...”</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 697)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider rephrasing last sentence to finish ‘but also contribute to human well being’</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend paragraph 8.144</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 688)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GI needs to go to a smaller scale to help individual sites provide necessary infrastructure</li> <li>• Map is missing canal, important habitats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP935)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments to make at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP850)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the policy but few aspects need further consideration including setting out the hierarchy of sites</li> <li>• Alone or in association test relates only to European sites</li> <li>• Clarity needed over wording of ‘habitats regulations assessment and appropriate assessment’</li> <li>• Suggest word changes “protected species or any species or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of Development Management Policy 3 regards ‘cumulative effects’.</li> <li>• Amend 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph to read “... designated site, protected species or any species or habitat of principal importance ...”</li> </ul>

	<p>habitat” to reflect the NERC Act</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend overarching policy across all core strategy to avoid repetition</li> </ul>	
Environment Agency (DP 883)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy has potential to incorporate the needs of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plans. Natural watercourse to be amended to reflect the lakes, reservoirs, canals and groundwater bodies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Development Management Policy 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph to read “A natural watercourse, lakes, reservoirs, rivers, canals and groundwater areas including Water Framework Directive protected areas as listed in the Humber and Severn River Basin Management Plans.”</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 676)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Woodland Trust (DP292)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that the policy could allow loss of ancient woodland and veteran trees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to add the following sentence within the policy: ‘New developments will be required to include appropriate tree planting, to retain and integrate healthy, mature trees and hedgerows and replace any trees that need to be removed. Development will not be permitted that would directly or indirectly damage existing mature or ancient woodland, veteran trees or ancient or species- rich hedgerows’</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP991)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy is in line with national guidance and is supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP730)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policy</li> <li>• Recommend removing the word ‘significant’ from bullet (c) as it contradicts point (f)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to delete the word ‘significant’ from 1<sup>st</sup> set of criteria c in Development Management Policy 3.</li> </ul>

Mr J Lefroy MP (DP589)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the policy but question whether development should be able to have adverse impact on ancient woodland and trees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to remove reference to ancient woodland and ancient trees in Development Management Policy 3.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 733)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be clear targets for losses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 735)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) process and current Staffordshire BAP is welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP936)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with Core Policy 15 but recommend including Cannock Chase AONB and Cannock Chase SAC as one policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Legal requirements for Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and European sites are different so it is appropriate to have 2 separate policies.</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP849)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the AONB policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 677)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the AONB Policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP899)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support reference to heritage in the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP 501)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot agree with questions 23 and 24 due to the suggestion that sustainable development would be permitted if the need arose. Consider this a loose commitment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP851)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the policy and reference to landscape character areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Country Landowners Association - West Midlands (DP 811)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape Character Assessments are a tool and should be used in this way. Concern that characterisation will lead to restrictive and prescriptive policies. Recognition should be given to the changing nature of the rural area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 678)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believe housing within the AONB is not essential. In some cases commercial development may be acceptable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1029)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to visual implications should be deleted as all development will have visual implications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP900)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome reference to County's Historic Landscape Characterisation but wish to see amended to 'Historic Landscape Characterisation and Historic Environment Character Assessment'.</li> <li>1<sup>st</sup> bullet point amend as (including heritage assets and biodiversity)</li> <li>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point amend as 'Registered Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, and assets identified in the Historic Environment Record'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend Development Management Policy 4, 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point to read "... (including heritage assets, cultural character and biodiversity.)"</li> <li>Noted and amend Development Management Policy 4, 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point to read "... Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and assets identified in the Historic Environment Record;"</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP 502)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree but wish to express concern over measures to protect the environment, which still seems vulnerable, in particular areas of scientific interest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP 206)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP937)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DMP5 would be covered by any policy dealing with Cannock Chase SAC – concern over duplication of policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Legal requirements for Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and European sites are different so it is appropriate to have 2 separate policies.</li> </ul>

Staffordshire County Council (DP 992)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy is in line with national guidance and is supported</li> <li>Supporting text should make clear that assessment of impacts should also consider European sites outside of the Borough</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend paragraph 8. 164 to read “Therefore an assessment of impacts for European sites outside the Borough may be required for some developments.”</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 738)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy should state that developments within certain distance of European sites should contribute towards its enhancements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 679)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP 503)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree but wish to express concern over measures to protect the environment, which still seems vulnerable, in particular areas of scientific interest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1090)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protection of air quality should form part of the policy statement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Paragraph 8.171 refers to air quality listed in possible negative impacts. Add a new paragraph under 8.172 to read “Planning applications will be required to provide information relating to the possible negative impacts highlighted above.”</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP 1057)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note the progress on the visitor survey and associated work relating to the Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP938)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with draft policy but as previously mentioned believe the AONB and SAC could be covered by one policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Legal requirements for Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and European sites are different so it is appropriate to have 2 separate policies.</li> </ul>

St Modwen Developments (DP1030)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No definition of large developments is provided</li> <li>Justification of distances is not clear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Core Policy 17 is subject to review following the outcome of current work. The justification of distances can be found in the Evidence Base at <a href="http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/habitats-regulations-assessment">http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/habitats-regulations-assessment</a></li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP 993)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to ongoing work consideration should be given to the wording of the policy. A definition of large developments would be useful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Core Policy 17 is subject to review following the outcome of current work. The justification of distances can be found in the Evidence Base at <a href="http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/habitats-regulations-assessment">http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/habitats-regulations-assessment</a>.</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (DP 740)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome the policy, along with changes as a result of the recent visitor survey.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 683)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the proposals but would wish to see buffer zone increase to 1000m</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Core Policy 17 is subject to review following the outcome of current work. The justification of distances can be found in the Evidence Base at <a href="http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/habitats-regulations-assessment">http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/habitats-regulations-assessment</a>.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP 637)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mitigation of impacts will be dealt with in a non statutory document over which the council has no control. Mitigation and standards for open space will need to be tested in the plan.</li> <li>CIL will be the mechanism for obtaining monies for SAC mitigation</li> <li>Recommend reviewing zone of influence based on more recent visitor survey data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Policy 17 will be supported by the mitigation implementation strategy will be adopted by all relevant authorities who will also monitor its effectiveness</li> <li>Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> <li>Core Policy 17 is subject to review following the outcome of current work. The justification of distances can be found in the</li> </ul>

		Evidence Base at <a href="http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/habitats-regulations-assessment">http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/habitats-regulations-assessment</a> .
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 605)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inconsistency with promoting AONB and limiting effects of recreation on the SAC. Concern that creation of other areas won't substitute for the experience of visiting Cannock Chase</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. On-going work and future mitigation strategy to provide balance of visitors whilst protecting the special features of the Special Area of Conservation.</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP 504)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree as the policy allows for exceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1092)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Light pollution should also be included in the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 23 - Design.</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP939)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believe there should be a single policy covering Green Belt.</li> <li>The policy does not set out the purpose of designating Green Belts or set out exceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Core Policy 17 and Development Management Policy 6 considered in light of National Planning Policy Framework and amended if needed.</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association - West Midlands (DP812)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the policy does give importance to current proposals give to the rural dimension. Wish to see the promotion of agriculture and horticulture, rural economic and social development and meeting the needs of rural housing in the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Core Policy 17 and Development Management Policy 6 considered in light of National Planning Policy Framework and amended if needed.</li> </ul>
Cllr E G R Jones (DP299)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognise importance of Green Belt Policy but concern that contributing with existing policy would not allow for economic and social benefits to be taken into consideration.</li> <li>Example of application for a care home provided, which was refused although it was given support from Primary Care Trust, would provide jobs and addresses local housing and care needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Core Policy 17 and Development Management Policy 6 considered in light of National Planning Policy Framework and amended if needed.</li> </ul>



St Modwen Developments Ltd (DP257)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trentham Gardens was rebranded following the grant of the 2001 planning application and should be referred to as "The Trentham Estate and Gardens".</li> <li>Support continued identification of the former Meaford Power Station as a Major Developed Site</li> <li>Promote Meaford Power Station site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 24 with updated name.</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 685)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP591)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the Green Belt Policy</li> <li>Consideration should be given to protecting area of land between Stafford and Stone, similar to Green Belt protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP 159)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Mr M Gardner (DP 118)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst Green Belt does not apply to Stafford town, concern that the countryside and agricultural land around the town is being lost to urban sprawl</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP941)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with contents of Development Management Policy 6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP901)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the policy should reference historic environment and heritage assets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed amend Development Management Policy 6, criteria c of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph to read "... and their surroundings, taking account of heritage assets and landscape setting where appropriate to the development;"</li> </ul>

Ranton Parish Council (DP 686)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP594)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with questions 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 518)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the continuation of Green Belt policy but questions where boundaries should be reassessed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Further consideration of Green Belt boundary amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1093)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be mix of tenure size to accommodate the elderly and ageing population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP 1058)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the principle but would object to specific targets as suggested in 8.179</li> <li>• The Strategic Housing Market Assessment was from 2007 and not considered up to date</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Barwood Development Securities (DP 1012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the principle but would object to specific targets as suggested in 8.179</li> <li>• The Strategic Housing Market Assessment was from 2007 and not considered up to date</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 689)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New housing developments in small rural settlements should comply with the wishes expressed by the local community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP 144)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The council should acknowledge that there will be times when mix of dwelling types and sized will not be appropriate</li> <li>• Service Families Accommodation developments are determined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

	by military requirement rather than need to provide a wider mix	
St Modwen Developments (DP1031)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the policy is inappropriately worded as it would prevent apartment development, prevent all development intended for rent, raise issues of viability, prevent development where specialist provide is inappropriate.</li> <li>Policy should be amended to provide an appropriate mix of dwellings types, sizes and tenures, include an affordable element where viable, provide specialist housing where needed</li> <li>In second bullet, the first sentence and first word of second sentence should be deleted.</li> <li>Should be no reference to lifetime homes standard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to delete reference to PPS3 within Core Policy 18, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point.</li> <li>Noted and add the following new text to Core Policy 18 to read “All new market and affordable housing development must be delivered to Lifetime Homes Standards. Consideration may be given to relaxing this in certain circumstances where there is robust evidence that this will make a scheme unviable or is not technically feasible.” “New developments should provide a range of dwelling types and sizes for a mixture of different households, but with the proportion based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing household and dwelling size in the development locality</li> <li>Indicative waiting list data for the locality.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP903)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome policy content on character and distinctiveness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP 744)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed – subject to site specific protection supplied by Neighbourhood Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
McDyre and Co for J F Bostock Settlement (DP646)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to current and foreseeable economic climate the policy should have a rider to state that lifetime homes should be encouraged unless it can be demonstrated it is not feasible or would render the development unviable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and add the following new text to Core Policy 18 to read “All new market and affordable housing development must be delivered to Lifetime Homes Standards. Consideration may be given to relaxing this in certain circumstances where there is</li> </ul>

		robust evidence that this will make a scheme unviable or is not technically feasible.”
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support good design but do not consider Building for Life Standards are appropriate as the document is produced by other bodies and has not been tested.</li> <li>• The plan should contain criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 23 – Design.</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd (DP622)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy should be sufficiently flexible</li> <li>• Viability should be acknowledged along with circumstances where other benefits may outweigh criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and add the following new text to Core Policy 18 to read “All new market and affordable housing development must be delivered to Lifetime Homes Standards. Consideration may be given to relaxing this in certain circumstances where there is robust evidence that this will make a scheme unviable or is not technically feasible.”</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 525)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand should also be taken into account along with need to ensure sustainable patterns of development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP451)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree with the requirement that all new developments must adopt lifetime home standard due to resources and costs</li> <li>• As an alternative, suggest a proportion to be built to lifetime home standard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and add the following new text to Core Policy 18 to read “All new market and affordable housing development must be delivered to Lifetime Homes Standards. Consideration may be given to relaxing this in certain circumstances where there is robust evidence that this will make a scheme unviable or is not technically feasible.”</li> </ul>
Bellway Homes (DP412)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The market will also be a factor in the determination of appropriate housing mix</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> <li>• Affordable housing is addressed in Core</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing is not always feasible on site and there needs to be recognition that off site contributions may be acceptable</li> </ul>	Policy 19.
Providence Land Limited (DP 398)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flexibility for villages in para 8.184 is supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Seighford Settled Estate (DP176)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A range of housing may not be appropriate on all sites. Smaller sites may result in 'bitty' incoherent development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Core Policy 18 makes reference to local need and compatibility with site density, character and distinctiveness of the area.</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP 160)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dwellings should have regard to principles in the town design statement and any neighbourhood plan.</li> <li>Affordable housing should only be in response to identified local need and must be matched with infrastructure and employment opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 23 – Design regards Town and village design statements. Affordable housing is addressed in Core Policy 19.</li> </ul>
Tetlow King Planning (DP 104)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP 31)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Living space must be adequate</li> <li>If standards cannot be met, the development should be refused</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Policy aims to achieve the high standards for Lifetime Homes</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP943)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments on Development Management Policies 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP 763)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed and support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 691)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreement with the proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

Parish Council (DP 207)		
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP 161)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 693)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally in agreement with the proposals. There should be a definition of “disproportionate”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 8 with 2 new criteria and amended last paragraph. New paragraph added to provide clarity.</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP 764)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed and Support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP 208)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes provided the development conforms to the permitted plans and any planning conditions are enforced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP 162)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr F Biard (DP71)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria b. is too prescriptive, side extensions in some circumstances would be ok.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP 765)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed and support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 694)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP 209)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP 163)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Ranton Parish Council (DP 695)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not oppose but in the rural area such dwellings are normally used for short term renting which can impact on local communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Houghton Parish Council (766)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed and support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 696)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic movement, vehicles and vehicle speeds are a major issue in rural areas. Any such development would need to be discussed with the local community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1094)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council will only look to take a commuted sum in exceptional circumstances.</li> <li>Affordable rent is now included in the definition of affordable homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.187 to refer to ‘affordable rent’ in the definition of affordable housing.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP 1059)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support housing schemes providing element of affordable housing, concern about the accuracy of the evidence base underpinning the policy, in particularly viability assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.193 to read “...current plan period based on the Borough’s Affordable Housing Viability Assessment.”</li> </ul>
Barwood Development Securities (DP 1013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support housing schemes providing element of affordable housing, concern about the accuracy of the evidence base underpinning the policy, in particularly viability assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.193 to read “...current plan period based on the Borough’s Affordable Housing Viability Assessment.”</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP945)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association - West Midlands (DP813)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Importance of mixed housing should be emphasised</li> <li>Concern that only some areas within the rural area are identified</li> <li>Affordable housing in rural areas to be met along with not restricting other housing which meets local needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 19, Core Policy 20 and Development Management Policy 12. Update policy in line with National Planning Policy Framework.</li> </ul>

Ranton Parish Council (DP 699)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of affordable housing in small rural areas should be done following a consultation with the local population. The need is not inherent in all communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Council to continue working with Parish Councils and Registered Providers on rural exception sites.</li> </ul>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP 145)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MOD consider proposals for military accommodation, as non-market housing should be exempt from affordable housing contributions.</li> <li>Rents paid in such properties are below market rent and are therefore affordable in itself.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1032)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy should be clarified to reflect the viable target and be amended to read "The Council has set an affordable housing target of 30% where this is viable"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.193 to read "...current plan period based on the Borough's Affordable Housing Viability Assessment."</li> </ul>
Grainger PLC (DP 800)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocate the need for a very careful viability assessment for any such development</li> <li>No justification is given for the lower site threshold areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.193 to read "...current plan period based on the Borough's Affordable Housing Viability Assessment."</li> </ul>
McDyre and Co for J F Bostock Settlement (DP647)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 13% figure would be more realistic</li> <li>Threshold of 5 or more is more appropriate in smaller settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway/ St Modwen (DP 640)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Viability assessment demonstrates that in some parts, 30% is not viable. The viability assessment does not look at strategic sites</li> <li>Targets should be based on viability and therefore a minimum target cannot be set</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.193 to read "...current plan period based on the Borough's Affordable Housing Viability Assessment."</li> <li></li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for Akzo Nobel UK Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with recognition that financial viability test can be used</li> <li>Consider it premature to include a target in advance of a viability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.193 to read "...current plan period based on the</li> </ul>



(DP624)	<p>assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing definition has now been amended</li> </ul>	<p>Borough's Affordable Housing Viability Assessment."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.187 to refer to 'affordable rent' in the definition of affordable housing.</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 579)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing requirements should not be set at levels that would affect the profitability of developments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 19 to read "As a general principle, there will be a presumption that affordable housing will be provided on site. Only in exceptional circumstances will the Council accept an off site contribution on another site provided by the developer, where it is proven that on site provision is not feasible or unviable."</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP 506)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with the right to allow developers to build affordable housing off site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Fulford Parish Council (DP 368)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not entirely agree with the policy due to the 'get out' clause</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 19 to read "As a general principle, there will be a presumption that affordable housing will be provided on site. Only in exceptional circumstances will the Council accept an off site contribution on another site provided by the developer, where it is proven that on site provision is not feasible or unviable."</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP 210)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Tetlow King Planning (DP 105)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Happy with the policy approach but concur there needs to be viability testing to ensure the policy is realistic.</li> <li>Pleased to see previous comments have been incorporated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.193 to read "...current plan period based on the Borough's Affordable Housing Viability Assessment."</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1095)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Councils can have an input into determining the nominations policy to ensure housing goes to the households with a local connection. The dwellings will be managed by a Registered Provider</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP946)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not wish to comment on Development Management Policies 12, 13 and 14 at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association - West Midlands (DP 814)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A commitment do more small scale housing in rural settlement would assist flexibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend CP9 following Member consideration of Draft NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery.</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP 747)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policy – in that the needs will be based on parish and not extended to people already in the parish and occupying social housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP 701)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialist housing should be location in Stafford, Stone and larger villages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to Development Management Policy 12 amendments.</li> </ul>
Milwich Action Committee (DP 670)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree but look for definition of rural exception sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to be add a definition to the glossary</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 597)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Providence Land Limited (DP 399)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These sections will be superseded by NPPF. Exception sites may included affordable and market housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend CP9 following Member consideration of NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core</li> </ul>

		Policy 2 with additional criteria added concerning housing delivery
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP 211)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree but it should also include elderly people wishing to move into smaller properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. To be considered through local needs / parish surveys.</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP 164)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the principles of the policy. Note that in questions 3 and 5 expressed concern for edge of settlement development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Rural exception sites would still need to meet Core Policy 23 criteria.</li> </ul>
Tetlow King Planning (DP 106)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support specialist housing but it is not always appropriate to include within the housing mix</li> <li>• Concern over term 'small scale'</li> <li>• Suggestion in the fourth bullet should be affordable housing statement</li> <li>• Multi parish approach would be the more pragmatic and seek removal of single parish reference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to Development Management Policy 12 amendments.</li> </ul>
Mr F Biard (DP 72)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy could do with locational criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Providence Land Limited (DP 400)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement in para 8.195 is wrong and should be amended</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.195 to read "... restraint policies where housing development would not normally be permitted. A significant number of small settlements and a significant proportion of the Borough's population live in these geographic areas. The Council sees rural exception sites as one way of meeting housing needs in these settlements."</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council – Environmental & Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy to determine the categorisation of planning class for specialist and extra care housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.198 to provide a definition of specialist housing.</li> </ul>

Service (DP1096)		
Ranton Parish Council (DP 702)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specialist housing should be location in Stafford, Stone and larger villages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
G & C Leese Bros (DP369)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest the addition of a specific named provision for Park Homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
McCarthy & Stone retirement Lifestyle Ltd (DP 358)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pleased to see the policy within the document</li> <li>The policy needs to acknowledge the range of accommodation and care</li> <li>A development incentive could be provided to encourage development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend last sentence of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, Development Management Policy 13 to read "... will be delivered through a range of types and tenures." Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point to read "... location close to services and facilities."</li> </ul>
Mrs M France (DP 256)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wish to see older peoples accommodation in Weeping Cross Area of Stafford, in particular on the former policy headquarters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP 748)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP 520)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly support this policy, in particularly as it will help free up large family housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Tetlow King Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pleased to see the policy and the wording but would like to see a more positive approach towards encouragement</li> <li>Provide example policy from Bromsgrove</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP 1097)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for Gypsy and Traveller pictures to be reassessed by the Council.</li> <li>Different needs of different types of the travelling community should be taken into account</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second point should be reworded to avoid acceptable term</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Development</li> </ul>

(DP904)		Management Policy 14, 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point to read “The development of the site minimises the potential impact on the surrounding landscape, environment, heritage assets ...”
Environment Agency (DP 384)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the policy wording however notice an error in that PPS25 allows sites to be local within medium risk Flood Zone 2 if the exception test is passed. This may want to be reflected in the policy</li> <li>• Please note that the Draft NPPF withdraws Part B of the Exception Test which relates to the requirement of the development to be located on brownfield land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 14, 8th bullet point to read “within Flood Zone 1 or 2;”</li> </ul>
G & C Leese Bros Ltd (DP373)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadly support the wording however consider a key criterion to be preference for use of rural brownfield sites first, such as former locations of rural businesses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change. Further consideration of amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>
Traveller Law Reform project / Friends, Families and Travellers (DP 294)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the policy, however have concerns.</li> <li>• The policy does not state how many pitches are required</li> <li>• The policy does not give a trajectory, in particularly an annualised one</li> <li>• In the first sentence the word only should be deleted</li> <li>• Third bullet point should be deleted</li> <li>• Green Belt point should be rephrased to reflect national green belt policy</li> <li>• 6<sup>th</sup> bullet should refer to safe access to the public highway</li> <li>• Flood risk bullet requires careful explanation and interpretation</li> <li>• 2 Transit Pitches should also be planned for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to the following changes. Development Management Policy 14, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point to read “The development of the site minimises the potential impact on the surrounding landscape, environment, heritage assets ...”</li> <li>• Noted and agree to delete 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point of Development Management Policy 14 and amend 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read “Matters to address include pitch sizes, the adequacy ...”</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 14, 6th bullet point to read “The site has safe access to ...”</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 14, 8th bullet point to read “within Flood Zone 1 or 2;”</li> </ul>
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group (DP 81)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support general direction of the policy but suggest amendments:</li> <li>Remove word ‘only’</li> <li>6<sup>th</sup> bullet point change to ‘The site has safe access...’</li> <li>8<sup>th</sup> bullet point – the site is not located in an area of high flood risk</li> <li>Make reference to pitch targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to the following changes. Development Management Policy 14, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point to read “The development of the site minimises the potential impact on the surrounding landscape, environment, heritage assets ...”</li> <li>Noted and agree to delete 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point of Development Management Policy 14 and amend 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read “Matters to address include pitch sizes, the adequacy ...”</li> <li>Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 14, 6th bullet point to read “The site has safe access to ...”</li> <li>Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 14, 8th bullet point to read “within Flood Zone 1 or 2;”</li> </ul>
Houghton Parish Council (DP 749)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed – subject to Neighbourhood Plan provisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group (DP 83)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other options alongside Gypsy and Traveller Site Grant are available such as planning obligations, private site delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend final sentence of paragraph 8.208 to read “Traveller Site Grant, through private provision or planning contributions.”</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association West Midlands (DP815)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that core strategy should positively plan for rural businesses and be flexible to accommodate their needs</li> <li>Specify that the core policy should recognise the role of rural</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to add new paragraphs concerning rural businesses and the economy after para 8.213.</li> </ul>

	<p>businesses in the rural economy and their role in management of rural landscapes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specify that local planning authorities need to be more flexible in terms of sustainable transport requirements for rural businesses due to their rural location</li> </ul>	
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1098)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that there should be starter units for a range of new business development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
JT and DC Goucher for Baden Hall Enterprises (DP1041)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoting their site at Cold Meece as a potential new employment site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Further consideration of amendments through the Site-specific Allocations &amp; Policies Development Plan Document.</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP947)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to draft policy 20 as it is inconsistent with PPS 4 or the draft NPPF and provides too much protection for employment land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 20, point 3 to read “Applicants will need to provide substantial evidence to make ...” and “The development outweighs the retention of the site in its existing use.” Consider further in light of National Planning Policy Framework approach.</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP751)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the strict conditions contained within CP 20- Economy about loss of employment land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP704)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the thrust of the policy to retain existing employment land</li> <li>Suggest that reallocation of employment land should only be done as a last resort.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

<p>G and C Leese Bros Ltd (DP563)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that CP20 should be applied to employment generating sites in existing urban, urban edge and rural locations</li> <li>• Suggest that the policy should not be over prescriptive resulting in employment units in rural areas remaining empty.</li> <li>• Suggest that a more favourable approach to the re-use of PDL regardless of location should set out within the plan</li> <li>• Concerned that the tests do not allow for more flexible uses of employment land and would place undue burden on businesses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 20, point 3 to read “Applicants will need to provide substantial evidence to make ...” and “The development outweighs the retention of the site in its existing use.” Consider further in light of National Planning Policy Framework approach.</li> </ul>
<p>St Modwen Developments (DP1033)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the opening line should be amended to better reflect the approach set out in PPS 4 by replacing new employment development with new economic development.</li> <li>• Suggest that the word “material” be inserted before reduction in criteria two</li> <li>• Suggest that the word “and” should be replaced by “or” in criteria three</li> <li>• Suggest that a 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point be added that reads “The benefits of an alternative form of development outweigh the retention of the site in its existing use”</li> <li>• Suggest that the final three criteria are unnecessary and should be deleted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 20 1<sup>st</sup> sentence to read “The location, diversity and intensity of new economic development ...”</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 20, point 3 to read “Applicants will need to provide substantial evidence to make ...” and “The development outweighs the retention of the site in its existing use.” Consider further in light of National Planning Policy Framework approach</li> </ul>
<p>Stan Robinson Ltd - Stafford (DP254)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the text of CP 20 would benefit from the inclusion of greater flexibility to allow expansion of businesses to areas outside current RIE boundaries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>



Maximus Strategic (DP948)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment at this stage on DM 15, 16 and 17</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP706)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the DM policy 15</li> <li>Suggest that notice must be taken of the impact of increased traffic flows</li> <li>Suggest that communities should be consulted when development is proposed outside Recognised Industrial Estates (RIEs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1034)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that the RIE should be identified on a plan.</li> <li>Suggest that employment is changed to economic development to better accord with PPS 4</li> <li>Suggested that DM 15 point b is changed to the following "A limited element of retailing where this is ancillary to the operation of the estate."</li> <li>Suggest that DM15 d is amended to read / or support the role of the estate including its ability to attract investment."</li> <li>Suggest that the words "Other than in the circumstances outlined above..." should be added before, "The use of employment sites for employment purposes other than..."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Recognised Industrial Estates to be identified on the Proposals Map.</li> <li>Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 15, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence to read "Within the Recognised Industrial Estates the following appropriate economic uses..."</li> <li>Amend bullet point d to read "Other employment-generating uses to enhance inward investment, such as ..."</li> <li>Noted but no change</li> </ul>
Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the policy only provides for development within the RIE</li> <li>Suggest that in the event that CP 9 is not retained then the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>

	should be amended to allow expansion of RIEs whether or not they are located within a RDB to facilitate the needs of growing businesses.	
Eccleshall Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that it would be difficult to expand Raleigh Hall as it is an unsustainable rural location</li> <li>• Specify that there is no public transport and the existing roads will be unable to accommodate more traffic.</li> <li>• Suggest that industrial and commercial development should be concentrated in Stafford and Stone where there is good accessibility to public transport and the Motorway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP708)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly agree with the content of DM policy 16.</li> <li>• Suggest that Stafford should build on its strong industrial and educational facilities to become a high technology centre</li> <li>• Suggests the Borough needs small facilities with good broadband facilities at rents that start-up companies can afford</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP710)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the content of DM policy 17 but are concerned how the views of local people can be taken into account</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP949)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with Draft Core Policy 21</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Stoke on Trent City Council (DP785)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that further clarification and detail is required within the local plan with regard to retail policies, housing provision north of Stone and employment land provision</li> <li>• Concerned that there is no definition of local centres within the proposals map and the difference between local centres and key rural settlements</li> <li>• Concerned that it will be impractical to implement Core Policy 21 and DM Policy 18, given that there is no clear definition of town,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Refer to Core Policy 2 and associated justification text.</li> <li>• Noted. Refer to the new key diagram and proposals maps to locate defined centres.</li> <li>• Noted and no change. Core Policy 21 to be considered in line with National Planning</li> </ul>

	<p>district or local centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that town centre and retail policies in the local plan should aim to secure the vitality and viability of centres given that detailed policies from PPS 4 are being lost.</li> </ul>	Policy Framework.
Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council (DP781)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that further clarification and detail is required within the local plan with regard to retail policies, housing provision north of Stone and employment land provision</li> <li>• Concerned that there is no definition of local centres within the proposals map and the difference between local centres and key rural settlements</li> <li>• Concerned that it will be impractical to implement Core Policy 21 and DM Policy 18, given that there is no clear definition of town, district or local centre.</li> <li>• Suggest that town centre and retail policies in the local plan should aim to secure the vitality and viability of centres given that detailed policies from PPS 4 are being lost.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Refer to Core Policy 2 and associated justification text.</li> <li>• Noted. Refer to the new key diagram and proposals maps to locate defined centres.</li> <li>• Noted and no change. Core Policy 21 to be considered in line with National Planning Policy Framework.</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP768)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the contents of Core Policy 21</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP711)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the contents of Core Policy 21</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (DP641)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the supporting text does not make clear that centres provided within new communities will be district centres for the purposes of core policy 21</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP522)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for Core Policy 21</li> <li>• Suggest that the village of Eccleshall will need to provide increased residential development to fulfil its role as a local service centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

Mr J Holt (DP319)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agrees with the general thrust of the policy but suggest that the settlement categorisation should be throughout the whole document that acknowledges developments needs and growth can and will be met in more locations than just Stafford and Stone Town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr T Hutchinson for Providence Land Ltd (DP402)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the Core Policy 21</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Theatres Trust (DP242)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specify that it is necessary for smaller town and district centres to provide entertainment, leisure and cultural facilities of an appropriate scale and kind to serve their roles and catchments</li> <li>Support the last paragraph protecting existing community facilities for the future needs of residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP212)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the Core Policy 21</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP166)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the Core Policy 21 but foresee difficulties in enforcing it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP951)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments at present</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP713)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the content of DM policy 18</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP523)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that A3, A4 and A5 uses could be accommodated outside recognised centres to provide for local need.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Mr F Biard (DP73)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that core policy 21 is too prescriptive and will kill all sorts of harmless cafes and fish and chip shops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>

Ranton Parish Council (DP714)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the content of DM Policy 19</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1099)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that account should be taken of the existing uses of surrounding buildings where upper floors are being brought into use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Environment Agency (DP835)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that a caveat is added to ensure that change of use of upper floors is only supported where it can be demonstrated that there is safe access/ egress from the upper floors to dry land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 20, second sentence to read “Proposals should provide safe access, not lead to any significant loss of ground ...” Planning applications for re-use of upper floors dealt with on a case-by-case basis.</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP906)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports DM policy 20 in sustaining the use of historic buildings in town centres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP715)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with DM policy 20</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Trent Vision Trust (DP1046)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify that DM policy 21 goes beyond the current relevant tests set out in PPS 4</li> <li>• Criterion a should be deleted as the qualitative and quantitative needs assessments have been removed from PPS 4</li> <li>• Criteria D should be amended to take account of the terminology Significant adverse impact as set out in PPS 4</li> <li>• Criteria f should be deleted as if the proposals meet the sequential and impacts tests, then the range of goods and products must be considered appropriate for its location</li> <li>• Object to sentence that specifies that no new retail warehouses or superstores are required in these locations as it adopts a presumption for refusal and is contrary to PPS 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to delete 1<sup>st</sup> criteria in Development Management Policy 21.</li> </ul>
Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criterion a should be deleted as the qualitative and quantitative needs assessments have been removed from PPS 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to delete 1<sup>st</sup> criteria in Development Management Policy 21.</li> </ul>

(DP41)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that most of the policy repeats national guidance and should be reworded to provide a more locally specific focus</li> <li>• Suggest that the sentence that specifies that no new retail warehouses or superstores are required in these locations is deleted as it is contrary to PPS 4</li> </ul>	
St Modwen Developments (DP 1035)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PPS 4 removed the requirement to demonstrate need therefore part a should be deleted</li> <li>• Suggest that the sentence that specifies that no new retail warehouses or superstores are required in these locations is deleted, as it is contrary to positive approach set out in national policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to delete 1<sup>st</sup> criteria in Development Management Policy 21.</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP752)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the policy as set out in DM policy 21</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP716)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the policy as set out in DM policy 21 but suggest that public transport links should be established to retail and leisure centres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 21, criteria c to read “... modes of transport, including public transport, walking and cycling.”</li> </ul>
Environment Agency (DP836)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that point F of DM policy 22 is revised as it may conflict with PPS 25 sequential development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 22, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph to read “... forms of development, taking account of flood risk, noise and light ...”</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments (DP1036)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for DM policy 22</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP908)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports DM policy 22 as it encourages the re-use of historic buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Ranton Parish Council (DP717)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for DM policy 22</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Theatres Trust (DP243)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the policy must be more robust in resisting the re-use of community buildings for other developments as opposed to being refurbished and reused for community use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1100)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the statements on promotion of walking and cycling routes in core policy 22 Tourism because of the value to public health and well being</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP996)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest a wider definition to include facilities such as libraries, archives and museums</li> <li>• Suggest that Core policy 22 needs to take account of the Cannock Chase SAC recreational pressures and potential damage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 22 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read “... attractions such as Staffordshire County Libraries and Archives, the Museum and Shire Hall Gallery, Shugborough ...” and “... sensitive management and measure to protect the Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Stafford Castle, St Chads, the Staffordshire ...”</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP952)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Environment Agency (DP837)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support water based recreation but a caveat should be included to say, “without undermining water quality, flood risk areas nature conservation and biodiversity”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association - West Midlands (DP816)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify that the borough should take a positive approach to rural diversification for tourism, leisure and culture.</li> <li>• Suggest that the borough should allow tourism business to expand even if they are not on a public transport route</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
British Waterways (DP732)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that policy should be more consistent with DM policy 23</li> <li>• Concerned about the way CP 22 is worded is unduly restrictive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 22, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point to remove the words ‘be within or adjacent to settlements to’.</li> </ul>

	and would ensure that all waterside development in the rural area is prohibited	
St Modwen Developments Ltd (DP258)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that the draft policy regarding development Trentham Estate and Gardens should be amended to recognise the need to adopt a flexible and responsive approach to new development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Inland Waterways Association (DP107)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the policy of encouraging water-based recreation.</li> <li>Suggest that CP 22 is amended to remove the conflict with DM 23 by inserting the following wording “canal based tourism developments involving significant built development should be within or adjacent to settlements to protect the open countryside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 23, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph to read “Outside existing settlements marinas and moorings with limited services ...”</li> </ul>
Houghton Parish Council (DP769)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with CP22</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP718)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with CP22</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Young for J Ross Developments (DP524)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about consistency of Core Policy 22 with the policies seeking to protect the Cannock Chase AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 22 to read “... sensitive management and measure to protect the Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Stafford Castle ...”</li> </ul>
Sports England (DP281)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the encouragement of water based recreation but suggest that it should also be for both residents of Stafford and tourists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 22, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point to read “Encouraging water-based recreation and continuing ...”</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP213)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with Core Policy 22 but suggest a minor amendment to include “improve and maintain existing walking and cycling routes including towpaths, and promote linkages to both national and local networks”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 22 to read “Improving and promoting new and existing walking, cycling routes, including tow paths and linkages to national networks ...”</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with CP22</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>



(DP167)		
Inland Waterways Association (DP114)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that changes are required to the bullet point concerning canal based development of CP 22</li> <li>• Specify that para 8.223 should be updated and reinstated as explanation text under this policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 22, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point to remove the words ‘be within or adjacent to settlements to’</li> <li>• Noted and agree to add a new paragraph after paragraph 8.223.</li> </ul>
Inland Waterways Association (DP109)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that an additional paragraph is added to include the following “The Newport Branch Canal formerly linked the Shropshire Union Canal at Norbury Junction to Newport and to the Shrewsbury Canal; its restoration is being progressed by the Shrewsbury &amp; Newport Canals Trust. The Stafford Riverway Link Community Interest Company has been established to promote the restoration of the historic canal and river link from the Staffordshire &amp; Worcestershire Canal to Stafford town centre”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to add a new paragraph after paragraph 8.223 to read as follows: “The Newport Branch Canal formerly linked the Shropshire Union Canal at Norbury Junction to Newport and to the Shrewsbury Canal; its restoration is being progressed by the Shrewsbury &amp; Newport Canals Trust. The Stafford Riverway Link Community Interest Company has been established to promote the restoration of the historic canal and river link from the Staffordshire &amp; Worcestershire Canal to Stafford town centre.”</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP955)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
British Waterways (DP737)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the word “small scale” is removed from DM policy 22</li> <li>• Concern that the policy does not acknowledge that it is not always possible to locate suitable locations for new marinas in or adjacent to existing settlements</li> <li>• Suggest that an amendment is made to para 2 to include greater flexibility as follows “Outside existing settlements, marinas and moorings with service facilities will be acceptable provided”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 23, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph to read “Outside existing settlements marinas and moorings with limited services ...”</li> </ul>
Inland Waterways Association (DP110)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the content of DM23</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the reference to conservation areas and listed buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

(DP909)		
Ranton Parish Council (DP719)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the content of DM 23</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Inland Waterways Association (DP111)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IWA agrees with the contents of the Canal Facilities and New Marinas policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP911)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the content of DM24 does not clearly recognise the heritage significance of the registered park and garden with numerous listed buildings and structures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Development Management Policy 24, criteria a to read “historic environment including the Registered Park and Garden, existing ...”</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments Ltd (DP259)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that policy DM24 does not take account of existing extant planning permissions at Trentham Estate and gardens</li> <li>• Suggest that the policy makes clear that the Council will consider uses other than existing and approved uses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP721)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the content of policy DM 24</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP598)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable to my constituency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association - West Midlands (DP817)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that CP 23 may be too inflexible regarding local distinctiveness element of the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP1060)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that new development must be of high design standard</li> <li>• Object to requirements to provide development briefs for major applications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Barwood Development Securities Ltd (DP1014)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to requirements to provide development briefs for major applications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to secured by design and building for life requirements</li> <li>• Object to lifetimes homes requirement for all new developments</li> </ul>	
Maximus Strategic (DP958)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP913)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that CP 23 would be better placed as either part of or follow on from the section on Environmental Protection</li> <li>• Suggest an additional point to address the relationship between design and the historic environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Staffordshire Police (DP124)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the inclusion of secure by design and provide justification for its inclusion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments Ltd (DP1037)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to a comprehensive masterplanning approach and suggest this should be better addressed through design and access statements</li> <li>• Object to the third bullet point on sustainable construction</li> <li>• Object to building for life reference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Haughton Parish Council (DP770)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the content of CP24</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP723)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the content of CP24</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey/ Bellway/ St Modwen (DP643)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to a comprehensive masterplanning approach</li> <li>• Suggest that secured by design standards and building for life are deleted from the policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Jones Lang LaSalle for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Building for Life requirement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Azko Nobel UK Ltd (DP627)		
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP599)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agrees with the design policy provided it does not stifle creativity in design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates (DP453)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to building for life standards</li> <li>Suggest that many of the provisions set out in the policy are duplications from previous policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK-interests at Stone (DP385)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to requirements to provide development briefs for major applications therefore the first bullet point should be deleted</li> <li>Suggest that the third bullet point is deleted as it duplicated provisions in CP 13</li> <li>Object to building for life reference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP214)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with policy CP 23 but it should also provide for provision for adequate external storage space to store prams, bikes or mowers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP169)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the content of the design policy provided that planners implement it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council Conservation Officer (DP1111)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that para 4 of CP24 is amended to the following “. Sympathetic to the character, appearance and construction of heritage assets...” and add an additional bullet point to para 4 “Traditional permeable building construction”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 24, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph to read “... sympathetic to their character, appearance and construction of heritage assets ...”</li> <li>Add a new criteria to Core Policy 24, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph to read “Traditional permeable building construction”</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the protection of the historic environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

(DP1061)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specify that there are no designated heritage assets at Mill Lane, Great Haywood following archaeological studies into the site.</li> </ul>	
Staffordshire County Council (DP997)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the policy and specify that the County Archives have a wide range of resources that document the development of the landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP960)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment to make</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association - West Midlands (DP818)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that development of historic environment assets is viewed more positively in terms of reuse and of land and buildings to deliver positive economic benefits.</li> <li>Suggest that the policy should consider how landscape change is managed and not just look solely at preservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
English Heritage (DP914)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the policy but suggest that it should be relocated to form part of a wider section on Environment Protection, Management and Design</li> <li>Suggest that greater emphasis is placed on non designated assets</li> <li>Suggest that an additional bullet pointy is added to the second part of the policy to encourage the use of the County's Historic landscape characterisation study, HECA, Extensive Urban Surveys and West Midlands Farmsteads and Landscapes Project as well as supporting text updating</li> <li>Suggest that para 4 is amended to the following "Development Proposals will be expected to sustain, and where appropriate, enhance the significance of heritage assets and their setting by promoting high quality design which takes account of:...".</li> <li>Suggest that para 5 requires some clarification and recommend that emphasis is put on conserving the significance of heritage assets to be more consistent with PPS 4.</li> <li>Suggest that opening line of para 6 could be amended to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change</li> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 24, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph to read "Development and advertisement proposals will be expected to sustain and where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets and their setting by promoting ..."</li> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 24, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph to read "... must conserve and protect the significance of heritage ..."</li> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 24, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph to read "Heritage assets will be conserved and enhanced by;"</li> </ul>

	<p>“Heritage assets will be conserved and enhanced by”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the heritage at risk portion of the policy could be more positive providing a commitment to improve their condition. Also suggest an additional supporting paragraph in relation to heritage at risk</li> <li>• Concerned about the final bullet point in relation to enabling development.</li> </ul>	
Houghton Parish Council (DP771)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with CP 24</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP724)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with CP 24 and suggest that the historic character of the town centre should be recreated by removing and remodelling some of the inappropriate buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP(DP600)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with CP 24</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP509)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Query why there is no reference to St. Chad’s Church in Stafford</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Refer to Spatial Portrait and Core Policy 22.</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP215)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest an additional paragraph at the bottom of policy CP 24 stating the following “Where loss is unavoidable, appropriate mitigation measures will be put into place, including archaeological investigation (including a written report) or recording. This information should be deposited at the County Record Office and be available to the general public”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and add a new paragraph at the end of Core Policy 24 to read “Where loss is unavoidable, appropriate mitigation measures will be put into place, including archaeological investigation (including a written report) or recording. This information should be deposited at the County Record Office and be available to the general public”</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP168)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the policy and suggest that developers are made aware of the Eccleshall Village Design Statements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest additional paragraph emphasising the rich rural and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Parish Council (DP216)	agricultural heritage of the Borough.	
Inland Waterways Association (DP112)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the policy and reference to the historic significance of canals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1101)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the statement that development that results in the loss of existing open space, sport and recreation facilities will be resisted unless alternative facilities can be provided</li> <li>Suggest that the policy should also include provision for allotment space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change. Refer to Core Policy 25, 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point 5 for allotments.</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP1062)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that recreation standards should be put into the core strategy as required by PPG 17 para 8</li> <li>Suggest that Land at Mill Lane, Great Haywood could provide a significant amount of amenity space to the northern boundary of the site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to add a new Appendix listing the PPG17 Standards.</li> </ul>
Barwood Development Securities Ltd (DP1015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that standards for provision of open space need to be examined as part of the core strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP994)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that additional information on the timescales and assessment of the proposal to address deficiencies of indoor and outdoor sports facilities would be helpful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP961)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Natural England (DP848)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the use of measurable standards such as ANGST to support and inform decisions around development and recreation space design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

Woodland Trust (DP293)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that the Woodland Access Standard could be used to inform the delivery of Core Policy 25</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 25, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph to read "... Greenspace Standards, including Woodland Access Standards."</li> </ul>
Houghton Parish Council (DP772)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with CP25</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP726)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with CP25</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey/ Bellway/ St Modwen (DP645)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that standards for provision of open space need to be examined as part of the core strategy as set out in para 8 of PPG 17</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to add a new Appendix listing the PPG17 Standards.</li> </ul>
Mr J Pert (DP534)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the terminology is not clearly explained in the policy or the explanatory text.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to add a new paragraph listing the PPG17 open space typologies.</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP511)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that there is little evidence that the Borough will take the lead in providing sports facilities or refurbishment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP424)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that there is limited provision for allotments to enable Stafford to be more self-sufficient in food</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP382)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the opening paragraph is too vague</li> <li>Suggests that a much higher profile is needed for cycle paths.</li> <li>Support for the park and ride service with integrated rural bus services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Sport England (DP283)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the local area needs have not been fully reflected in the area based policies</li> <li>Suggest that the first sentence should refer to adequate facilities (quantity) with good access as well as</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>Noted and amend Core Policy 25, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph to read "... seek to secure adequate provision and access to high</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that bullet point 6 is amended to protect all playing fields</li> <li>• Concerned that the last paragraph is not PPG 17 compliant</li> <li>• Concerned that the policy wording is too vague where replacement facilities are concerned which probably will result in replacement facilities that are inadequate. Suggest that any replacement facilities are equivalent, if not better, in terms of quantity, quality, accessibility and maintenance</li> <li>• Suggests that the final paragraph is reworded for ancillary facilities to include social space and catering facilities, which can provide valuable income to the club.</li> </ul>	<p>quality, well maintained open space ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 25, 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read “Protection of existing playing fields and artificial pitches ...”</li> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 25, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph to read “... unless better facilities in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility can be provided ...”</li> </ul>
Eccleshall Parish Council (DP170)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with CP 25 but have difficulties about its implementation of the ground</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP995)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries what measures are being proposed to meet the forecast increase in demand for sports pitches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and refer to Core Policy 3 &amp; 7.</li> </ul>
Stafford Borough Council –Environmental & Health Service (DP1102)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that adequate provision is made for taxi ranks in Stafford and Stone</li> <li>• Suggest that the following sentence is included “all developments that generate significant traffic flows including commercial traffic do not have a negative impact on air quality”</li> <li>• Suggest that any car parking assessment is carried out in conjunction with the Council’s Environmental and Health Service/ Environmental Maintenance Service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and amend Core Policy 26, 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read “... strategic road network, do not have a negative impact on the network or at junctions, air quality, ...”</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP1063)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest site at Mill Lane Great Haywood for consideration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP963)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment to make at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP727)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that there is no public transport in rural areas other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

	than on A or B Class roads	
Dr A Andrews (DP249)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the increased development will result in more traffic congestion given the inadequacy of the current infrastructure</li> <li>• Suggest that to promote more sustainable access to the countryside there will need to be more footpaths and bridleways to link to local and national routes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Houghton Parish Council (DP773)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with CP 26</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP602)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with CP 26-Transport</li> <li>• Suggest that integrated transport is made a top priority with particular attention given to bus interchanges in the town centre and on the outskirts.</li> <li>• Measures such as traffic light rephrasing and lane remodelling should also be considered to reduce congestion at peak times</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP515) and (DP513)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that financial factors will have an undue influence on transportation provision</li> <li>• Concerned at the lack of police presence in relation to traffic control</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP422)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AS DP 382</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Fulford Parish Council (DP371)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the policy will not adequately address the issues experienced by rural communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP217)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support CP 26 and content of para 8.251</li> <li>• Suggest that Sow valley Link is built as opposed to the Eastern Access Improvement Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Eccleshall Parish Council (DP171)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the principle of the policy but suggest that it is unachievable in rural areas given the decision to expand Raleigh Hall, which has no public transport access and would increase rural road traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Rev A Jeffries (DP32)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagrees with the transport policies</li> <li>• Concerned that the scale of the plans are too large in terms of housing and employment</li> <li>• Concerned that transport implications have not been adequately or realistically addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Fulford Parish Council (DP372)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the implementation of better public transportation to rural areas would provide an alternative to car based travel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP218)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that development that generates large traffic volumes should have good access links to the main highway network to avoid congestion on the road network.</li> <li>• Suggest that new developments should not generate increased heavy goods traffic along roads which are unequipped for such traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP964)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP728)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the contents of DM 25</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Mr J Lefroy MP (DP604)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the contents of DM 25</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP516)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the contents of DM 25</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

Haughton Parish Council (DP775)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the contents of DM 25</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ranton Parish Council (DP729)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the contents of DM 25</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (DP219)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that current maps need to be updated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Staffordshire County Council (DP998)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that public realm improvements may require commuted maintenance payments; therefore a policy in respect of commuted maintenance payments should be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs. Full consultation on a preliminary CIL Draft charging schedule</li> </ul>
Berkswich Parish Council (DP517)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify that there are no missing policies just the means to achieve them all</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Environment Agency (DP838)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the measures, targets and assessments carried out as part of the River Basement Management Planning are taken into account as part of the monitoring process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to include a new Appendix setting out specific targets and indicators</li> </ul>
Maximus Strategic (DP965)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose to continue to submit evidence to demonstrate that our proposals for a sustainable urban extension at land north of Beaconside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Country Landowners Association - West Midlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that policies within the document should be flexible for the changes that will occur over the plan period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
Transition Town Stafford (DP425)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that transition town Stafford should meet with the Forward Planning Team and Cllr Beatty.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
St Modwen Developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the number of commitments is realistically assessed</li> <li>• Suggest that SHLAA sites should be considered for allocation in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>

(DP1038)	<p>the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that provision for military personnel should be in addition to the general housing requirement.</li> </ul>	
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (DP386)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repeat of comment DP386</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repeat of comment DP386</li> </ul>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DP146)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the housing figures do not adequately take account of MOD housing requirements</li> <li>• Suggests that the 2008 population projections do not take account of MOD requirements; thus by including military personnel within the 500 per year the Council is not addressing the need arising for non military personnel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements from the current housing provision and identify 1Site to provide Service Family Accommodation. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery.</li> </ul>
Mr F Biard (DP74)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the rationale behind the housing figures should be summarised in section 3 and set out in the spatial vision, key objectives and Core policies 2, 3, 7 and 9 to make the rationale behind the housing figures clearer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
The Theatres Trust (DP244)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify that Theatres are not D2 under the Use class order but are Sui Generis.</li> <li>• Suggest that the following parking standard should be applied ' 1 cycle stand per 40 seats, 1 parking space per 5 fixed seats and adequate turning and loading facilities inc. space for one coach or 16.5m lorry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Appendix B.</li> </ul>
Campaign to Protect Rural England - Staffordshire (DP1118)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3 Issues facing the Borough – concern about scale of new development proposed and lack of infrastructure, lack of reference to peak oil, influence of planning on climate change, greater emphasis on natural environment and open space, delivery of affordable housing but not migrating households, quality design .</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and new paragraphs included regarding peak oil.</li> <li>• Noted and new paragraphs included on</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4 Policy Influences – object to Draft NPPF pro-growth approach and Stafford’s Growth Point status.</li> <li>• Spatial Vision to refer to sustainable transport facilities, climate change, environmental protection and enhancing rural areas.</li> <li>• Key Objectives – object to development north of Stafford beyond the landscape bowl and unsupported by east and west road schemes, concern about mitigation measures affecting Cannock Chase, Stafford as a regional centre, object to development at Stone and loss of farmland but support Meaford, rural travel to work and employment. Concern about housing and employment development not supported by evidence (industrial floorspace to working people) and inclusion of migration figures.</li> <li>• Stafford Town Policies – concern about scale of development, lack of evidence for transport infrastructure delivery including east and west road schemes, impact on the Cannock Chase SAC with lack of mitigation measures detailed, support historic environment and setting of Stafford Castle, lack of modal shift to sustainable transport, significant costs of infrastructure. Land north of Stafford object to elevated ground, increase affordable and specialist housing, increased traffic congestion to town centre but support a new mixed use recreation and agricultural landscape. Land west of Stafford object to development, traffic and Stafford Castle impacts, limited mitigation for Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation. Land east of Stafford – object to development on rising ground, expansion needs at Stafford Cemetery, concern about eastern access road and transport links to town centre, landscape impacts.</li> <li>• Stone Town policies – support deferring development to 2021, concern about traffic congestion on A34 and coalescence of Stafford and Stone, need to deliver alternative green space.</li> <li>• Areas outside Stafford &amp; Stone policies – suggest rural housing growth at locations with access to transport networks for services and facilities, object to development dispersal, concern about new</li> </ul>	<p>National Planning Policy Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree amendments to objectives b, d, m, new objective and paragraph.</li> <li>• Noted. Current housing provision based on 2008 Household projections and achieving delivery. Agree to re-locate Appendix A to support Core Policy 2 in the main document and consider including the specific housing provision for Stafford, Stone and areas outside of Stafford &amp; Stone within the Policy</li> <li>• Noted and remove the proposed employment allocation at Burleyfields, to be retained as protected open space</li> <li>• Noted and agree amendments to Core Policy 3, 4, and 5. Noted and refer to the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Strategy and the Draft Stafford Town Integrated Transport Strategy. Further details through a strategic framework and master planning exercise</li> <li>• Noted and agree changes to Core Policy 6 and new Burial Ground policy.</li> <li>• Noted and agree amendments to Core Policy 7 and 8.</li> <li>• Noted and following Member consideration of NPPF and criteria based approach for new housing in rural areas outside of Stafford and Stone in Core Policy 2 with additional</li> </ul>
--	--	---

	<p>employment at Ladfordfields &amp; Raleigh Hall due to transport, support for New Development in Countryside policy restrictions for traffic, access to services and landscape character reasons. Concern about rural affordable housing, farm diversification, water supply issues and rural traffic impacts on country lanes. Supports Planning Obligations and an affordable CIL tariff to deliver facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate Change and Natural Environment policies – increased breadth of Climate Change policy to include peak oil, change to travel patterns and dispersed development, renewable energy policy to balance energy supply with reduction in demand. Support for natural environment policies, to protect Cannock Chase SAC with details of mitigation measures to avoid damage and object to restricted access for public verses new suitable accessible space. Concern about Green Belt policy supporting commercial uses and require more detail about scale of new development permitted.</li> <li>• Housing policies – general support but concern about non residential uses in residential areas due to traffic, disturbance and impact on character, affordable housing to refer to economic viability and monitor need, new policy document for gypsies.</li> <li>• Economy policies – general support but concern about dispersed rural employment / impact on traffic, focus on high value sectors, development in higher-order centres, restrict residential marinas.</li> <li>• Design &amp; Historic Environment policies – general support but explain high quality and relationship between buildings &amp; massing.</li> <li>• Open Space, Sport &amp; Recreation policy – supported with reference to accessibility, quality and landscape treatment.</li> <li>• Transport policy – general support with a focus on changes to transport infrastructure arising from peak oil, access to rural areas and investigating new technologies. Concern about traffic engineering on housing estates. Minor word changes to improve</li> </ul>	<p>criteria added concerning housing delivery through the neighbourhood planning process or the Site-specific Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree changes to Core Policy 13, 17, Development Management Policy 2, 4, 6.</li> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> <li>• Noted and amendments to Core Policy 25.</li> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
--	--	--

	the Rights of Way policy.	
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1119)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction to Stafford &amp; Rural Homes and Housing Plus, both organisations operating in Stafford Borough to deliver affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1120)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the Spatial Vision and specific reference to rural areas.</li> <li>Policy Influences to reflect changes through National Planning Policy Framework and further details on Neighbourhood Planning with links to the Borough's strategic planning framework.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> <li>Noted and agree to amend Section 4 to refer to Neighbourhood Planning as well as the National Planning Policy Framework throughout the document.</li> </ul>
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1121)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define the need for affordable housing, military population and rural approach. Further clarification on land south of Stafford. Support economic growth in the Borough.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Agree to amend Core Policy 2 to exclude MoD requirements. Key objective 10 amended with paragraph 7.10.</li> </ul>
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1122)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about housing delivery in Stone deferred to beyond 2021 as well as the supporting infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and delete the words 'deferred to later in the Plan period' and 'in the longer term beyond 2021' in Core Policy 7.</li> </ul>
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1123)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support rural exception sites for affordable housing, based on community needs survey.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and refer to Development Management Policy 12 amendments.</li> </ul>
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1124)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about the mismatch between affordable housing thresholds in Core Policy 11 verses Core Policy 19.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to replace Core Policies 11 &amp; 12 with a new Infrastructure Delivery policy and new paragraphs</li> </ul>
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1125)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High sustainability standards to be met in all housing development – market and affordable to avoid a lack of standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to add the word 'All' to Core Policy 13.</li> </ul>
Stafford & Rural Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy to support feed-in tariffs and Green Deal to encourage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and no change.</li> </ul>



(DP1126)	micro generation of power and overcome fuel poverty.	
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1127)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific reference to rural exception housing in the Green Belt policy to meet identified local needs in perpetuity for residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1128)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management Policy 6 to consider extensions for disabled adaptations which may involve larger extensions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change.</li> </ul>
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1129)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support affordable and specialist housing but more detail on types and mix needed. Lifetime Homes Standards to refer to all housing. Amend paragraph 8.180 for affordable and market housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.180 to read "... mix of sizes in affordable and market housing ..."</li> </ul>
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1130)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management Policy 8 to consider extensions for disabled adaptations which may involve larger extensions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and no change</li> </ul>
Stafford & Rural Homes (DP1131)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing definition to be updated with affordable rent and reduce the threshold number to maximise delivery. Amend policy for clarity on Rural Exception sites and on-site delivery. Support clusters of 15 homes and potential capacity. Update paragraph 8.193 with economic viability assessment produced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.193 to read "...current plan period based on the Borough's Affordable Housing Viability Assessment."</li> <li>• Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 19 to read "As a general principle, there will be a presumption that affordable housing will be provided on site. Only in exceptional circumstances will the Council accept an off site contribution on another site provided by the developer, where it is proven that on site provision is not feasible or unviable."</li> </ul>

<p>Stafford &amp; Rural Homes (DP1132)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Rural Exception sites policy and suggest updated Development Management Policy 12 text and paragraph 8.195.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.195 to read "...restraint policies where housing development would not normally be permitted. A significant number of small settlements and a significant proportion of the Borough's population live in these geographic areas. The Council sees rural exception sites as one way of meeting housing needs in these settlements.""</li> <li>Noted and agree to amend Core Policy 19 to define affordable housing, quality design and need together with links to the Parish.</li> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.197.</li> </ul>
<p>Stafford &amp; Rural Homes (DP1133)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 8.198 to be updated concerning specialist housing. Update Table 4 and link to Staffordshire County Council Flexicare Housing Strategy. Separate policy on nursing home provision. Appendix B – Car Parking Standards to refer to extra care provision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree to amend paragraph 8.198 and Table 4 with updated figures.</li> </ul>

APPENDIX 8 – RESPONSES RECEIVED & OFFICER COMMENTS PLAN FOR  
STAFFORD BOROUGH – STRATEGIC POLICY CHOICES

**General comments**

Name of Respondents	Summary of Response	Officer Comments
BNP Paribas Real Estate (Mr C Robinson) on behalf of Trine Developments (SC244)	Agree with 30% housing target provided opportunity for lower percentage demonstrated by independent studies	Noted & no change
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC525)	Concerned with housing provision for level of in-migration rather than local need, loss of greenfield land rather than use of brownfield land, empty retail uses should be re-used for residential use and new development should be limited to existing boundaries at Beaconside and Blackheath Lane.	Noted & no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing.
How Planning (Mr J Suckley) on behalf of Grasscroft Home and Property Limited (SC 507)	Representation in support of residential development, in the short term, at site at Knightly Road, Gnosall.	Noted.
Bellway Homes (Mr F Thomas) (SC506)	A higher rate above 500 dwellings per year should be considered within the Plan. The hierarchy is supported along with approach to, although further clarification is required about how Key Service Villages are defined. Support development in Gnosall and representations also include site details for Knightley Road, Gnosall. Approach to development outside Stafford and Stone and establishing boundaries seem appropriate.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration.
S Felthouse (SC 505)	Concern about lack of reference to renewable energy policy in paragraph 5.10, object to wind turbine development in the Borough due to impact on environment and landscape but support other renewable sources. Support neighbourhoods & communities to be involved in future development	Noted. Publication Plan to provide a specific renewable energy policy in line with NPPF approach.
Barlaston Parish Council (Mr N Hemmings) (SC 492)	Accept the level of development set out for areas outside Stafford and Stone is small, in relation to Barlaston, but concern that the new Plan will not offer suitable protection to the village from large-scale developments within or	Noted. The Publication Plan will maintain the North Staffordshire Green Belt designation and

	adjacent to the settlement, not influenced by the adoption of the plan.	include specific details in terms of development at and outside Key Service Villages.
Mr M Smith (SC 479)	Concern over wind turbine development in the Borough and calls for policy ban on such development.	Noted. Publication Plan to provide a specific renewable energy policy in line with NPPF approach
Mr J Heath on behalf of Mr Watson (SC 477)	Representation in support of housing development at Little Stoke, Stone.	Noted
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of BDW Trading Ltd (BDW) (SC 460)	Representations relate to land interests at Ash Flats, South of Stafford, promoting housing development to support the Plan's strategy. Concern that the NPPF and West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) justify a higher figure above 500 new houses per year at Stafford Borough, in order to give more flexibility to the delivery of the strategy.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan.
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of Hallam Land Management and Davidsons (SC 470)	Representations relate to land interests at Walton, Stone. Support the Plan's approach. Concern that the NPPF and West Midlands RSS justify a higher figure above 500 new houses per year at Stafford Borough, in order to give more flexibility to the delivery of the strategy.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) achieved through the figure of 500 per year. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan.
First City Limited (Mr Booth, Mr Evans, Mr & Mrs Stott) (SC 245)	Support new housing development at Stafford, with other housing elsewhere to support local need and affordable housing. Support the Plan period to 2031, with a review process required to maintain a supply of new sites. Concern about a lower level of housing provided than within the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy evidence, with NPPF requiring consideration of a range of information. Confirm delivery of site to the east of Stafford for 600	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. West

	dwelling with further growth to be provided at Stafford due to the Growth Point	Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan.
John Rose Associates on behalf of Moorfields Industrial Estate (Gibbons Family) (SC 393)	Representation in support of extension and alternative uses at Moorfields Industrial Estate on the basis it would meet the strategy, provide local employment and support the rural economy. Consider not all development in the rural area should be 'small scale' but more modest scale could be allowed, with a greater proportion than 8%, where it meets local need and other criteria in the Plan.	Noted and no change.
Mr C J Leather (SC 478)	Concern over wind turbine development in the Borough and calls for policy ban on such development	Noted. Publication Plan to provide a specific renewable energy policy in line with NPPF approach.
Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Partnership (Ms R Hytch) (SC 459)	Increased recognition to be included in the new Plan for the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) as a strategic issue within the context of the new development strategy and to meet the requirements set out in the NPPF. Development at settlements within / adjacent to the AONB need to consider the AONB, with its boundary shown on a map. Criteria based policy to include reference to the Cannock Chase AONB. As part of the new Community Infrastructure Levy & S106 agreements a number of funding projects to support the AONB should be considered.	Noted. The Proposals Map to show the AONB boundary. Publication Plan to include a policy on the Cannock Chase AONB and taken into account with new development at adjacent settlements.
Indigo Planning on behalf of Seddon Homes (SC 444)	Introduction to representation for new housing development.	Noted
Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o Jones Lang LaSalle (Mr F Sandwith) (SC 352)	Representation in support of development on land north of Stafford	Noted
Mr O Dyke on behalf of Trent Vision Trust (SC 428)	Introduction to representation	Noted

Persimmon Homes North West (Mr B Williams) (SC 425)	The housing target for Stafford Borough should be increased to meet new housing needs, amendments to the affordable housing threshold to reflect viability and evidence, and the need for more viable options to be considered in relation to additional housing delivery.	Noted. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. Amendment to affordable housing policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Staffordshire County Council (Ms T Brotherton) (SC 421)	The document does not provide the level of detail required to assess education requirements outside Stafford and Stone. This information could be provided if the settlement hierarchy provided detailed numbers for settlements.	Noted and no change. New development delivered through the Neighbourhood Planning process or a Site-specific document with consultation.
Persimmon Homes North West (Mr B Williams) (SC 418)	Current challenges in delivering new housing across Stafford Borough means that it is important to respond to the advice of the development industry in order to ensure future delivery.	Noted
Natural England (M Ash) (SC398)	Advise that the most up to date evidence is used to meet the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the plan and major new developments. Concern that the plan has not looked into the detailed impacts of the relationship between development and environmental impacts / degradation. The scale of new development in settlements to the east of the Borough may be influenced by impacts on Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Environmental issues should inform the location and extent of new development as well as be addressed by policy and criteria approaches.	Noted and agree. The Plan to provide further details on specific environmental policies and criteria to meet NPPF requirements. The Habitat Regulations Assessment is currently being produced relating to 5 European sites. The updated evidence relating to Cannock Chase will be reported separately along with progress

		on the mitigation and implementation plan.
Stoke-on-Trent City Council (Mr P Price) (SC 397)	Joint response from Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council. Support approach to the level of development at 500 per year and phased development at Stone post 2021. Consider that a phasing strategy is required for employment development, to ensure brownfield land is developed before large greenfield development that will impact on redevelopment of brownfield sites in the North Staffordshire conurbation and meet local needs.	Noted. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the new provision for employment and housing.
The Planning Bureau Limited (L Jackson) on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyle Ltd (SC 396)	Further consideration is required to meet the needs of the ageing population based on the latest evidence, with a specific policy to deliver new development requirements for market and affordable housing as well as specialist housing. Concern about level of affordable housing sought in areas with good access to services and facilities.	Noted. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration for the population. The Publication Plan to include a specialist housing specific policy
Mr M Smith (SC 395)	Concern over wind turbine development in the Borough and calls for policy ban on such development	Noted. Publication Plan to provide a specific renewable energy policy in line with NPPF approach.
Mr M Tweed (SC 394)	Concern over wind turbine development in the Borough and calls for policy ban on such development	Noted. Publication Plan to provide a specific renewable energy policy in line with NPPF approach.



John Rose Associates Moorfields Industrial Estate (Gibbons Family) (SC 390)	Promoting land for new development at Moorfields Industrial Estate, a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt, for housing development. Case sets out that it will continue to play an important role in for employment in the rural area	Noted and no change.
South Staffordshire District Council (Mr E Fox) (SC 304)	Support the principle of the strategy but consider that the policy should be explicit to say that what settlements Stafford Borough consider as cross border, as any development in South Staffordshire to serve Stafford Borough needs would be objected to.	Noted.
Action Parkside Residents Committee (Mr K Dartford) (SC 257)	Concern over development north of Stafford and the impact on road infrastructure as well as a lack of services, facilities & new infrastructure. Concern about the local environment and surface water run-off issues.	Noted. Further details to be provided through Publication policy and future consultation events for land north of Stafford.
RPS Planning & Development (K Else) on behalf of Barratt West Midlands (SC 210)	Representations promoting land for development at North Baswich, Stafford. Does not agree with provision of development and consider a higher provision for housing above 500 houses per year should be made. Consider that some of the evidence based documents are out of date. Support the settlement hierarchy and proportion split, seek clarity on the Eastern Access Improvement Scheme (EAIS). Agree with 30% affordable housing target but seek clarity on when this will be applied. The representation also includes extracts relating to the Eastern Access Improvement Scheme, site plan and household projection details.	Noted. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration for the population. The Publication Plan to include an affordable housing specific policy with amendment for clarification in terms of area approach. Proposals map to identify the EAIS and specific policy for land east of Stafford.
Creswell Parish Council (SC 158)	Concerns that the plan does not adequately address infrastructure needs and future delivery of infrastructure. Consider that the plan is deciding the location and distribution before looking at how access and traffic can be addressed.  Concern that neighbourhood planning cannot take place in those areas where strategic development is planned and how large sites will be integrated with	Noted. Further details to be provided through Publication policy and future consultation events for land north of Stafford.

	existing communities. Object to development without assurances on delivery of adequate infrastructure. Consider that the plan should adequately address the need and delivery of the Eastern Distributor Road	
Dr Malcolm Bell on behalf of Mr G & C Leese (SC 137)	Promoting redevelopment of a scrap yard for mobile home park, to be included in the Publication Plan with clarification of appropriate uses on this site.	Noted and no change. Future uses on the site guided by policy approach in the Publication Plan, to be considered by planning officers.
The Theatres Trust (R Freeman) (SC 100)	Publication Plan to include reference to community and cultural facilities.	Noted and no change.
Centro (Mr JHaywood) (SC 179)	Duty to cooperate and cross boundary issues to be considered. Stafford has strong rail links to the West Midlands and it is important that these are supported. Consideration should be given to improved public transport links for Stafford Borough residents to large employment sites outside the Borough such as i54 in South Staffordshire. Stafford Borough should assist with the accessibility and connectivity of all new developments.	Noted. Duty to co-operate discussions on-going with relevant parties. Publication Plan includes transport infrastructure and a transport policy approach.
Mrs A Murphy (SC 89)	Concern over wind turbine development in the Borough and calls for policy ban on such development	Noted. Publication Plan to provide a specific renewable energy policy in line with NPPF approach.
Mr L Stephan on behalf of Moore Family Trust (SC 75)	Welcome document in light of NPPF and strategy for rural area. Consider sites that are well located and promoted should be given considerable weight. Promoting site at The Haywoods with significant community benefits.	Noted.
H & H Holman Properties Ltd (Mr P Holmes) (SC 62)	Agree with the hierarchy and distribution of housing development. Promoting site for proposed retirement village north of Eccleshall.	Noted
T Thatcher (SC 60)	Concern over wind turbine development in the Borough and calls for policy ban on such development	Noted. Publication Plan to provide a specific renewable energy policy in line with NPPF

		approach.
Mr and Mrs Bramall (SC 59)	Concern over wind turbine development in the Borough and calls for policy ban on such development	Noted. Publication Plan to provide a specific renewable energy policy in line with NPPF approach.
Mr J D Chadwick (SC 58)	Concern over traffic impacts development will bring with additional services and facilities required to support this new development.	Noted
Mr J Martin (SC 57)	Development, particularly affordable housing, will be required in Hixon, which is identified as a Key Service Village.	Noted
Norbury Parish Council (Mr A McRae) (SC 44)	Agrees with the proposals in the document whilst acknowledging that the % for smaller rural areas will be unrealistic as in the past the completion rate in the area has been much higher. Such a low target may present a constraint on small-scale development and more scope for sensitively designed new housing outside Key Service Villages should be given, including at Woodseaves. Support a mix of boundaries and criteria-based approach.	Noted. Publication Plan to include a specific mechanism to monitor new development proportions and action required. Further details for policies included in the Publication Plan.
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mrs J McCabe) (SC 43)	The Ministry of Defence (MOD) has concerns relating to the proposed housing target of 500 dwellings per annum and clarify that household projections do not include home armed forces stationed outside England  Support viability consideration in relation to affordable housing. Policy to confirm that the Council will support development for Defence purposes at MOD Stafford.	Noted. Agree that housing for MOD personnel are excluded from the Borough housing target of 500 per year.
Mr G Willard (SC 33)	Promoting a site on behalf of a blue chip national food retail outlet in Stone. The NPPF requires that a range of suitable sites are delivered to meet the scale and type of uses for town centres either within or outside the centre. There are constrained options for new development in Stone town centre.	Noted. Further details for land at Stone town centre.

The Coal Authority (R Bust) (SC 32)	There is only a small area containing coal resources in the north of Stafford Borough, which is not likely to be sterilised by built development.	Noted and no change.
Mr C J Phillips (SC 31)	Objecting to two sites put forward as part of consultations on the Sandon and Burston neighbourhood plan	Noted. Sites to be consulted as part of Neighbourhood Plan
Mr and Mrs R E and A R Dewberry (SC 30)	Objecting to two sites put forward as part of consultations on the Sandon and Burston neighbourhood plan	Noted. Sites to be consulted as part of Neighbourhood Plan
Mr M Keenan (SC 29)	Objecting to two sites put forward as part of consultations on the Sandon and Burston neighbourhood plan	Noted. Sites to be consulted as part of Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Wildblood (SC 28)	Objecting to two sites put forward as part of consultations on the Sandon and Burston neighbourhood plan	Noted. Sites to be consulted as part of Neighbourhood Plan
C Capjon (SC 27)	Objecting to two sites put forward as part of consultation on the Sandon and Burston neighbourhood plan	Noted. Sites to be consulted as part of Neighbourhood Plan
Tetlow King Planning (M Rossiter) (SC 26)	The provision of new housing should be higher than 500 new houses per year to meet needs, up to 750 per year. Consider distribution of housing to be appropriate, along with criteria based policy and rejection of alternatives. Regarding affordable housing – object to the policy approach due to lack of ambition. Applying a higher level of growth at locations such as Eccleshall and Stone, with 30% elsewhere would emphasis the Council's commitment to affordable housing. A threshold should also be set out in the policy.	Noted. Amendment to affordable housing policy for clarification in terms of area approach. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration
Mr E Stones (SC 21)	Support all the preferred strategic policy choices.	Noted
Mrs D Faulkner (SC 20)	The plan should address pavements in the rural area to provide for pedestrian safety, particularly in Derrington.	Noted and no change.
Staffordshire Police (Mr G Scott) (SC 19)	Developments should consider 'Secured by Design' principles, which reduces crime and improves the environment as backed up by the carbon cost of crime	Noted. Principles referred to within the Design policy of the

	document provided.	Publication Plan document.
<b>1 Introduction</b>		
Indigo Planning on behalf of Commercial Estates Group (SC 518)	Promoting land east of Stafford.	Noted.
Paragraph 1.4		
Fisher German on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 211)	Agree with the approach to amending existing boundaries, as currently suitable land outside of boundaries is not considered developable in planning terms.	Noted. Further policy details provided in the Publication Plan.
Paragraph 1.6		
Mr F Biard (SC 16)	Welcome the new development approach and consider it to rectify the failings of the previous unsound Core Strategy	Noted.
Paragraph 1.7		
Fisher German on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 212)	Welcome the Council's commitment to producing a Sites and Allocations Development Plan Document to ensure full consultation on additional sites.	Noted
Paragraph 1.9		
Mr F Biard (SC 3)	Explanation of how the Sustainability Appraisal fits in to the plan required	Noted. Publication Plan to include a section introducing the Sustainability Appraisal process.
<b>2 The Context for Stafford Borough</b>		
Mr O Dyke on behalf of Trent Vision Trust (SC 429)	Does not agree with the key diagram as it shows strategic locations which have not yet been agreed	Noted and no change.

Hyde Lea Parish Council (Mr D L Jones) (SC 381)	Agree with cross border consultation / discussion	Noted.
Cannock Chase Council (Mr Matthew Hardy) (SC 366)	Support the inclusion of Cannock and Rugeley on the Key Diagram as well as the Chase Line railway as this is a strategic rail route between Cannock and Rugeley that provides onward rail connections to Stafford	Noted and agree to include on the Key Diagram.
Paragraph 2.4		
Colwich Parish Council (Mr J Blount) (SC 262)	Consider the lack of a strategic plan is a considerable disadvantage, particularly in terms of infrastructure on the local scale	Noted. Publication Plan to provide sufficient strategic detail.
Paragraph 2.5		
Colwich Parish Council (Mr J Blount) (SC 261)	Consider the lack of a strategic plan is a considerable disadvantage, particularly in terms of infrastructure on the local scale.	Noted. Publication Plan to provide sufficient strategic detail.
Paragraph 2.6		
Fisher German on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 227)	Agree with approach and consider it in line with the approach to rural development as set out in the NPPF.	Noted. Further details regarding rural sustainability to be included in the Publication Plan.
Paragraph 2.7		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr M Hardy) (SC 362)	Support reference to the duty to cooperate	Noted.
Paragraph 2.9		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr M Hardy) (SC 363)	Note need to co-operate on cross boundary issues and support reference to the Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)	Noted

Paragraph 2.10		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr M Hardy) (SC 365)	Strongly support the recognition of the need for joint working on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC)	Noted
Brocton Parish Council (SC 310)	Welcomes the policy of working with neighbouring and other authorities particularly in relation to Cannock Chase AONB and SAC. In this respect Brocton Parish Council would welcome an examination of water abstraction agreements with Severn Trent Water. Evidence shows a declining water level, which may have an impact on Cannock Chase SAC.	Noted. Water issues have been taken into account through the Cannock Chase SAC Habitat Regulations Assessment work
Paragraph 2.12		
Mr F Biard (SC 17)	This statement requires further explanation if it is not to be revisited later on	Noted and agreed. Further detail concerning land at south of Stafford within Publication Plan.
Paragraph 2.13		
Mr P Shaw (SC 192)	Neighbourhood Planning should be led by Parish Councils with the Borough Council giving full cooperation to ensure the plan is robust.	Noted.
Staffordshire & Worcestershire Canal Society (Mr F Cooke) (SC 82)	Neighbourhood planning is a good idea but someone still needs to speak for the needs of the wider community, regional and national values, standards and needs. Controls need to be enforced on local development in the wider interests of society.	Noted. Neighbourhood planning will be assessed against the new Local Plan and the NPPF, subject to future consultation with all stakeholders.
Paragraph 2.14		
Mr P Shaw (SC 196)	Any neighbourhood plan should be adhered to by the Borough Council	Noted. Once adopted, neighbourhood plans will form part of the new Development Plan for Stafford Borough.

Dr M Bell on behalf of Mr G & C Leese (SC 138)	The document is unclear how the rural employment locations on the Key Diagram have been selected. Platts Bridge has been excluded despite being an employment location in the rural area. Does this land class as a Recognised Industrial Estate?	New employment provision and location options have been considered through previous consultations, with preferred locations set out in the Draft Publication. Platts Bridge is not part of an existing Recognised Industrial Estates. Development of new employment sites in the countryside will be considered through a new criteria based policy in the Publication Plan.
Mr F Biard (SC 4)	All plans should have a scale and North point. The Stoke on Trent zone of economic influence is in the 'key' but cannot be seen on the plan	Noted. Amendments to key diagram for the Publication Plan The Proposals Map to scale will include a North point to accompany the Publication Plan.
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC1)	Key for symbols are not visible and there is no scroll down to view them	Noted. Symbols and keys to be amended for Publication version to comply with various Internet compatibility modules.
<b>3 The Scale of Housing and Employment- Borough Wide Development Strategy</b>		
Persimmon Homes North West (Mr B Williams) (SC 420)	Increased housing provision required to meet the requirements of the NPPF related to meeting local housing needs, due to the levels identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for 293 affordable dwellings. Provision at 500 new houses per year will not meet this need in the plan.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. SHMA



		update to inform the new Plan.
Harris Lamb (Mr M Alcock) on behalf of Townsons Estates Plc (SC411)	Promoting new housing on existing employment land at Walton Business Park, Stone. Agree with the approach to the scale of housing and employment. However consider this should be reviewed annually to ensure that needs are being met. The 2010 population projections suggest there may be an increased household requirement and the housing number should be amended to 564 per annum to reflect a possible 19% increase in household and a 3% vacancy rate	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration.
Hyde Lea Parish Council (Mr D L Jones) (SC 382)	Agree with 500 dwellings per year	Noted.
Brocton Parish Council (Mrs C Hammond) (SC 305)	Agree with preferred approach and reasons for its selection	Noted.
Environment Agency (Miss J Field) (SC 287)	Housing and employment provision to be considered in the context of sufficient water resources with detailed discussions needed with Severn Trent Water to ensure that funding is in place to support growth, and that cross boundary development pressure on water resources are considered early on in the planning process, based on the Water Cycle Study.	Noted. Regular meetings take place with service providers to ensure delivery of growth including funding plans. Severn Trent Water engaged in evidence based information.
Staffordshire & Worcestershire Canal Society (Mr F Cooke) (SC 83)	Brownfield sites should be used before greenfield land. Villages rarely see new housing at reasonable proportions, particularly affordable housing. Development in the Green Belt needs to be strictly controlled.	Noted. Publication document to include criteria-based approach for considering brownfield land and small-scale development on the edge of settlements. Green Belt boundaries and policies proposed to be unchanged.
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group (Mrs A de la Rue) (SC 25)	There is a lack of reference to the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show-people. The numbers may be smaller than for mainstream housing but should not be overlooked. It is not clear where the	Noted. Publication document to include a policy to deliver new accommodation, with an updated evidence base to

	accommodation fits in with the strategy.	provide sufficient details.
Paragraph 3.3		
Mr F Biard (SC 5)	Provide an update for the evidence base in relation to SHMA, Strategic Housing Market Assessment, Employment Land and viability.	Noted and agree to include up-to-date evidence base in the Publication document.
Paragraph 3.8		
Staffordshire & Worcestershire Canal Society (Mr FCooke) (SC 84)	Higher density housing would enable targets to be met within urban areas	Noted. Evidence demonstrates there is insufficient land within urban areas to meet NPPF full, objectively assessed needs. Density to be assessed on a case-by-case basis using a new Design policy within the Publication Plan document, suitable for the character of the area taking into account most efficient use of land.
Paragraph 3.9		
Mr F Biard (SC 6)	Questions the soundness of using projections produced four years ago.	Noted. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration for the population. The strategy is based on most recent evidence at the time of production, including flexibility linked to proportionate delivery

		of higher household growth.
Paragraph 3.10		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr M Hardy) (SC 367)	Migration from Cannock Chase District to Stafford Borough is a significant movement of households and should be recognised.	Noted. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. Publication document to reflect in-migration from all areas.
Providence Land Limited (Mr T Hutchinson) (SC129)	Paragraph 3.10 is misleading as it states that the need is made up of local need and in migration but sentence states that the NPPF should meet locally assessed requirements in their area.	Noted. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration planned for in the Publication document.
Paragraph 3.14		
Mr T Northcott Lawrence (SC85)	Even 25 hectares of new employment land is over generous given the 'anticipated decrease in employee jobs'	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the new employment land provision. The plan is to provide additional job opportunities for a diverse economy.

Paragraph 3.16		
Mr Francis Biard (SC 7)	Paragraph 4.7 of the NPPF suggests more than simply 5 year housing supply	Noted. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration, achieving a high level of supply consistent with delivery in Stafford Borough since 2001. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply.
Paragraph 3.17		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr M Hardy) (SC 371)	Notes the preferred approach to housing and employment land provision.	Noted
Mr F Biard (SC 8)	Given the wide variation in employment land provision, might it be better to plan for a provision in excess of 8 hectares per year to allow for flexibility.	Noted and no change. Delivery of 8 hectares per year provides flexibility and is consistent with historic completion rates over a 10 year period.
Paragraph 3.18		
Eccleshall Parish Council (Mrs C Heelis) (SC 141)	Agree that inadequate number of houses would undermine the local economy. However recognise that the 500 new houses per year figure should be flexible to meet changing circumstances.	Noted and agreed. The Publication strategy to deliver 500 new houses per year over the Plan period, with flexibility on delivery. Plan subject to annual

		monitoring to assess targets.
Mr T Northcott Lawrence (SC86)	Difficult to plan and make assumptions using data that is 4 years old and with a changing economy	Noted. Stafford Borough has a duty to Plan for the future through statutory legislation.
<b>Question 1</b>		
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr Anne Andrews) (536)	Disagree with new housing and employment provision due to concern over the loss of greenfield land and lack of critical infrastructure. The plan should plan for 250 dwellings, although recognise that planning could be done by appeals is a disadvantage of this approach.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need. New policies to meet infrastructure requirements in line with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
Indigo Planning on behalf of Commercial Estates Group (SC519)	Regarding questions 1 and 2 consider that the housing target should in higher – 11,789 dwellings overall to 2031 as this is more consistent with the RSS, will secure infrastructure delivery and do not consider it to be of detriment to regeneration of brownfield sites. Stafford town should have more than 5,000 dwellings and presented as minimum, with flexibility of more housing east of Stafford.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. New Plan policies to consider brownfield sites being delivered as well as strategic locations. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply.
How Planning on behalf of Grasscroft Home and Property	Strongly disagree with preferred approach and support option 3 of higher growth, as this would be in line with paragraph 182.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full,

Limited (SC 508)		objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply.
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (Mr Boughey) (SC 493)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision	Noted
Barlaston Parish Council (Mr N Hemmings) (SC 480)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision	Noted
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of Hallam Land Management and Davidsons (SC 471)	The general approach is supported and considered to be in conformity with the NPPF. However it is not considered that 500 dwellings per year is appropriate as the basis of household projections because this does not take into account population growth as set out in the 2010 projections.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections.
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of BDW Trading Ltd (SC 461)	The general approach is supported and considered to be in conformity with the NPPF. However it is not considered that 500 dwellings per year is appropriate as the basis of household projections because this does not take into account population growth as set out in the 2010 projections. A figure of 600 – 650 would be appropriate	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections.

Salt and Enson Parish Council (Mrs S Starr) (SC 445)	Agree with the new provision for housing and employment if proven need but sufficient thought needs to be given to the disadvantages listed.	Noted.
Milwood Homes (SC 434)	The strategy should consider an increased scale of provision should market demand require this approach with a wider array of site locations	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. Non strategic sites will be considered through Neighbourhood Plans or a Sites and Allocations Plan, based on delivery rates.
Staffordshire County Council (Ms T Brotherton) (SC 419)	Target would represent an additional 105 primary ages pupils, 75 high school pupils and 15 sixth form pupils per year. Education requirements for the strategic locations have been provided in March 2012.	Noted. Publication document provides a detailed policy for each Strategic Development Location, also to be considered as part of the infrastructure delivery plan and Community Infrastructure Levy funds.
Pegasus Planning on behalf of Maximus Strategic (SC 399)	Concern that the document does not provide a sound basis for progressing with the new Local Plan strategy. The proportion of housing to Stafford should be higher at 72%, a total figure rather than annualised figure for housing given, the Ministry of Defence (MOD) requirement should be excluded from the overall housing figure and the Plan does not consider environment assessment of locations fully, instead it relies on the Regional Spatial Strategy Sustainability Appraisal.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. Consider the target for Stafford is

		appropriate. Each of the Strategic Development Locations has been considered against economic, social and environment objectives through a Sustainability Appraisal. MOD housing requirements are excluded from the overall housing numbers.
Hyde Lea Parish Council (Mr D L Jones) (SC 383)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision	Noted
Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o Jones Lang LaSalle (Mr F Sandwith) (SC 355)	Consider the assessment of future housing needs is not robust as that it does not meet the Borough's needs. The housing market assessment is out of date, does not take into account 2010 population projections, does not take into account evidence from the RSS Phase 2 revision and does not include MOD requirements	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. MOD housing requirements are excluded from the overall housing numbers. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. An updated SHMA will inform the Publication Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply.
Hixon Parish Council (Mrs C)	Agree with preferred approach for new housing and employment provision.	Noted



Gill) (SC 346)		
George F White LLP (Mr Richard Garland) on behalf of Grainger PLC (SC 315)	Agree with option 3 for the following reasons: housing and employment do not have to be linked and should be considered independent of each other, question why 2008 household projections are being used, 500 per year would not meet the needs of the Borough, not all dwellings will be constructed and the NPPF states there should be significant increase in housing – 500 per year marks decrease in provision.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply.
Stone Town Council (J Allen) (SC 331)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision.	Noted.
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd (Mrs J Hodson) on behalf of MJ Barratt Development (SC 311)	Flexibility should be considered and the numbers presented as a minimum. It is not considered sound to rely on undelivered permissions.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply.
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd (Mrs J Hodson) on behalf of Walton Homes (SC 289)	Flexibility should be considered and the numbers presented as a minimum. It is not considered sound to rely on undelivered permissions	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is

		achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply.
Swynnerton Parish Council (Mrs L Harrington-Jones) (SC284)	Does not agree with providing further land for employment in Swynnerton Parish as there are sufficient employment sites which could also provide land for alternative employment uses. There are smaller units awaiting occupation and changing nature of employment – i.e homeworking	Noted and no change. The Publication document provides strategic provision for the Stafford Borough area, including requirements for new employment land based on historic completion rates and losses to residential uses. New policies to support home-working and the local economy.
Swynnerton Parish Council (Mrs L Harrington-Jones) (SC283)	The Parish Council would not wish to see further employment allocations within the Parish	Noted. The new Local Plan does not currently identify new employment allocations in the Swynnerton Parish Council area.
Houghton Parish Council (Mrs J Hill) (SC 266)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision.	Noted
J Ross Developments (Mr N Scott) (SC 248)	Support the preferred approach of new housing and employment provision. Concern about lack of attempt to reassess housing requirements, particularly in-migration. Presumably in-migration from South Staffordshire could have been met from land south of Stafford but this is not considered. The impact of development 'leap frogging' over designations such as the AONB and Green Belt will lead to dis-location of housing markets. The need to progress with the new local plan outweighs the need for a radical reappraisal of the role of	Noted and no change. The Publication document sets out the approach for allocation of land at Stafford town, based on infrastructure delivery, the Cannock Chase AONB and access issues.

	Stafford in a regional context. For these reasons support the approach but feel that the past fluctuations regarding delivery is not adequately explained in relation to high development outside Stafford.	
Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates (SC 230)	Object to preferred approach on the basis that it does not flow from the evidence base, is inconsistent with NPPF advice, is inconsistent with the Growth Point in that the level of growth is similar to that previously taken place.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections and Growth Point status. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply.
BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Trine Developments (SC 241)	Consider the scale of housing is too low and would not meet adequacy, local needs. It emphasises the fact that there has been an emphasis on sites that are not deliverable in the short term. Sites are coming through the market that are deliverable in the short term. Housing target should be amended to 625 per annum.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply. The Publication document to encourage a range of new sites delivered through Strategic Development Locations and

		criteria-based policy site led planning applications in other areas.
BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of J Baker Esq. (SC 237)	Consider the scale of housing is too low and would not meet adequacy, local needs. It emphasises the fact that there has been an emphasis on sites that are not deliverable in the short term. Sites are coming through the market that are deliverable in the short term. Housing target should be amended to 625 per annum.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply. The Publication document to encourage a range of new sites delivered through Strategic Development Locations and criteria-based policy site led planning applications in other areas.
Fisher German LLP (Mr C Meynell) on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 213)	The Council previously agreed with the West Midlands Regional Assembly through the Regional Spatial Strategy to an average provision of 550 per year to reflect New Growth Point status. This would require additional allocations, as some sites will not be deliverable in the first 5 years.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. West Midlands RSS evidence base

		not part of adopted Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply. The Publication document to encourage a range of new sites delivered through Strategic Development Locations and criteria-based policy site led planning applications in other areas.
Mr P Shaw (SC 198)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision.	Noted.
English Heritage (Miss A Smith) (SC 193)	Welcome consultation given the changing context in terms of national planning. Generally agree with scale of development however this may have implications for the historic environment and so endorse an up to date evidence base to assess the significance. Consider phasing of the plan necessary to secure brownfield development and necessary infrastructure is delivered. Broadly agree with the distribution however this may need to be kept under review so assessment work on strategic sites can be carried out	Noted. Further evidence based work may be required in relation to Strategic Development Locations for heritage assets. Policy approach to support delivery of brownfield sites.
Stone Rural Parish Council (T Smith) (SC 180)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision.	Noted
Creswell Parish Council (SC159)	The Parish Council has already accepted the granting of consent for development on HP13 and accepts growth. Whilst there will be improvement to highway infrastructure as part of HP13 there is still concern over further expansion at Beaconside without the creation of the Eastern Distributor Road. Concern that large-scale development would not be integrated with Stafford.	Noted. Further details provided through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and sections of the Publication Plan document.
Providence Land Limited (Mr T Hutchinson) (SC 128)	The Council has not set out a strategy to significantly boost supply as required by the NPPF or not robustly justified to support a lower than 550 figure. Further housing is required to meet affordable housing provision identified through the	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is

	Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).	achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply. An update to the SHMA will inform the Publication Plan document.
Planning Prospects on behalf of St Modwen Developments (SC 117)	The housing target should be increased above 500 per year to take account of household projections, MoD requirements, delivering affordable housing linked to an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment, economic needs and growth, infrastructure requirements and availability of land.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply. An update to the SHMA will inform the Publication Plan document. Agree that housing for MOD personnel are excluded from the Borough housing target of 500 per year
Planning Prospects on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd -	The housing target should be increased above 500 per year to take account of household projections, MoD requirements, delivering affordable housing linked	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework

Interests at Stone (SC 106)	to an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment, economic needs and growth, infrastructure requirements and availability of land.	(NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply. An update to the SHMA will inform the Publication Plan document. Agree that housing for MOD personnel are excluded from the Borough housing target of 500 per year.
McDyre and Co (Mr B McDyre) on behalf of G Edwards & Haszard Family (SC 96)	Largely agree with the approach for new housing and employment provision but consider 550 houses per annum more in line with NPPF and Growth Point Status.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply
McDyre and Co (Mr B McDyre) on behalf of Bassett Group	Largely agree with the approach for new housing and employment provision but consider 550 houses per annum more in line with NPPF and Growth Point	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework

Holdings Ltd (SC 90)	Status.	(NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan.
Hilderstone Parish Council (Mrs H Howie) (SC 156)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision, provided that new infrastructure is delivered to support expansion	Noted
CT Planning (Mrs P Kreuser) on behalf of Mr Bowen and Mr & Mrs Madders (SC 78)	Promoting land south of Tixall Road, Stafford. Do not agree with the approach and consider that higher housing and employment provision is required to meet NPPF requirements and provide flexibility.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. Publication document provides flexibility for delivering development through the criteria based approach and identifying strategic allocations.
CT Planning (Mrs Philippa Kreuser) on behalf of Mr R Clarke (SC 77)	Promoting land at Beacon Farm, Stafford. Do not agree with the approach and consider that higher housing and employment provision is required to meet NPPF requirements and provide flexibility	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. West



		Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. Publication document provides flexibility for delivering development through the criteria based approach and identifying strategic allocations.
Indigo Planning on behalf of Seddon Homes (SC 101)	The new Plan should make provision for at least 11,000 dwellings to meet needs set out in evidence base, the NPPF and also the Growth Point status. Attention is drawn to the Central Lancashire Core Strategy inspectors report in that figures should not be targets but as a minimum indication.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply
Mr L Stephan on behalf of the Moore Family Trust (SC 63)	Agree with the preferred approach but regard should be given to additional allocations to ensure there is not an undershoot of provision	Noted. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply in Stafford Borough. The new Plan Publication document sets out Strategic Development Locations and a criteria-based approach for new development within and outside of settlements to deliver requirements.
Norbury Parish Council (Mr A	Agree with the new housing and employment provision.	Noted.

McRae) (SC 45)		
Sport England (Mrs M Taylor) (SC 39)	Attention is drawn to paragraph 73 of the NPPF and whether the PPG17 Assessment for Stafford Borough, which was published in 2009, should be updated.	Noted.
Mr C Campbell on behalf of Taylor Wimpey/Bellway/St Modwen (SC 35)	Delivery of new housing is necessary to support the economy and reduce environmental impacts of commuting. The Borough's housing target should be 550 new homes per annum in line with the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy's Panel Report. Clarification is required about provision for military personnel.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections. West Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply. Agree that housing for MOD personnel are excluded from the Borough housing target of 500 per year
<b>Question 2</b>		
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC527)	Consider provision should be 250 dwellings per year but note that this may lead to 'planning by appeal'. Agree that increased provision should be rejected for the reasons set out in the document.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections

How Planning on behalf of Grasscroft Home and Property Limited (SC 509)	New housing and employment provision should be increased above that proposed in the Plan in order to provide a flexible supply. Strongly disagree that option 3 should be rejected for reasons set out in response to question 1.	Noted and no change.
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (Mr Boughey) (SC 494)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision, with rejection of alternatives.	Noted.
Barlaston Parish Council (Mr N Hemmings) (SC 481)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision, with rejection of alternatives.	Noted
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of Hallam Land Management and Davidsons (SC 472)	The preferred option does not take full account of the NPPF requirement, which states that Local Plans should deliver a significant increase in the supply of housing, which is not recognised in the preferred option. The evidence base suggests a higher figure than 500 new houses per year. The reasons for rejecting a higher level of development are not supported by the evidence.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections.
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of BDW Trading Ltd (SC 462)	The preferred option does not take full account of the NPPF requirement, which states that Local Plans should deliver a significant increase in the supply of housing, which is not recognised in the preferred option. The evidence base suggests a higher figure than 500 new houses per year. The reasons for rejecting a higher level of development are not supported by the evidence	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration based on household projections.
Indigo Planning on behalf of Seddon Homes (SC 447)	Object to the provision of 500 new houses per year as the Plan should deliver at least 11,000 houses over the period to 2031. Taking existing commitments into account is contrary to the positive approach as set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF. Targets should be minimum, not absolute, as detailed in the recent Central Lancashire Core Strategy Inspector's Report.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. West

		Midlands RSS evidence base not part of adopted Plan. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply.
Salt and Enson Parish Council (Mrs S Starr) (SC 446)	Do not agree with the new housing provision. 250 new houses per year is considered to be sufficient.	Noted and no change.
Milwood Homes (SC 435)	Preferred approach represents the most balanced way forward, subject to the additional provision above.	Noted.
Pegasus Planning on behalf of Maximus Strategic (SC 400)	General support for 500 dwellings per year but consider this should be a minimum figure. Do not consider greenfield development as a disadvantage, particularly when it would enable settlements to remain sustainable and considering brownfield sites are a finite supply.	Noted and no change.
Hyde Lea Parish Council (Mr D L Jones) (SC 384)	Agree but brownfield sites should still be considered before greenfield sites. Housing needs to consider low wage earners and needs of elderly population, town centre housing and curtailing out of town retail.	Noted. The Publication document sets out development strategy including for brownfield sites and policies for specialist housing, affordable housing and out of town retail development.
Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o Jones Lang LaSalle (Mr F Sandwith) (SC 357)	The new housing provision of 500 new houses per year will not fully meet needs or boost the supply of housing significantly. Do not consider that a higher delivery rate would create capacity issues for house-builders. Consider there would be environment problems such as ad hoc development and planning by appeals with insufficient housing provision. Additional housing should be identified at land north of Stafford.	Noted and no change. Further details set out in the specific area policies for land north of Stafford.
Hixon Parish Council (Mrs C Gill) (SC 347)	New housing for Ministry of Defence personnel is subject to influence beyond Stafford Borough Council's control and should not be factored into the housing requirement equation.	Noted and agree. Housing for MOD personnel to be excluded from the Borough housing target

		of 500 per year.
George F White LLP on behalf of Grainger Plc	<p>Agree with rejection of Option 2 (500 new houses per year and 8 hectares per year) and strongly disagree with the rejection option 3, the higher growth option. It is unclear how the disadvantages have been weighted by the Council. A lower figure would not meet affordable housing need identified through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p> <p>The funds secured through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) need to be considered, with a higher level of development increasing CIL revenues.</p> <p>It should be noted that not all permissions will be completed and therefore an element should be discounted from the figures. In addition there is a lack of evidence to demonstrate environmental pressure from higher development scenarios, with Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment sites available.</p>	<p>Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration. The 5 year housing land statement demonstrates meeting more than a 5 year supply.</p> <p>An update to the SHMA will inform the Publication Plan document. CIL will be in place by 2014 and provide some funds for infrastructure delivery.</p>
Stone Town Council (J Allen) (SC 332)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision, with rejection of alternatives	Noted
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd (Mrs J Hodson) on behalf of MJ Barratt Development (SC312)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision, with rejection of alternatives.	Noted
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd (Mrs J Hodson) on behalf of Walton Homes (SC 290)	Based on the rejection of alternatives, the option appears the best approach.	Noted
Houghton Parish Council (Mrs J Hill) (SC 267)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision, with rejection of alternatives.	Noted
Paul Sharpe Associates on	The alternative options presented are so unreasonable that all responses are	Noted and no change. National

behalf of Fradley Estates (SC231)	likely to agree with their rejection. However no opportunity is given to provide an alternative approach, an unfair question is presented. Other options may be reasonable, such as 650 dwellings per year which would be consistent with Growth Point, provide more meaningful level of affordable housing, would be delivered by housebuilders and is consistent with the NPPF.	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration.
BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Trine Developments (SC 242)	Consider the reasons for rejecting higher growth scenario are community concerns, not reasons stemming from the evidence base. A higher growth strategy would meet local needs fully and provide affordable housing.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration.
BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of J Baker Esq. (SC 238)	Consider the reasons for rejecting higher growth scenario are community concerns, not reasons stemming from the evidence base. A higher growth strategy would meet local needs fully and provide affordable housing	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration.
Fisher German LLP (Mr C Meynell) on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 214)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision, with rejection of alternatives, subject to comments made above	Noted
Stone Rural Parish Council (T Smith) (SC 181)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision, with rejection of alternatives	Noted
Creswell Parish Council (SC160)	Accept the preferred approach with the proviso that additional highway infrastructure is essential for Strategic Development Locations at Stafford. Eccleshall Road is heavily used by traffic to the detriment of life for local residents. The Strategy also needs to consider servicing mechanism, not just	Noted. Further details in terms of transport infrastructure and service measures provided through delivery of land north of

	allocation mechanisms.	Stafford policy.
Providence Land Limited (Mr T Hutchinson) (SC 130)	Further robust analysis and evidence is required to justify the pros and cons of each scenario. There are advantages to meeting the higher scenario, which are not provided such as assisting first time buyers and providing suitable homes for older people who wish to downsize. Declining occupancy will result in falling population without new building to compensate which could have a knock on impact on the local economy, schools and local services.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration.
Planning Prospects on behalf of St Modwen Developments (SC118)	Options 1 and 2 are not supported as they would not meet the full and objective needs as required by the NPPF.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration.
Planning Prospects on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Interests at Stone (SC107)	Options 1 and 2 are not supported as they would not meet the full and objective needs as required by the NPPF.	Noted and no change. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need is achieved through the figure of 500 per year including local need and in-migration.
McDyre and Co on behalf of G Edwards and Haszard Family (SC97)	Agree that the other alternatives can be rejected.	Noted.
McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings Ltd (SC91)	Agree that the other alternatives can be rejected.	Noted

Hilderstone Parish Council (Mrs H Howie) (SC 157)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision, with rejection of alternatives	Noted
Mr L Stephan on behalf of the Moore Family Trust (SC 64)	Do not agree with the preferred approach, as reasons for rejecting option 3 are tenuous. The advantages of higher numbers would be significant to the area, particularly as the plan is to be delivered over a substantial period of time.	Noted and no change.
Norbury Parish Council (Mr A McRae) (SC 46)	Agree with the new housing and employment provision, with rejection of alternatives	Noted
<b>4 The Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy</b>		
Mr O Dyke on behalf of Trent Vision Trust (SC 431)	Support the hierarchy and Stone placed second after Stafford. The definition of the towns' potential growth should be expanded as this could provide opportunity for more infrastructure such as medical, retail or leisure to support the town, which should consider the viability of regeneration within the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area.	Noted. Further details provided in the Publication document regarding new developments at Stone including policy approach.
Persimmon Homes North West (Mr B Williams) (SC 423)	Concern raised in terms of viability with a greater proportion of new development at Stafford, which is less viable than other areas such as Stone. The new strategy needs to be compliant with the NPPF of making every effort to meet development needs of the area, related to viability.	Noted and no change. Significant development at Stafford supported by infrastructure evidence and viability testing demonstrates deliverability throughout the Plan period to 2031. New Local Plan to be reviewed to assess progress, based on completions.
Harris Lamb on behalf of Townson Estates PLC (SC 412)	Agree with the settlement strategy with new development based on the proportionate size of the settlement. Developments in Stafford and Stone should be considered preferential to developments in Key Service Villages.	Noted and no change. Development strategy provides appropriate proportions as part of the settlement hierarchy



		based on delivery, the evidence base and other key factors.
Hyde Lea Parish Council (Mr D L Jones) (SC 385)	No strong views	Noted
Brocton Parish Council (Mrs C Hammond) (SC 306)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages and understand the reasons. No new development should take place until improvement to infrastructure, particularly roads is completed. Development in villages to the east of Stafford Borough would have impacts on the A34 and motorway access, to be addressed. Public transport links from smaller rural villages to larger settlements needs to be addressed, to link key service providers.	Noted and no change. The Publication document supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan detailing transport schemes with new development to provide funding for new provision.
Environment Agency (Miss J Field) (SC 288)	No objection to the settlement hierarchy or selection of Key Service Villages. Development in areas where river catchments are sensitive to pollution must ensure upgrades to water treatment works to maintain the water resources. This will not impact on the hierarchy. Due to outcomes of the Water Cycle Study a sequential test approach should be applied for individual sites. The findings of the SFRA and SWMP should be taken into account.	Noted and agreed. Water resource evidence findings and on-going discussions with service providers to support delivery through the Publication document.
Paragraph 4.3		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr M Hardy) (SC 373)	Note reference to Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	Noted
Paragraph 4.6		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr Matthew Hardy) (SC 375)	Note that Great and Little Haywood have been designated as Key Service Villages (KSV's) and that there are 'no major constraints to delivery of new development at KSV's. Have transport links to Rugeley been considered and did the study consider flood zones and defences?	The Sustainability Appraisal and evidence base has taken into account public transport links and flooding issues through the Infrastructure Strategy Phase 1 and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Fisher German LLP (Mr C Meynell) on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 215)	Agree with the list of settlements and role to deliver a strong local economy.	Noted
Eccleshall Parish Council (Mrs C Heelis) (SC 142)	Agree that Eccleshall should be a Key Service Village. Croxton may benefit from small development to support its facilities, which appears to be an equal of Swynnerton and Brocton.	Noted and no change. Croxton has fewer services than other Key Service Villages.
Mr T Northcott Lawrence	It would be useful to know the capacity of services within villages.	Noted.
Mr J Heath on behalf of Mr E Talbot (SC 81)	Support the hierarchy in that the KSV's will help achieve the strategy, question deliverability at Stafford for scale of development, with other areas providing sustainable communities through services and facilities.	Noted and no change. Strategy based on evidence including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
Mr F Biard (SC 9)	A table of the services those villages have currently would provide evidence base.	The evidence base includes an Assessment of Services and Facilities for each settlement This is available online at <a href="http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/gathering-evidence">http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/gathering-evidence</a>
Paragraph 4.7		
Colwich Parish Council (Mr J Blount) (SC 269)	The key phrase is that 'a range of improvements would be required to facilitate development'. This should include bus services	Noted and agreed. Public transport included as a criteria when assessing locations for new development.
Paragraph 4.8		
Sport England (Mrs M Taylor) (SC 40)	The refreshed PPG17 Assessment and strategy would need to inform an updated infrastructure plan.	Noted and no change.

<b>Question 3</b>		
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC528)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy including Stafford and then Stone.	Noted.
Indigo Planning on behalf of Commercial Estates Group (SC520)	Support the hierarchy and consider it to be consistent with the NPPF	Noted.
How Planning on behalf of Grasscroft Home and Property Limited (SC 510)	Agree with preferred approach and reasoning for selecting the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted.
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (SC 495)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted
Barlaston Parish Council (SC482)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of Hallam Land Management and Davidsons (SC 473)	Selection of the settlement hierarchy is agreed. However the evidence base does not support the phasing of development at Stone until after 2021. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is out of date and using it is inconsistent with the NPPF	Noted. Phasing at Stone to support the North Staffordshire conurbation and high level of past completions. An update to the SHMA will inform the Publication Plan document.
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of BDW Trading Ltd (SC 463)	Support the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted
Salt and Enson Parish Council (SC 448)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted
Milwood Homes (SC 436)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted.
Staffordshire County Council	Note that each of the KSV's have a school and have assumed this addresses the provision of local services for local people. Further details are needed to	Noted and agree to continued liaising with SCC education

(SC 424)	ensure existing schools can provide for new requirements of new housing.	through new developments.
Pegasus Planning Maximus Strategic (SC 401)	Supported the preferred Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted.
Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o Jones Lang LaSalle (Mr F Sandwith) (SC 360)	Agree for majority of new development to be at Stafford. Land north of Stafford should have further development allocated in line with current landholdings. Further work on master planning and co-working with adjacent landowners. Development to the north of Stafford would undermine local housing market in neighbouring authorities such as Stoke-on-Trent	Noted and no change.
Hixon Parish Council (SC 348)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy approach and reasoning.	Noted.
George F White LLP on behalf of Grainger Plc (SC 320)	Agree with principle of establishing a Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy but concern about the settlements included will lead to stagnation and lack of affordable housing delivery in other rural settlements outside the hierarchy.	Noted. The Publication document to include a criteria-based policy setting out the approach for development within and outside of settlements to ensure sustainability, including through Neighbourhood Planning and a Site-specific Allocations document.
Stone Town Council (SC 333)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd (Mrs J Hodson) on behalf of MJ Barratt Development (SC313)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd (Mrs J Hodson) on behalf of Walton Homes (SC 291)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted

Houghton Parish Council (SC 268)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted
Harris Lamb on behalf of Nova Capital Management Ltd (SC258)	Support the general approach	Noted
Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates (SC232)	No objection to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy in principle, but concern about the distribution of housing within the hierarchy. Past completions have seen development in less sustainable rural locations and it is not logical to allocate further housing in these areas. A greater proportion of new development should be directed to Stone, in particular.	Noted and no change. Focus of new development at Stafford, using the evidence base available. Lesser development at Stone to support the North Staffordshire conurbation, rural economy to be supported.
First City Limited (Mr Booth, Mr Evans, Mr & Mrs Stott) (Sc 246)	Support the approach to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy as being consistent with the NPPF requirements.	Noted.
Fisher German LLP on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 216)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy and consider the approach is generally based upon sound assumptions	Noted.
English Heritage (Miss A Smith) (SC 194)	Generally agree with approach for Stafford and Stone. Consideration should be given to utilising a wider range of sustainability measures beyond services and transport when considering development in smaller settlements, including how a settlement functions and relate to other settlements. An example of this type of approach is Shropshire Council Community Hubs and Clusters	Noted.
Stone Rural Parish Council (SC182)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted.
Manby Steward Bowdler on behalf of Mr and Mrs Swinnerton (SC 167)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy and the approach	Noted.
Creswell Parish Council	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy provided it comes with prior	Noted. Publication document

(SC161)	infrastructure provision in a co-ordinated approach for the wider area to reduce the impact of traffic.	informed by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the transport funding provided through new development including via the Community Infrastructure Levy.
Providence Land Limited (Mr T Hutchinson) (SC 131)	Identification of KSV's is in accordance with the NPPF and evidence base	Noted.
Planning Prospects on behalf of St Modwen Developments (SC119)	General approach is supported. Further comments provided below regarding the distributions of new development within the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy.	Noted
Planning Prospects on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Interests at Stone (SC 108)	General approach is supported. Further comments provided below regarding the distributions of new development within the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy.	Noted
McDyre and Co on behalf of G Edwards and Haszard Family (SC 98)	Agree that Stafford should be the focus of new development, followed by Stone and the Key Service Villages (KSV's)	Noted
McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings Ltd (SC92)	Agree that Stafford should be the focus of new development, followed by Stone and the Key Service Villages (KSV's)	Noted
Moore Family Trust (SC 65)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy and the approach set out in the document, and the reasons for selection of these settlements	Noted
Norbury Parish Council (Mr Andrew McRae) (SC 47)	Agree with the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy and the approach.	Noted
Mr C Campbell on behalf Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (SC 36)	Agree that Stafford should be the focus for development, based on evidence through the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. Burleyfields is a highly sustainable location capable of delivering up to 2,200 homes.	Noted

<b>Question 4</b>		
How Planning on behalf of Grasscroft Home and Property Limited (SC 511)	Disagrees with the selection of settlements, as the list is too exhaustive. Consider that Haughton, due to number of facilities, Weston, due to population size and facilities, Woodseaves, due to services and Tittensor due to size, recreational facilities and other facilities should not be Key Service Villages (KSVs), particularly in the same category as Gnosall, Barlaston, Eccleshall and Little Haywood and Colwich.	Noted and no change. The Publication document will include a criteria-based policy to assess new development to KSVs using a variety of factors.
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC529)	Do not agree with the selection of settlements. Concerned about the inclusion of Great Haywood, Little Haywood & Colwich and Weston due to traffic implications, with significant improvements to Highways Infrastructure required.  Support inclusion of the other Key Service Villages	Noted. Further details set out in the Publication document and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (SC 496)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages (KSVs)	Noted
Barlaston Parish Council (SC483)	The KSV's vary considerably in size and it is difficult to see the benefit of grouping them together.	Noted. The Publication document will include a criteria-based policy to assess new development to KSVs using a variety of factors. Agree that each settlement has different characteristics and services.
Salt and Enson Parish Council (SC 449)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages subject to development keeping in line with available services and amenities and do not become so large that they lose character.	Noted. The Publication document will include a criteria-based policy to assess new development to KSVs using a variety of factors. Agree that each settlement has different characteristics and services
Milwood Homes (SC 437)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages	Noted.

Fisher German on behalf of The Inglewood Investment Company (SC 416)	Support the KSV's, particularly Great Haywood	Noted.
Maximus Strategic (402)	No comments	Noted.
Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o Jones Lang LaSalle (Mr F Sandwith) (SC 364)	Agree with the principle of identifying KSV's. However the majority of development should be within and around Stafford town, with land north of Stafford identified as a stand alone scheme or part of a comprehensive plan for additional development.	Noted.
Hixon Parish Council (SC 349)	Dispute that Hixon has good transport links to Stone.	Noted and agree to amend Publication document to make reference to good public transport links to Stafford.
Mr G F White LLP on behalf of Grainger Plc (SC 332)	Concern over the selection of the KSV's and the methodology, objecting to Great Bridgeford being excluded. Not all settlements are included in the hierarchy, which is not sustainable and against NPPF requirements for supporting the rural economy. Great Bridgeford and Ranton could deliver development which could also sustain neighbouring properties	Noted. The Publication document will include a criteria-based policy to assess new development to KSVs and other settlements using a variety of relevant factors.
Stone Town Council (SC 336)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages	Noted.
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of MJ Barratt Development (SC 314)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages, consider the villages selected appropriate.	Noted.
Councillor Mrs J Tabernor (SC300)	Do not agree with Little Haywood & Colwich included within the Key Service Villages. Although there are bus services, there isn't a decent bus service between Little Haywood and Great Haywood. Colwich and Little Haywood only have one shop, a school, and two village halls so therefore lacks amenities. Great Haywood has better services but is difficult to access from Little	Noted and no change.



	Haywood.	
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd (Mrs J Hodson) on behalf of Walton Homes (SC 292)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages, consider the villages selected are appropriate, particularly Hixon which should be considered for proportional housing growth.	Noted
Haughton Parish Council (SC270)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages	Noted
First City Limited (Mr Booth, Mr Evans, Mr & Mrs Stott) (SC 247)	Support the hierarchy and selection of Key Service Villages. However there needs to be a clear rural strategy within the plan, with the focus on the larger KSVs with an economic and social base which could act as hubs, to provide a guide for Neighbourhood Planning and a Sites and Allocations document.  Overall conclude that the strategy accords with the NPPF but question the evidence base used to decide the quantum of development. Consider the strategy to be sound.	Noted. The Publication document will include a criteria-based policy to assess new development to KSVs and other settlements using a variety of relevant factors. The Publication document will also contain a strategy for the rural area.
Fisher German LLP on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 218)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages, the reasons generally accord with the principles of the NPPF	Noted.
Mr P Shaw (SC 200)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages	Noted.
Stone Rural Parish Council (SC183)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages	Noted.
Manby Steward Bowdler on behalf of Mr and Mrs Swinnerton (SC 172)	Agree with the selection of KSV's, particularly Haughton which is considered to have excellent links with Stafford and neighbouring settlements as well as services and facilities.	Noted.
Creswell Parish Council (SC162)	Development in some settlements such as Eccleshall and Woodseaves is likely to have adverse traffic affect on Creswell Grove.	Noted.
Providence Land Limited (Mr T Hutchinson) (SC 132)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages, generally a sound approach. Growth should be based on proportionality as some KSV's such as Gnosall are	Noted. The Publication document will include a criteria-

	larger with more capacity to accommodate growth than others such as Great Haywood.	based policy to assess new development to KSVs using a variety of relevant factors.
Planning Prospects on behalf of St Modwen Developments (SC121)	No objections raised concerning the selection of Key Service Villages.	Noted
Planning Prospects on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Interests at Stone (SC 109)	No comment.	Noted
McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings Ltd (SC93)	Agree with selection of KSV's and Tittensor in particular. Consider that half of the Bassett Group site in Tittensor should be excluded from Green Belt and brought into the Residential Development Boundary for allocation as housing	Noted. The Publication document will include a criteria-based policy to assess new development to KSVs using a variety of relevant factors. No proposed changes to Green Belt boundary. Settlement Boundaries established through a Sites & Allocations document.
Moore Family Trust (SC 66)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages and the reasons set out	Noted.
Norbury Parish Council (SC 48)	Agree with the selection of Key Service Villages	Noted.
Miss J Jackson (SC 22)	Some of the KSV's have had considerable development in recent years leading to encroachment on other nearby settlements, such as Great Haywood and Little Haywood, Hixon and Stowe-by-Chartley.	Noted and no change. The Publication document will include a criteria-based policy to assess new development to KSVs using a variety of relevant factors. No proposed changes to Green Belt boundary. Settlement Boundaries established through

		a Sites & Allocations document.
<b>Question 5</b>		
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC530)	No Key Service Villages should be deleted or added to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy. Concern about the inclusion of eastern KSVs without significant highway improvements such as the Eastern Distributor Road. It is unrealistic to expect a shift from private cars to public transport or cycling.	Noted and no change.
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (SC 497)	No Key Service Villages should be deleted or added to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy.	Noted
Barlaston Parish Council (SC484)	Is there a case for including Meaford in the list of key service villages?	Noted and no change. There are insufficient services and facilities to justify including Meaford as a Key Service Village.
Pegasus Planning on behalf of Maximus Strategic (SC 403)	No further comments.	Noted.
Hixon Parish Council (SC 350)	No Key Service Villages should be deleted or added to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted.
Mr G F White LLP on behalf of Grainger Plc (SC 324)	Do not consider any Key Service Villages should be deleted, with the exception of Tittensor. Ranton and Great Bridgeford should be added to the list.	Noted and no change.
Stone Town Council (SC 337)	Norton Bridge should be added to the hierarchy in light of development surrounding HS2	Noted and no change due to insufficient services & infrastructure at Norton Bridge.
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of MJ Barratt Development (SC 316)	No Key Service Villages should be deleted or added to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy.	Noted

Councillor Mrs Jean Tabernor (SC 301)	Little Haywood & Colwich should be deleted from the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy.	Noted
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Walton Homes (SC 293)	No Key Service Villages should be deleted or added to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted
Haughton Parish Council (SC271)	No comment	Noted
Applied Town Planning Ltd on behalf of J Ross Developments (SC 249)	No Key Service Villages should be deleted or added to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy.	Noted
Fisher German LLP on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 219)	No Key Service Villages should be deleted or added to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy but allocation should reflect services and facilities and ability to sustain a greater range of such uses. Allocation should also have regards to spatial separation of settlements to stop possible collation.	Noted and no change. The Publication document will include a criteria-based policy to assess new development to KSVs using a variety of relevant factors.
Stone Rural Parish Council (SC184)	Tittensor and Yarnfield considered to be borderline KSV's	Noted and no change.
Manby Steward Bowdler on behalf of Mr & Mrs Swinnerton (SC173)	No Key Service Villages should be deleted or added to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy	Noted.
Creswell Parish Council (SC163)	No comment	Noted
Planning Prospects on behalf of St Modwen Developments (SC120)	Support identification of Little Haywood and Colwich as a Key Service Village. There are greater sustainable merits due to immediate proximity to Great Haywood as a settlement cluster	Noted

Planning Prospects on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Interests at Stone (SC 110)	No comments	Noted
Mr L Stephan on behalf of Moore Family Trust (SC 67)	Agree with Key Service Villages included and add other settlements to support the approach by way of clustering.	Noted and no change.
Norbury Parish Council (SC 49)	No Key Service Villages should be deleted or added to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy.	Noted
Mr G Loadwick (SC 18)	Woodseaves has heavy vehicles moving through village and has a lack of gas mains so should be deleted as a Key Service Village.	Noted and no change.

## 5 The Distribution of Housing Growth

Indigo Planning on behalf of Seddon Homes (SC 454)	Object to the lack of housing provision at Stone which should be increased from 8% to 10-15% due to the strong market, affordability pressures, sustainability issues and re-directing development away from less sustainable rural areas where 20% provision is current identified in the Plan. Object to a single Strategic Development Location at Stone is providing a lack of flexibility and the site is less sustainable than sites being promoted by Seddon Homes at Newcastle Road, Nicholls Lane and Trent Road. Support early phasing of new housing provision, front-loaded as part of the Plan process.	Noted and no change. Development at Stone has implications on the North Staffordshire urban regeneration initiatives and evidence of recent housing delivery. Studies support location of Strategic Development Location. Future sites with potential allocation through Sites & Allocations document.
Mr O Dyke on behalf of Trent Vision Trust (SC 432)	Higher proportion of housing growth at Stone, up to 17% to reflect historic rates and less sustainable directing growth to Key Service Villages and rural areas.	Noted and no change. Recent growth at Stone and future implications for urban regeneration in North Staffordshire.
Harris Lamb on behalf of	Object to level of growth at Key Service Villages and Rural Areas, to be based	Noted and no change. Recent

Townsons Estates Plc (SC 413)	on proven housing need, with more provision at Stone based on recent growth (17%) to reduce pressure on Stafford.	growth at Stone and future implications for urban regeneration in North Staffordshire. Stafford identified as growth area, supported by services & facilities.
Hyde Lea Parish Council (Mr D L Jones) (SC 386)	Agree with distribution of housing growth	Noted.
Brocton Parish Council (Mrs C Hammond) (SC 307)	Agree with distribution of housing growth and support criteria for small scale development in order to protect rural villages and their character.	Noted.
Paragraph 5.3		
Hilderstone Parish Council (Mrs H Howie) (SC 151)	Concern about historic level of housing development in rural areas being unsustainable and hopes new Local Plan will remain on target.	Noted.
Paragraph 5.5		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr M Hardy) (SC 376)	Support focus on Stafford and Stone for new development as well as naming Key Service Villages for consistency.	Noted.
Paragraph 5.7		
Fisher German LLP on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 220)	Scale of housing provision outside Stafford and Stone to increase to 25% due to historic rate of delivery in such areas.	Noted and no change. Future strategy objective to deliver sustainable development at Stafford and Stone.
Eccleshall Parish Council (Mrs C Heelis) (SC 143)	Disagree with rigid targets for particular Borough areas leading to planning permission refused if a target has been reached.	Noted. Explain the context of targets in the Plan and implications if a target is reached or exceeded.

Mr Francis Biard (SC 10)	Questioning the realism of 8% target in rural areas due to historic rates of planning permission being 35%, leading to a policy delivery problem.	Noted. Explain the context of targets in the Plan and implications if a target is reached or exceeded.
Paragraph 5.8		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr M Hardy) (SC 377)	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is a survey with no guarantee of future development.	Noted and no change. Demonstrating supply rather than delivery.
Mr P Shaw (SC 201)	8% housing provision in rural villages to be integral to the strategy to ensure their future viability and allow some limited growth.	Noted.
Paragraph 5.10		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr M Hardy) (SC 378)	Support 'very small scale' development in rural areas to meet local need.	Noted.
Eccleshall Parish Council (Mrs C Heelis) (SC 144)	Support development at Key Service Villages to sustain facilities, to be small scale, well related and environmental factors. Reduced housing provision in smaller settlements could undermine existing bus services.	Noted.
<b>Question 6</b>		
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC531)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth with necessary infrastructure prior to development.	Noted.
Indigo Planning on behalf of Commercial Estates Group (SC521)	Support 70% of new housing development at Stafford consistent with Growth Point status and RSS, to be greater than 5,000 new homes. Greater level of provision at Stone than the Key Service Villages to support focus on Stafford & Stone for sustainable development.	Noted and no change. Level of provision by area based on deliverability and North Staffordshire urban regeneration.
How Planning on behalf of Grasscroft Home and Property	Disagree with the distribution of housing growth with greater focus on spread evenly across the Borough area than at Stafford & Stone, to reflect evidence of	Noted and no change.

Limited (SC 512)	delivery historically.	
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (Mr Boughey) (SC 498)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth	Noted.
Barlaston Parish Council (Mr N Hemmings) (SC 485)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth. Limited implications for Barlaston.	Noted.
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of Hallam Land Management and Davidsons (SC 474 & SC 476)	Higher rate of housing provision of 540 per year across the Borough with at least 50 per year at Stone. Evidence of housing trajectory and compliance with National Planning Policy Framework required in order to boost significantly the supply of housing. 10% provision at Stone to support the local economy and a sustainable distribution.	Noted and no change. Strategy is compliant with NPPF and meeting objectively assessed needs. Provision at Stone based on recent delivery and North Staffordshire urban regeneration.
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of BDW Trading Ltd (SC 464)	Support the distribution of housing growth with a focus on Stafford town.	Noted.
Salt and Enson Parish Council (Mrs S Starr) (SC 450)	Agree with distribution of housing growth with monitoring to limit greenfield loss and pressures on services.	Noted.
Milwood Homes (SC 438)	Agree with distribution of housing growth to support Localism & Neighbourhood Planning, allowing some rural development. Smaller sites to be identified at Stafford rather than only Strategic Development Locations to ensure delivery.	Noted and no change. Further provision through Sites & Allocations DPD if required in the future.
Staffordshire County Council (Ms T Brotherton) (SC 426)	Agree with distribution of housing growth including provision of essential education infrastructure in the context of local schools and capacity.	Noted.
Pegasus Planning on behalf of Maximus Strategic (SC 404)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth with mechanisms included to prevent significant levels of housing to less sustainable rural areas.	Noted. Explain how to maintain targets in the Plan and implications if a target is reached or exceeded in an area.



Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o Jones Lang LaSalle (Mr F Sandwith) (SC 368)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth with the focus on Stafford town due to existing infrastructure, services & facilities, not to undermine other local housing markets. Support housing north of Stafford.	Noted.
Hixon Parish Council (Mrs C Gill) (SC 351)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth provided this is proportional across the Key Service Villages rather than at one or more.	Noted and agreed.
Mr G F White LLP on behalf of Grainger Plc (SC 325)	Disagree with the distribution of housing growth with greater focus on rural areas and Key Service Villages in order to meet local need and affordable housing provision through market requirements, up to 35% rather than 20%. Lack of provision leads to stagnation and loss of services & facilities in rural areas.	Noted and no change. Strategy is in line with NPPF to provide market and affordable housing at Key Service Villages.
Stone Town Council (J Allen) (SC 339)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth.	Noted.
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of MJ Barratt Development (SC 318)	Disagree with the distribution of housing growth with a greater proportion to Stone and the Key Service Villages rather than Stafford and unsustainable rural areas linked to windfalls. Need to consider existing commitments and specify the new allocations.	Noted and no change. Strategy focus on Stafford is supported by existing infrastructure.
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Walton Homes (SC 294)	Disagree with the distribution of housing growth with a greater proportion to Stone and the Key Service Villages rather than Stafford and unsustainable rural areas linked to windfalls. Need to consider existing commitments and specify the new allocations.	Noted and no change. Strategy focus on Stafford is supported by existing infrastructure.
Haughton Parish Council (Mrs J Hill) (SC 272)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth.	Noted.
Harris Lamb on behalf of Nova Capital Management Ltd (SC 259)	A greater proportion of housing provision to be directed to Stone through an increase in the Strategic Development Location to 1,000 houses, no phased release of the site and identification of other sites to support the local economy and meet market demand. 8% to Stone is too low and promoting land at Barlowworld site within Walton ward for housing.	Noted and no change. Development at Stone has implications on the North Staffordshire urban regeneration initiatives and evidence of recent housing delivery. Future sites

		with potential allocation through Sites & Allocations DPD.
Applied Town Planning Ltd on behalf of J Ross Developments (SC 250)	Concern about the scale of housing provision at Stafford not being achieved with a greater focus required to Key Service Villages in order to support the local housing market and existing services & facilities whilst restricting development across the rural area due to harmful effect on character and design. SHLAA is evidence of potential supply, not delivery	Noted and no change. Explain the context of targets in the Plan and implications if a target is reached or exceeded.
Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates) (SC233)	Object to the limited level of housing provision at Stone, to be increased to 17% due to existing services, facilities and infrastructure. The strategy is unsustainable and illogical to focus more growth at Key Service Villages and rural areas, leading to increased pressure on services. Stafford's Growth Point status to deliver more housing, including in-migration, is justification for more growth at Stone, with no evidence that housing in Stafford Borough has undermined urban regeneration in North Staffordshire. Stafford and Stone are not within the Green Belt areas. Promoting land east of Stone for future housing development.	Noted and no change. Development at Stone has implications on the North Staffordshire urban regeneration initiatives and evidence of recent housing delivery. Studies support location of Strategic Development Location. Future sites with potential allocation through Sites & Allocations DPD.
BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Trine Developments (SC 243)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth to meet local urban & rural needs.	Noted.
BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Mr J Baker Esq (SC239)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth to meet local urban & rural needs.	Noted.
Fisher German LLP on behalf of Lichfield Diocese ((SC 217)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth with Key Service Villages to support existing facilities, including open space.	Noted.
Mr P Shaw (SC 202)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth	Noted.

Stone Rural Parish Council (T Smith) (SC 185)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth	Noted.
Manby Steward Bowdler on behalf of Mr and Mrs Swinnerton (SC 174)	Support the figure of 500 per year new housing provision, to be presented as a total to recognise some years may exceed this target. Broadly agree with the distribution of housing growth but Key Service Villages to be supported further rather than Stafford to support sustainable communities.	Noted and no change.
Creswell Parish Council (SC164)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth provided it is supported by new highway infrastructure, based on feasibility and appropriate funds.	Noted.
Providence Land Limited (Mr T Hutchinson) (SC133)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth with a higher proportion at Key Service Villages based on local housing needs, existing facilities and number of houses in the settlement.	Noted and no change.
Planning Prospects on behalf of St Modwen Developments (SC122)	The distribution of housing growth should provide greater proportions of 20% to Key Service Villages to reflect actual delivery and sustainability.	Noted and no change. Stafford focused to deliver a sustainable strategy with services.
Planning Prospects on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Interests at Stone (SC 111)	A greater proportion of the housing growth should be directed to Stone as a sustainable location with employment, services & facilities. 8% at Stone and delayed until after 2021 is too low a figure for the settlement, particularly when compared to Stafford at 72%, contradicting Stone's established status and role. The figure should be increased to 15%.	Noted and consider increasing the housing proportion at Stone to 10-12% based on the existing commitments and the new allocation.
Indigo Planning on behalf of Seddon Homes (SC 102)	Object to the lack of housing provision at Stone which should be increased from 8% to 10-15% due to the strong market, affordability pressures, sustainability issues and re-directing development away from less sustainable rural areas where 20% provision is current identified in the Plan. Object to a single Strategic Development Location at Stone is providing a lack of flexibility and the site is less sustainable than sites being promoted by Seddon Homes at Newcastle Road, Nicholls Lane and Trent Road. Support early phasing of new housing provision, front-loaded as part of the Plan process.	Noted and no change. Development at Stone has implications on the North Staffordshire urban regeneration initiatives and evidence of recent housing delivery. Studies support location of Strategic Development Location. Future sites with potential allocation through Sites & Allocations

		DPD.
McDyre and Co on behalf of G Edwards and Haszard Family (SC 99)	Support the housing distribution of growth with 72% at Stafford town, promoting land at Old Croft Road to be included as a Strategic Development Location to support delivery of the Eastern Access Road.	Noted and no change. Further sites considered through a Sites & Allocations document.
CT Planning on behalf of Mr Bowen and Mr & Mrs Madders (SC 79)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth.	Noted.
Hilderstone Parish Council (Mrs H Howie) (SC 148)	Acknowledge some new development required in rural areas but empty properties to be re-used first. Support 8% at rural areas to restrict new development on the edge of villages being approved, to be maintained.	Noted.
Mr L Stephan on behalf of Moore Family Trust (SC 68)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth with a 5% flexibility for each category to ensure appropriate delivery.	Noted and no change.
Norbury Parish Council (Mr A McRae) (SC 50)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth.	Noted.
Sport England (Mrs M Taylor) (SC 41)	Distribution of housing growth should not lead to loss of existing sports buildings and land, including playing fields.	Noted.
Mr C Campbell on behalf of Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (SC 37)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth with the focus on Stafford town and support delivery of 2,200 houses west of Stafford together with physical, social and community infrastructure.	Noted.
<b>Question 7</b>		
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC532)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth to reduce pressure on greenfield sites across the Borough. Highways infrastructure east of Stafford is inadequate to provide for new development.	Noted and no change.
Indigo Planning on behalf of Commercial Estates Group	Support the level of housing distribution to Stafford town but requires new infrastructure as existing provision is inadequate for the scale of growth. New development will support new infrastructure and viability. The Council to	Noted.

(SC522)	ensure sufficient evidence is available for support at the Examination.	
How Planning on behalf of Grasscroft Home and Property Limited (SC 513)	Agree with the criteria-based approach for Key Service Villages, based on varied services and facilities together with market demand in order to ensure deliverability and avoid under-supply. Promoting land at Gnosall.	Noted.
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (Mr Boughey) (SC499)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Barlaston Parish Council (Mr N Hemmings) (SC 486)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of Hallam Land Management and Davidsons (SC 475)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives with a focus on Stafford and Stone, with increased provision at Stone and reduced provision for the rest of the rural area.	Noted and consider increasing the housing proportion at Stone to 10-12% based on the existing commitments and the new allocation.
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of BDW Trading Ltd (SC 465)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Milwood Homes (SC 439)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Pegasus Planning on behalf of Maximus Strategic (SC 405)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o Jones Lang LaSalle (Mr F Sandwith) (SC 369)	Agree with the distribution of housing growth with the focus on Stafford town due to existing infrastructure, services & facilities, not to undermine other local housing markets. Support housing north of Stafford.	Noted.
Hixon Parish Council (Mrs C Gill) (SC 353)	Hixon Parish Council wishes to be part of the Neighbourhood Planning process.	Noted.

Mr G F White LLP on behalf of Grainger Plc (SC 327)	Housing growth should be distributed across the Borough area rather than at Stafford and Stone, in line with historic housing delivery to provide for local affordable housing requirements, limited impact on greenfield land, insufficient brownfield land available and lack of delivery at Stafford. Promoting land at Great Bridgeford with limited infrastructure and transport pressures whilst rejecting the planning by appeal concerns.	Noted and no change.
Stone Town Council (J Allen) (SC 340)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Houghton Parish Council (Mrs J Hill) (SC 273)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Applied Town Planning Ltd on behalf of J Ross Developments (SC 251)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Fisher German LLP on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 221)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Stone Rural Parish Council (T Smith) (SC186)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Mr Tom Doubtfire for Creswell Parish Council (SC 165)	No specific comments.	Noted.
Planning Prospects on behalf of St Modwen Developments (SC123)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone. However the alternatives are extreme examples and subtle adjustments in distribution for a balanced approach may be appropriate.	Noted.
Planning Prospects on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Interests at Stone (SC 112)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone. However the alternatives are extreme examples and subtle adjustments in distribution for a balanced approach may be	Noted.

	appropriate.	
Hilderstone Parish Council (Mrs H Howie) (SC 149)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone provided new transport infrastructure is included to reduce road traffic impacts on Hilderstone.	Noted.
Mr L Stephan on behalf of Moore Family Trust (SC 69)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Norbury Parish Council (Mr A McRae) (SC 51)	Agree with the preferred approach and a rejection of the alternatives, with a focus on Stafford and Stone.	Noted.
Miss J Jackson (SC 23)	Concern about level of housing development at Key Service Villages and a greater proportion at KSVs than Stone.	Noted and no change.
<b>Question 8</b>		
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC537)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area, provided inadequate highways infrastructure is highlighted serving the Haywoods.	Noted.
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (Mr Boughey) (SC 500)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area.	Noted.
Barlaston Parish Council (Mr N Hemmings) (SC 487)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area.	Noted.
Salt and Enson Parish Council (Mrs S Starr) (SC 451)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area.	Noted.
Milwood Homes (SC 440)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area, provided criteria is not overly restrictive and enables Neighbourhood Plans to be delivered.	Noted.
Pegasus Planning on behalf of	No specific comments.	Noted.

Maximus Strategic (SC 406)		
Hixon Parish Council (Mrs C Gill) (SC 354)	Disagree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area but prefer use of Residential Development Boundaries to determine location of new development with public involvement.	Noted.
Mr G F White LLP on behalf of Grainger Plc (SC 329)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area, provided sufficient flexibility is used to reflect local circumstances and issue of well-related to existing settlement. Promoting development at Great Bridgeford to be included as a Key Service Village and more housing at rural locations.	Noted and no change.
Stone Town Council (J Allen) (SC 341)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area.	Noted.
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd (Mrs J Hodson) on behalf of MJ Barratt Development (SC319)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution at Key Service Villages but not for the wider rural area, provided consideration includes deliverability, market interest and achieving a housing target.	Noted.
Councillor Mrs J Tabernor (SC302)	Disagree with the housing distribution to Key Service Villages as 35% already provided is more than a fair share.	Noted and no change.
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd (Mrs J Hodson) on behalf of Walton Homes (SC 295)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution at Key Service Villages but not for the wider rural area, provided consideration includes deliverability, market interest and achieving a housing target.	Noted.
Haughton Parish Council (Mrs J Hill) (SC 275)	Neighbourhood Plan to assist delivery of the criteria based approach.	Noted.
Colwich Parish Council (Mr J Blount) (SC 265)	Concern about new development exceeding capacity of existing services and infrastructure at Colwich Parish.	Noted.



Applied Town Planning Ltd on behalf of J Ross Developments (SC 252)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area but concern about resources available to deliver the policy.	Noted and no change.
Paul Sharpe Associates on behalf of Fradley Estates) (SC234)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area. Object to level of housing at Stone compared to the Key Service Villages. 6% at KSVs identified by allocations rather than criteria based policy due to lack of past control to restrict development is rural areas. Other rural areas to use a strictly sustainability led criteria based approach and small scale is too liberal.	Noted and consider increased proportion of housing growth at Stone together with amendments to criteria-based policy.
Fisher German LLP on behalf of Lichfield Diocese (SC 222)	Distribution between Key Service Villages not equal but based on existing service base so further development at Eccleshall is promoted.	Noted.
Mr P Shaw (SC 203)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area	Noted.
English Heritage (Miss A Smith) (SC 195)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area, to include historic environment considerations and heritage assets such as farmsteads.	Noted and include historic environment within policy criteria.
Stone Rural Parish Council (T Smith) (SC 187)	8% for rest of rural areas reduced further due to lack of barns available to convert, recent delivery rates and reduce loss of greenfield.	Noted and no change.
Manby Steward Bowdler on behalf of Mr and Mrs Swinnerton (SC 175)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area but include flexibility case by case rather than specify numbers of particular Key Service Villages.	Noted.
Mr Tom Doubtfire for Creswell Parish Council (SC 166)	Key Service Villages require appropriate infrastructure provision.	Noted.
Providence Land Limited (Mr T Hutchinson) (SC 134)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area. Distribution to consider size of Key	Noted.

	Service Village, existing opportunities and constraints.	
Planning Prospects on behalf of St Modwen Developments (SC124)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area, subject to details being provided with proximity to Stafford and Stone with existing infrastructure provision also considerations.	Noted.
Planning Prospects on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Interests at Stone (SC 113)	No comments.	Noted.
McDyre and Co on behalf of Bassett Group Holdings Ltd (SC94)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area with a focus on previously developed land rather than greenfield. Agree with the distribution of housing growth at Key Service Villages but to include the 8% rest of rural areas to provide sustainable development linked to services.	Noted and no change. A proportion of new development will occur in rural areas, as evidenced from historic build rates.
Hilderstone Parish Council (Mrs H Howie) (SC150)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area with future planning decisions to ensure robust implementation and very small scale taking into account Parish Council knowledge.	Noted.
Mr L Stephan on behalf of Moore Family Trust (SC 70)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area, to include site suitability, deliverability and community benefits.	Noted.
Norbury Parish Council (Mr A McRae) (SC 52)	Agree with a criteria-based approach for housing distribution between Key Service Villages and the wider rural area	Noted.
<b>6 Affordable Housing</b>		
Indigo Planning on behalf of Seddon Homes (SC 457)	Note the Council's target of 30% affordable housing but should be considered on a site by site basis subject to viability testing.	Noted.
Persimmon Homes North West	Concern that level of affordable housing will not deliver the need identified in	Noted. Strategic Housing Market

(Mr B Williams) (SC 422)	the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and lack of consideration of affordable housing viability evidence leading to a refinement in policy approach by area. Object to onus on developers to prove economic viability of less than 30% rather than being area specific or using a dynamic viability index (Shropshire). Concern about tenure split of 80:20 social rent to intermediate housing, should be 60:40.	Assessment updated to provide evidence. Affordable housing policy amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough.
Harris Lamb on behalf of Townson Estates Plc (SC 414)	A lower percentage of affordable housing provision should be identified due to the recent economic downturn.	Noted. Affordable housing policy amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough.
Brocton Parish Council (Mrs C Hammond) (SC 308)	Concern about delivery of affordable housing in rural areas with limited new housing development, such as Brocton.	Noted and new development outside settlements amended to deliver appropriate new housing provision.
Indigo Planning on behalf of Seddon Homes (SC 103)	Note the Council's target of 30% affordable housing but should be considered on a site by site basis subject to viability testing.	Noted.
Mr R J Simcock (SC 34)	Promoting land at Yarnfield House, Yarnfield for affordable housing.	Noted.
Paragraph 6.2		
Mr P Shaw (SC 204)	Agree with making provision for intermediate affordable housing.	Noted.
Paragraph 6.3		
Mr P Shaw (SC 205)	Note the position of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and lack of evidence for area-based need across the Borough.	Noted and updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment evidence.
Paragraph 6.7		

Swynnerton Parish Council (Mrs L Harrington-Jones) (SC 282)	Affordable housing based on local need rather than a blanket policy approach of 30%.	Noted. Affordable housing policy amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough
Eccleshall Parish Council (Mrs C Heelis) (SC 145)	Affordable housing based on local need linked to a survey rather than a blanket policy approach of 30%.	Noted. Affordable housing policy amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough
Paragraph 6.10		
Mr F Biard (SC 11)	Affordable housing based on local need rather than a blanket policy approach of 30% to avoid resource consuming conflicts and inconsistency.	Noted. Affordable housing policy amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough
<b>Question 9</b>		
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC535)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough but sufficient provision for downsizing to smaller properties in order to release larger housing for families remaining in villages.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Indigo Planning on behalf of Commercial Estates Group (SC523)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough including provision at land east of Stafford, provided site by site and viability testing.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Grasscroft Home and Property Limited (SC514)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough including provision for land at Knightley Road, Gnosall with flexibility through viability testing to consider reduced levels.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.

Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (Mr Boughey) (SC501)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Barlaston Parish Council (Mr N Hemmings) (SC488)	Potential for increased affordable housing at Barlaston if land is provided.	Noted.
BDW Trading Ltd (SC466)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site and viability testing considerations. Viability is challenging in parts of Stafford town.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Salt and Enson Parish Council (Mrs S Starr) (SC452)	Agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial boundaries.	Noted.
Milwood Homes (SC441)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site and viability testing considerations.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Staffordshire County Council – Education (T Brotherton) (SC427)	Note 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site and viability testing considerations. Consultation necessary to consider impact on additional school places required.	Noted.
Maximus Strategic (SC407)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site and viability testing considerations.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Hyde Lea Parish Council (Mr D L Jones) (SC387)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o Jones Lang LaSalle (Mr F Sandwith) (SC370)	Concern that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment is dated at 2008, with flexibility required for affordable housing to reflect viability. Agree with a financial viability test balanced against other costs, particularly regarding Community Infrastructure Levy payments.	Noted. Strategic Housing Market Assessment updated to provide evidence.

Hixon Parish Council (Mrs C Gill) (SC356)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Stone Town Council (J Allen) (SC342)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Grainger PLC (SC330)	Concern that evidence presented is area based but a blanket target of 30% affordable housing is being sought, rather than reflecting higher percentages at higher value areas. Concern about lack of ability to deliver requirements set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment so a flexible area approach is needed. Further affordable housing in rural areas to be provided for, supported by increased development in areas.	Noted. Strategic Housing Market Assessment updated to provide evidence. Affordable housing policy and development outside settlement boundaries amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough.
M J Barratt Development (SC321)	Concern about 30% affordable housing requirement in fragile housing market and current economic situation undermining delivery and meeting local needs, reduce target to 20% with viability test and site by site.	Noted. Affordable housing policy amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough.
Walton Homes (SC296)	Concern about 30% affordable housing requirement in fragile housing market and current economic situation undermining delivery and meeting local needs, reduce target to 20% with viability test and site by site.	Noted. Affordable housing policy amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough.
Swynnerton Parish Council (Mrs L Harrington-Jones) (SC285)	Yarnfield has provided sufficient affordable and market housing through existing planning applications for 245+ new homes.	Noted and consider inclusion of Yarnfield as a Key Service Village.
Swynnerton Parish Council (Mrs L Harrington-Jones) (SC286)	Yarnfield has provided sufficient affordable and market housing to contribute to the role of Key Service Villages through existing planning applications for 245+ new homes.	Noted and consider inclusion of Yarnfield as a Key Service Village.

Colwich Parish Council (Mr J Blount) (SC280)	Agree with 30% affordable housing, to be described through the Neighbourhood Plan process.	Noted.
Houghton Parish Council (Mrs J Hill) (SC276)	Houghton has 10% of existing housing stock as social rented.	Noted.
Colwich Parish Council (Mr J Blount) (SC264)	Agree with 30% affordable housing, to be described through the Neighbourhood Plan process.	Noted.
J Ross Developments (Mr N Scott) (SC253)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site and viability testing considerations. Development should not be undermined by unrealistic demands.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Fradley Estates (Paul Sharpe Associates) (SC235)	Disagree that wages have not kept pace with increased house prices due to stagnant level. Housing provision should not be suppressed at Stone due to the strong housing market to deliver affordable homes. Concern about viability evidence not being capitalised upon.	Noted. Affordable housing policy amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough.
J Baker Esq (SC240)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site and viability testing considerations.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Lichfield Diocese (SC223)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site, proven need and viability testing considerations. Market and affordable housing mix required in rural villages.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Stone Rural Parish Council (T Smith) (SC188)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Manby Steward Bowdler on behalf of Mr & Mrs Swinnerton (SC176)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is flexibility through site by site and viability testing considerations. Development should not be undermined by unrealistic demands.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.

Mr T Doubtfire on behalf of Creswell Parish Council (SC168)	Concern about affordable housing provision on the urban fringe but support delivery on land north of Stafford at Akzo Nobel's site.	Noted and no change.
Providence Land Limited (Mr T Hutchinson) (SC135)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site, proven local need and viability testing considerations.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
St Modwen Developments (SC125)	Affordable housing viability shows area variations rather than a blanket 30% approach being appropriate, based on deliverability and viability not presenting undue burdens on development. Support a minimum target of 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site, proven local need and viability testing considerations with flexibility to reduce below 30% if necessary.	Noted. Affordable housing policy amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough.
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd – Interests at Stone (SC114)	Affordable housing viability shows area variations rather than a blanket 30% approach being appropriate, based on deliverability and viability not presenting undue burdens on development. Support a minimum target of 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site, proven local need and viability testing considerations with flexibility to reduce below 30% if necessary.	Noted. Affordable housing policy amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough.
Hilderstone Parish Council (Mrs H Howie) (SC152)	Object to affordable housing being delivered alongside market housing in villages due to scale of new development. Affordable housing to be delivered through rural exception sites, to be in perpetuity, small scale and linked to character with greater control through Neighbourhood Plans	Noted. Amendment to policy for new development outside settlement boundaries.
Moore Family Trust (SC71)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site considerations.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Norbury Parish Council (Mr A McRae)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach



Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / St Modwen (SC38)	The affordable housing viability study does not include consideration of strategic development areas to justify 30% affordable housing with such areas subject to other significant infrastructure costs incurred up-front. Delivery of affordable housing in Stafford is challenging or unviable for part of the Plan period. Policy should be amended to reflect current market values and viability for the Plan period linked to percentages. Viability assessments for strategic development areas are needed.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
<b>Question 10</b>		
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC536)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Grasscroft Home and Property Limited (SC515)	Agree that 40-50% affordable housing is unviable and undeliverable.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (Mr Boughey) (SC502)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Barlaston Parish Council (Mr N Hemmings) (SC489)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
BDW Trading Ltd (SC467)	An appropriate area based target should be included rather than a minimum threshold of 30% across the Borough.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Salt and Enson Parish Council (Mrs S Starr) (SC453)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Maximus Strategic (SC408)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of	Noted. Amendment to policy for

	alternatives.	clarification in terms of area approach
Hyde Lea Parish Council (Mr D L Jones) (SC388)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o Jones Lang LaSalle (Mr F Sandwith) (SC372)	Agree with viability testing to consider other costs and a blanket 30% affordable housing target across the Borough is unduly restrictive due to viability challenges for north of Stafford area.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Hixon Parish Council (Mrs C Gill) (SC358)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Stone Town Council (J Allen) (SC343)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Grainger PLC (SC334)	The rejection of alternatives requires further clarification.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
M J Barratt Development (SC323)	Concern about 30% affordable housing requirement in fragile housing market and current economic situation undermining delivery and meeting local needs, reduce target to 20% with viability test and site by site.	Noted. Affordable housing policy amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough.
Councillor Mrs J Tabernor (SC303)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives. New infrastructure is required before housing.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Walton Homes (SC297)	Concern about 30% affordable housing requirement in fragile housing market	Noted. Affordable housing policy

	and current economic situation undermining delivery and meeting local needs, reduce target to 20% with viability test and site by site.	amended to reflect area-based approach rather than 30% across the Borough.
Haughton Parish Council (Mrs J Hill) (SC277)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Lichfield Diocese (SC224)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough provided there is site by site, proven need and viability testing considerations. Market and affordable housing mix required in rural villages.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach.
Stone Rural Parish Council (T Smith) (SC189)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Mr T Doubtfire for Creswell Parish Council (SC169)	No specific comments.	Noted.
St Modwen Developments (SC126)	No comments.	Noted
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd – Interests at Stone (SC115)	No comments.	Noted
Hilderstone Parish Council (Mrs H Howie) (SC153)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Moore Family Trust (SC72)	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of alternatives.	Noted. Amendment to policy for clarification in terms of area approach
Norbury Parish Council (Mr A	Support 30% affordable housing across the Borough and the rejection of	Noted. Amendment to policy for

McRae) (SC54)	alternatives.	clarification in terms of area approach
<b>7 The Means of Directing Growth</b>		
Seddon Homes (SC458)	Support identification of Residential Development Boundaries for growth. Key objections to less than 11,000 minimum houses, 10-15% needed at Stone together with additional sites identified, not just one SDL.	Noted.
Trent Vision Trust (SC433)	Settlement boundaries to be established at this stage to provide certainty to developers rather than defer to Neighbourhood Plans or Site-specific Allocation document. Needs to conform with strategic housing areas.	Noted.
Townson Estates PLC (SC415)	Settlement boundaries for whole settlements to replace Residential Development Boundaries and Industrial Area Boundaries with criteria based approach. Promoting land at Stone Business Park for housing.	Noted. Employment areas to be identified within new boundaries.
Moorfields Industrial Estate (Gibbons family) (SC392)	Moorfields Recognised Industrial Estate to have a boundary review, similar to Raleigh Hall & Ladfordfields, to provide new development which will not have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Moorfields is similar in location to Raleigh Hall, would support the local economy and new jobs, with development west of the current site.	Noted and no change.
Hyde Lea Parish Council (Mr D L Jones) (SC389)	Preserve Green Belt and use all available brownfield sites.	Noted.
Brocton Parish Council (Mrs C Hammond) (SC309)	Concern about loss of Residential Development Boundaries at Brocton leading to new development on greenfield sites, undermining the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty's setting & Green Belt. Brocton to be recognised as one settlement with a boundary.	Noted.
Mr G & C Leese (SC140)	Object to lack of certainty concerning future use of brownfield sites for alternatives uses. Brownfield land to be used for housing to avoid loss of greenfield land, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.	Noted and no change.

Seddon Homes (SC104)	Support identifying new Residential Development Boundaries.	Noted.
Mr G E Fletcher (SC61)	Support development at Walton, Stone provided traffic improvements are delivered, phased development with timings to enable assisted housing.	Noted.
Paragraph 7.4		
Mr P Shaw (SC206)	Support the criteria-based approach and criteria listed.	Noted.
Mr T Northcott Lawrence (SC88)	Criteria to include valuation of infrastructure costs to provide for needs.	Noted.
Paragraph 7.5		
Mr P Shaw (SC207)	Support re-establishing boundaries to deliver housing and employment development whilst small scale development outside boundaries.	Noted.
Woodland Trust (Mr J Milward) (SC76)	Criteria regarding nature conservation and biodiversity to include reference to ancient woodland, ancient trees and new native woodland creation. A new criteria should be added to support native woodland.	Noted and no change. Protection of woodland included in new Policy.
Sport England (Mrs M Taylor) (SC42)	Criteria (i) to protect sports facilities in line with para 74 of National Planning Policy Framework.	Noted and no change.
Paragraph 7.8		
Mr P Shaw (SC208)	Each village to determine applications on their merits through criteria set out in Neighbourhood Plans or new Borough allocations.	Noted and no change.
Mr F Biard (SC12)	Support the consideration of alternative approaches to deliver new village development, leading to more legitimacy. A mix and match approach?	Noted.
Paragraph 7.9		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr M	Support identification of Residential Development Boundaries to prevent	Noted.

Hardy) (SC379)	unrestricted growth.	
Colwich Parish Council (Mr J Blount) (SC274) & (SC263)	Support identification of Residential Development Boundaries and wish to progress a Neighbourhood Plan with Borough Council support.	Noted.
Eccleshall Parish Council (Mrs C Heelis) (SC146)	Support identification of Residential Development Boundaries with limited development outside boundaries to support smaller villages. Wish to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan based on the new Local Plan and funds.	Noted.
Paragraph 7.10		
Mr P Shaw (SC209)	Support new employment proposals at Recognised Industrial Estates.	Noted.
Mr F Biard (SC13)	Welcome clarity given concerning new employment proposal locations.	Noted.
Paragraph 7.11		
Mr G & C Leese (SC139)	Further clarification needed regarding employment uses outside Recognised Industrial Estate, to be considered favourably for further development and new investment opportunities.	Noted. Further clarification provided through new Policy.
Paragraph 7.12		
Cannock Chase Council (Mr M Hardy) (SC380)	Support consideration of open countryside, Green Belt and other uses when decisions made on extensions to existing employment areas.	Noted.
Paragraph 7.14		
Eccleshall Parish Council (Mrs C Heelis) (SC147)	Object to expansion of Raleigh Hall employment area due to increased noise and pollution from traffic and heavy good vehicles, with inadequate links to the motorway network. Support light industry for local jobs.	Noted and no change. Rural employment to be provided for in the Plan.

Mr F Biard (SC14)	It is realistic to have employment growth at Raleigh Hall and Ladfordfields	Noted.
Mr B Apps (SC2)	Object to distribution companies using industrial estates without direct dual carriageway access to motorways due to dangers for cyclists and pedestrians through use of narrow roads and lack of infrastructure.	Noted.
Paragraph 7.15		
Mr F Biard (SC15)	Support employment development at Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt to encourage inward investment and job creation.	Noted.
<b>Question 11</b>		
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC533)	Support Residential Development Boundaries and criteria-based policy.	Noted.
Indigo Planning for Commercial Estates Group (SC524)	Support principle of Residential Development Boundaries but for the Strategic Development Locations boundaries should not be fixed due to the scale of growth until the Site-specific Allocations document in order to provide additional housing development at Stafford town.	Noted and no change.
Grasscroft Home and Property Limited (SC516)	Disagree with directing growth to Stafford and restrictive Residential Development Boundaries leading to housing supply challenges. At Gnosall there is insufficient housing land within the existing urban area to meet local needs and the new strategy in the Plan. Land at Knightley Road, Gnosall should be developed to meet the high level of demand.	Noted. Further clarification provided through the new Plan.
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (Mr Boughey) (SC503)	Agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries.	Noted.
Barlaston Parish Council (Mr N Hemmings) (SC490)	Strongly agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries.	Noted.

BDW Trading Ltd (SC468)	Support setting of settlement boundaries to protect rural areas, with new development on appropriate sites identified through a boundary review, in order to meet housing targets.	Noted.
Salt and Enson Parish Council (Mrs S Starr) (SC455)	Agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries.	Noted.
Milwood Homes (SC442)	Broadly agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries, to be provided through Neighbourhood Plans. Concern that criteria may restrict development so further clarification required.	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan.
Staffordshire County Council – Education (T Brotherton) (SC430)	Support criteria listed with education provision to be considered. Identifying school places and requirements is easier with Residential Development Boundaries rather than ad hoc development. Welcome discussion on immigration implications for school place planning.	Noted.
The Inglewood Investment Company Ltd (Fisher German) (SC417)	Support identification and reassessment of Residential Development Boundaries for new housing but concern over flexibility, which is partly addressed by the supported criteria-based policy approach. Concern about timescale for delivery of Neighbourhood Plans and lack of certainty. Flexibility through a criteria based policy to enable development	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan.
Maximum Strategic (SC409)	Support establishing settlement and industrial areas boundaries with Strategic Development Locations to be specifically defined in the new Plan, including provision for all on-site infrastructure and development.	Noted.
M J Barratt Development (SC326)	Agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries, with modifications required to include potential sites as well as areas in the Green Belt.	Noted and no change.
Hyde Lea Parish Council (Mr D L Jones) (SC391)	Full infrastructure required before new housing and industrial areas developed.	Noted.



Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o Jones Lang LaSalle (Mr F Sandwith) (SC374)	Support focus of new development at Stafford, establishing Strategic Development Location boundaries in the Plan through master planning as well as new Residential Development Boundaries to restrict development in other areas of the Borough. Promoting land north of Stafford, working with adjacent landowners on a strategic framework.	Noted.
Hixon Parish Council (Mrs C Gill) (SC359)	Agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries. No expansion of areas until consultations are completed.	Noted.
Stone Town Council (J Allen) (SC344)	Agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries.	Noted.
Grainger PLC (SC335)	Agree with establishing settlement boundaries but affected by settlement identified and boundaries set. Concern about neighbourhood planning restricting development rather than enabling delivery. Land to be allocated through a Site-specific Allocations document, due to limited infill in many villages. Support review of Residential Development Boundaries, the criteria-based approach in the interim to deliver growth and local communities bringing forward land through Neighbourhood Plans.	Noted.
Walton Homes (SC298)	Agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries, with modifications required to include potential sites as well as areas in the Green Belt.	Noted and no change.
Houghton Parish Council (Mrs J Hill) (SC278)	Neighbourhood Plans will assist in establishing settlement boundaries.	Noted.
Nova Capital Management Ltd (SC260)	Residential Development Boundaries require a full review as the approach is restricting redevelopment of sites linked to the urban area of Stone and not in the open countryside. Promoting land at Barloworld, Walton ward for new housing development	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan.
J Ross Developments (Mr N Scott) (SC255)	Community involvement in planning not to restrict development. Concern about development boundaries delivery. Support criteria based approach but unclear	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan.

	about allocation to Key Service Villages. Clarification needed.	
Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd (SC228)	Support identification of Recognised Industrial Estates in the new Plan at this stage with a boundary line and specific reference, rather than through a Site-specific Allocation document or Neighbourhood Plan. Object to any reference to limited expansion or restriction on new employment provision as contrary to National Planning Policy Framework and achieving Local Plan objectives for employment delivery.	Noted.
Fradley Estates (Paul Sharpe Associates) (SC236)	Concern about lack of housing growth provided at Stone, redirected to Key Service Villages and inadequate affordable housing so not in line with National Planning Policy Framework. Residential Development Boundaries to guide development in rural areas through Neighbourhood Plan or Site-specific Allocations document but concern about lack of certainty in the short term leading to further housing market pressures.	Noted and no change.
Lichfield Diocese (SC225)	Disagree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries. Criteria-based approach more appropriate to deliver new development in suitable locations.	Noted and no change.
English Heritage (A Smith) (SC197)	Support a criteria-based approach but acknowledge role of community in Neighbourhood Plans. Boundaries to be established using assessment of historic environment & its assets. Criteria-based approach to include character and significance of historic farmsteads through evidence.	Noted. New policy to include wording related to the historic environment.
Stone Rural Parish Council (T Smith) (SC190)	Agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries.	Noted and no change.
Manby Steward Bowdler for Mr & Mrs Swinnerton (SC177)	Support the criteria-based approach to consider new development on its merits enabling flexibility. Establishing new boundaries through Neighbourhood Plans or a Sites & Allocation document will take time and lead to uncertainty for delivery.	Noted. Further details provided through Policy in the new Plan.
Mr T Doubtfire for Creswell	Agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries,	Noted.

Parish Council (SC170)	but concern about lack of highway and infrastructure delivery	
Providence Land Limited (Mr T Hutchinson) (SC136)	Specific housing numbers to be identified at each Key Service Village to help steer Neighbourhood Plans regarding opportunities & constraints. Criteria-based policy alone is not appropriate as further assessment needed to guide master planning and site selection. Site-specific Allocations document needed if no Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted and no change. Further details provided in the new Plan.
St Modwen Developments (SC127)	Support establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries to protect the countryside, rather than Residential Development Boundaries, in order to identify all land uses within urban areas. Query identification of Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt as not in national policy.	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan. Major Developed Sites linked to last bullet of para 89 in the NPPF
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd – Interests at Stone (SC116)	Support establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries to protect the countryside, rather than Residential Development Boundaries, in order to identify all land uses within urban areas.	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan.
McDyre and Co for Bassett Group Holdings Ltd (SC95)	Support the criteria based approach and prefer boundaries established through a Site-specific Allocations document rather than Neighbourhood Plans due to lack of resources, uncertainty of timescale and delivery.	Noted.
Hilderstone Parish Council (Mrs H Howie) (SC154)	Support establishing Residential Development Boundaries to identify the location of new development rather than lead to inappropriate housing in small villages with limited facilities. Support affordable housing provision.	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan for the approach.
Moore Family Trust (SC73)	Support the criteria based approach to delivering new development at Key Service Villages rather than relying on specific allocations as being more flexible. Residential Development Boundaries are not consistent with the new planning system and driving forward the economy.	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan for the approach.
Norbury Parish Council (Mr A McRae) (SC55)	Agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries.	Noted.

Jackson (SC24)	Agree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries. The new Plan should consider Parish Plans prepared by local communities in order to protect the countryside and avoid industrial area expansion involving high volumes of Heavy Goods Vehicles.	Noted.
<b>Question 12</b>		
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council (Dr A Andrews) (SC534)	Agree with the criteria listed, with specific reference to highway infrastructure.	Noted.
Grasscroft Home and Property Limited (SC517)	Agree with the criteria listed, in order to ensure new housing growth is delivered in settlements.	Noted.
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council (Mr Boughey) (SC504)	Agree with the criteria listed.	Noted.
Barlaston Parish Council (Mr N Hemmings) (SC491)	Agree with the criteria listed.	Noted.
BDW Trading Ltd (SC469)	Agree with the criteria listed, in line with National Planning Policy Framework, but clarify that new sites needed to achieve housing targets.	Noted and no change.
Salt and Enson Parish Council (Mrs S Starr) (SC456)	Agree with the criteria listed.	Noted.
Milwood Homes (SC443)	Disagree with the criteria listed as Neighbourhood Plans should be delivering new development and should not be overly restricted. Further details are required in order to clarify the criteria impact on delivery.	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan.
Maximus Strategic (SC410)	Agree with the criteria listed.	Noted.
Hixon Parish Council (Mrs C Gill) (SC361)	Agree with the criteria listed.	Noted.
Stone Town Council (J Allen)	Agree with the criteria listed.	Noted.

(SC345)		
Grainger PLC (SC338)	Agree with the criteria listed, provided there is local flexibility to ensure rural housing supply. Criteria to recognise rural settlement interaction together with transport links and associations with larger settlements.	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan.
M J Barratt Development (SC328)	Agree with the criteria listed, to be expanded to include deliverability.	Noted and no change.
Walton Homes (SC299)	Agree with the criteria listed, to be expanded to include deliverability.	Noted and no change.
Houghton Parish Council (Mrs J Hill) (SC279)	Agree with the criteria listed, to be expanded to include deliverability.	Noted.
J Ross Developments (Mr N Scott) (SC256)	Agree with criteria listed. Community involvement in planning not to restrict development. Concern about development boundaries delivery. Support criteria based approach but unclear about allocation to Key Service Villages. Clarification needed.	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan.
Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd (SC229)	Clarification of criteria to be used for employment proposal expansion in the context of Recognised Industrial Estates. A different approach should be adopted for employment site expansion as the criteria do not apply in the same way to housing and employment. A strong local economy to be supported, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.	Noted. Further details and clarification provided in the new Plan and the approach to employment.
Lichfield Diocese (SC226)	Agree with the criteria listed. Disagree with approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries. Criteria-based approach more appropriate to deliver new development in suitable locations.	Noted.
English Heritage (A Smith) (SC199)	The criteria listed should be expanded to include reference to historic environment evidence on character and farmsteads as well as setting of heritage assets and Scheduled Ancient Monuments.	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan.

Stone Rural Parish Council (T Smith) (SC191)	Agree with the criteria listed.	Noted.
Manby Steward Bowdler for Mr & Mrs Swinnerton (SC178)	Support the criteria-based approach to deliver new development in advance of Neighbourhood Plans ensuring greater market flexibility to meet demand with community involvement through planning applications. Neighbourhood Plans should not be resisted by establishing Residential Development Boundaries. The Council remains the decision-maker.	Noted. Further details provided in the new Plan.
Mr T Doubtfire for Creswell Parish Council (SC171)	Agree with the criteria listed, provided properly resourced & delivered appropriately for local communities.	Noted.
Hilderstone Parish Council (Mrs H Howie) (SC155)	Agree with the preferred policy approach and use of criteria clarified.	Noted.
Moore Family Trust (SC74)	Support future delivery of employment land expansion and job opportunities at appropriate locations within the rural areas.	Noted.
Norbury Parish Council (Mr A McRae) (SC56)	Agree with the criteria listed, based on the approach to establishing settlement and industrial area boundaries.	Noted.
<b>8 Next Steps and Further Information</b>		
Haughton Parish Council (Mrs J Hill) (SC281)	Haughton has a strong community spirit in a rural setting, to be supported by limited new development rather than significant expansion.	Noted.
Seddon Homes (SC105)	The new Local Plan to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. Key objections to the Plan being less than 11,000 minimum houses, 10-15% needed at Stone together with additional sites identified, not just one Strategic Development Location and should not be phased later in the Plan period.	Noted.

## APPENDIX 9 – LIST OF SPECIFIC AND GENERAL CONSULTEES

Seighford Settled Estate	Mono Consultants Ltd
EDP	Mr and Mrs Brookes
Stone Town Council	The Theatres Trust
Network Rail	Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service
Highways Agency	John Chivers Commercial
Natural England	Mr Oldfield
Toilet Association	MoD Stafford - 12 Signal Group
Norbury Parish Council	Mr Darrant OBE
Milwich with Fradswell Parish Council	Mr Hill
Hixon Parish Council	Mr Heath
Hilderstone Parish Council	AJ & S Pelter
Brocton Parish Council	Mr / Ms Pelter
Creswell Parish Council	Mr Macdonald
Gnosall Parish Council	Mr Adamson
Stowe by Chartley Parish Council	Ms Kratz
High Offley Parish Council	Haughton Parish Plan Steering Group
Eccleshall Parish Council	Mr and Mrs Anthoney
Councillor G Meddings	Aaron Chetwynd Charetered
Seighford Parish Council	Architects
Salt and Enson Parish Council	Mr Todd-Jones
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council	Mr Simmonds
Ranton Parish Council	Mr Lawrence
Haughton Parish Council	Mr Morris
English Heritage	Mr / Ms Ryan
Stoke-on-Trent City Council	Ms Jones
Highways Agency	Mr / Ms Jones
Newcastle under Lyme Borough	Mr Rayworth
Council	Mr and Mrs Adamthwaite
Environment Agency	Dr Bloor
Mr and Mrs Jordan	Mr Farmer
Mrs Tams	AG & M Taylor
Mr Perry	Berkswich Football Club
Mr and Mrs Wilson	Sustainability Matters in Stafford
Mr and Mrs Clifford	Borough
Mr Barrett	Ms Farmer
Mr Boden	Manby Steward Bowdler
Mr Harris	Mrs Vaughan
Mr Simcock	Ms Lewis
Mr and Mrs Kirwan	RSL Planning Consortium
National Trust	Tetlow King Planning
British Waterways Wales and Border	Mrs Latham
Counties	Mrs Price
Inland Waterways Association	Ms Margetson and Mr Woodward
Renew North Staffordshire	Mrs Salt
Cannock Chase AONB Partnership	Mr Salt
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust	Miss Bell

Mrs Evans  
Mr & Mrs Bennett  
Mr Lucas  
Mr Williamson  
James & Ward Ltd  
Mr White  
Mr Wilding  
West Midlands Chief Engineers and  
Planning Officers Group  
Mr Plant  
Knight Frank  
Mr Poyser  
Mr Wood  
Mr Hutchins  
Mr Griffin  
Mr Smith  
Mr & Mrs Hutchins  
Ms Spencer  
Mr and Mrs Summers  
Ms Wanless  
Mr Griffiths  
Mr Foulston  
Residents of Hampton Gardens  
Mr Marshall  
Mr and Mrs Peacock  
Mr King  
Mrs Bradshaw  
Mr Jones  
Mr Harper  
Mr Cooke  
Mr and Mrs Matthews  
Mr Renshaw  
Savills  
Mrs Barton  
Mrs Barton  
Mrs Ingleby  
Friends of Victoria Park  
Mr Baldock  
Mrs Green  
Ms Goring  
Mrs Franklin  
Mr Beech  
Harrowby Estates  
Mr Phelan  
Mr and Mrs Cashmore-Thorley  
Mrs Metcalf  
Miss Cleall  
Defence Estates  
Persimmon Homes North West  
Mr Lee

Mr Bray  
Mr Ball  
Mr & Mrs Dawson  
Severn Trent Water Ltd  
Ms Sharman  
Mr & Mrs Crombie  
Mr Hunt  
Bryn & Rachel  
Stafford Bowling Club  
Ms Gaunt  
C H Bendall  
C & P E Hutchinson  
Miss Udall  
Mr Harding  
Mrs Harding  
Dr Powell  
Cartwright  
Mr / Ms Parsons  
Mrs Edgecombe  
Mr Lawton  
Mr and Mrs Turner  
Mr and Mrs Hardt  
Mr. Kelly  
Mr Eden  
Mr Pitt  
Mrs Spraggett  
Mr Cheadle  
Stafford District Voluntary Services  
Defence Estates Safeguarding  
Mr Phillips  
Mr Roberts  
Mr Shenton  
Mr Brewer  
Mr / Ms Silcox  
Mrs Westwood  
Mrs Baggaley  
Mrs MacGregor  
Elizabeth Holton  
British Waterways  
C A Hilton  
J M Hilton  
K Hilton  
Dr Willard  
DTZ on behalf of Royal Mail  
Ms Bratt  
Bratt Family  
Ms Clapp  
Mr & Mrs Brosnan  
Mr Jessup  
Mr Noak



Mr Dewsnap  
Mr Stafford Northcote  
Burton Manor Sports Association  
Mr Peake  
Mr Collett  
Ms Holbrook  
A J Phillips  
Mr Proudlock  
Mr Millar  
Ms Coupland  
Mr Perry  
Mrs Craig  
Mrs Regan  
Mr Sandy  
Mr Evans  
Mrs Prince  
Mrs Sparrow  
Mr Sparrow  
T & L Pitchford  
Ms Spencer  
Gladman Developments  
Mrs Hall  
Ms Kelly  
Mr Garnett  
Mr Fletcher  
Mr & Mrs Atkinson  
Mr Dart  
Mr Turner  
Mr Woolridge  
Bidwells  
Defence Estates  
David Hickie Associates  
Mr Staniland  
Staffordshire Police  
Haston Reynolds Ltd  
Mr Morrish  
Mr Chesters  
Mr Dewhurst  
Mr Horsley  
Mr Hutt  
Mr Bufton  
Mr Pimble  
Mrs Wilson  
Mrs Knapper  
Ms Roads  
Morris Homes Midlands Ltd  
Mr Deakin  
Derrington Action Group  
Ms Sydney

Staffordshire Police Property  
Development  
Mr / Ms Ellis  
Mr Buck  
S D V S Centre  
Philips Planning Services (PPS) Ltd  
PPS on behalf of Mr C and Mrs P  
Sandy  
PPS on behalf of Mr Frank Cochran  
PPS on behalf of Mr Jonathon Lloyd  
PPS on behalf of Mr Roly Tonge  
Mr Talbot  
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group  
Ms Lawrence  
Mr Franklin  
Gnosall Resident  
D James  
Mr Hull  
Mr Fraser  
Mr & Mrs Oakley  
Mr Webb  
Mrs Webb  
Mr Mochrie  
Mr Kemp  
D Stocking  
Staffordshire Badger Conservation  
Group  
D W Wright  
Mr Collier  
Mrs Collier  
E Edginton  
Mrs Parry  
Mrs Haynes  
Mr Ranson  
Mr Shannon  
Ms Edwards  
Mr Greaves  
Mr Burrows  
Ms Turner  
Ms Aberley  
Mrs Senior  
Mr Boston  
M Huscoe-James  
Mr Grant  
Ms Finney  
Mr Evans  
Mrs Evans  
Miss Baxter  
Mr Kirby  
Mr Featherstone

Bellway Homes  
Mrs Garner  
Mr Mugglestone  
Mr Wilson  
Mr Pye  
Dr Douce  
Mr Loadwick  
Mrs Gregory  
Miss Anslow  
Mr Hancox  
Mr Prosser  
Mr Hall  
B C L Consultant Hydrogeologists  
Limited  
Ms Dewhurst  
Mr Brown  
Mr Brown  
Mr Woodward  
Fisher German  
Mr and Mrs Hopkin  
Shopping Centre Manager Demetriou  
Mr & Mrs Wagstaff  
Westgate Solar Control  
Mr Ghateaura  
Mr Dewhurst  
Seighford Parish Council  
Mr & Mrs Jones  
Ms Paris  
Mr White  
St Modwen Properties Plc  
Mrs Glen  
G & J Perry  
C P Haworth  
Mrs Elkin  
Mr Elkin  
Mr Murray  
Countrywide Homes Ltd c/o First City  
Ltd  
Evans, Stott & Boote Family c/o First  
City  
First City Limited  
Mrs Minshull  
Mr Green  
Mr Gibson  
Mr & Mrs Walter  
Tyler Parkes Partnership  
Ms Hall  
Ms Smith  
Ms Ball  
Ms Parsons

Mr Hewlett  
Mrs Halliday  
Mr Lee  
Ms Forrester  
Mr Wilson  
Mrs Holt  
Mr and Mrs Hopkins  
Mr Hulme  
Mrs Wright  
Mr Thomson  
Mr Ochiltree  
Mr and Mrs Simpson  
Taylor Young  
Mr Macmillan  
Mr Mercer  
Mr Sinkins  
Cllr Sunley  
Mr Mellor  
Mr Bradbeer  
Ms Meechan  
Mrs Larkin  
Mr Dale  
Mr Lameris  
Mr Maude  
Mr Rawlins  
Mrs Rawlins  
Dr Whittow  
Mr and Mrs Wright  
David Lock Associates Ltd  
Ms Peak  
Mr and Mrs Steer  
Mrs Hodson  
Mrs Thomas  
Mrs Timmis  
Mrs Wakeman  
Mr Baldry  
Mrs Featonby  
Ms Taylor-Young  
Ms Gardiner  
J Winstanley  
Stone Resident  
North Staffordshire Chamber  
Mrs Fownes  
Ms Carr  
Mrs Hammond  
Miss Harrison  
Major Prendergast MBE  
Dr and Mrs Cross  
David Price Associates  
Mrs Price

Mrs King  
Mr and Mrs Jebb  
Mr Atkins  
Mrs Maingay  
J M & R J Winkle  
Ms Lloyd  
Hewitt Freebron Associates  
Mr Pert  
Mrs Clewley  
Roseacre Nursery  
Mr & Mrs Astle  
Mr Hood  
Mrs Hamilton  
Mr Myers  
Mrs Myers  
Mrs Yearstanding  
Mr Preston  
Mrs Cadman  
Mr Cadman  
Mrs Sylvester  
Mrs Emery  
Defence Infrastructure Organisation  
Mr Sydney  
Harris Lamb Ltd  
Mr Wragg  
Mr Edwards  
Mr & Mrs Boulton  
MBD Architecture  
Mr Freer  
Mr Groves  
Emery Planning Partnership  
Mr Glover  
Ms Kelly  
Mr Harris  
Mr & Mrs Youde  
Mr Nixon  
A Johnson  
Mrs Mellor  
Harrison & Hetherington Ltd  
Mr Booker  
Staffordshire County Council  
Mrs Hall  
Lt Col Brynolf  
Mrs Barnard  
Mrs Rowe  
Ms Piper  
Mr Parsons  
Mrs Probyn  
Mr & Mrs Hall  
J Regan

Stafford Gospel Hall Trust  
J & J Design  
Mrs Fox  
Mr Tyson  
Ms Foxley  
Mr & Mrs Simms  
Mr & Mrs Slater  
FBC Manby Bowdler  
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust  
Barbers Rural  
Ms Shubinsky  
Mrs Baxter  
Ms Bignell  
Balfour Partnership  
Mrs Hammersley-Fenton  
Mrs Kelly  
Mrs Harling  
Mr Thomas  
Mrs Ong  
Mrs Sinkins  
Mr & Mrs Butler  
Mr Bailey  
Mrs McCulloch  
Seddon Homes Limited  
Mr Price  
Mr Marchant  
Mr Williamson  
Mr Tooth  
Miss Edge  
Stop (Stone & Valley Opposed to  
Severn Trent Water)  
Mr & Mrs Corban  
K Gilbert  
Turley Associates  
Mr Halliday  
Mr Parsons  
K Robinson  
Mr Plant  
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners  
Mrs Holloway  
Mr and Mrs Holloway  
Mrs Downton  
Mrs Boughton  
Mr Kilkenny  
Mr and Mrs Laycock  
Mr & Mrs Mott  
Mr Adams  
Mr Burgess  
Ms Farrell  
Mr Lee

Mr Stuart  
Mr Brindley  
Mr and Mrs Leyland  
Mr Chapman  
Mrs Chapman  
Mrs Sullivan  
Ms Rippon  
Mrs von Elbing  
Miss Simmonds  
Mrs Jones  
Mr & Mrs McAulay  
Mrs Harrington-Jones  
Ms Jones  
Walker  
Miss Grainger  
Mr Lyons  
Mr Hughes  
Mrs Leather  
Ms Lycett-Smith  
Mrs Fitzpatrick  
Mr & Mrs Merrick  
Howard Sharp & Partners LLP  
Mr Tweed  
Mr and Mrs Harden  
Mr Maingay  
Mr Biard  
Ms Amos  
Mr and Mrs Thorne  
Mr Menard  
Mr & Mrs Booth  
Ms Moore  
A J Cartwright  
Dr O'Sullivan  
Ms Foulston  
Ms Mitchell  
Miss Hulme  
Mrs Thorpe  
Mrs Bagnall  
Bradgate Nurseries Limited  
Defence Estates  
Mr Lunn  
Mr Trillo  
Mr Blundell  
Mr Hutchinson  
Mr Cooper  
Mr Farrington  
Mr & Mrs Millward  
Mr Softley  
Mr Wilebur  
Property Directorate, Defence Estates

Mrs Cunnion  
Birmingham City Council  
Mr Prince  
Mrs Bosson  
Mr Poole  
Cannock Chase District Council  
Mr Matthews  
Mrs Dawson  
Bassett Group Holdings Ltd  
McDyre & Co  
Mr G Edwards  
Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd  
Eccleshall Business Focus Group

Ms Kinnersley  
Mr Kinnersley  
Mrs Adcock  
Mr Ratcliffe  
Mr Farr  
Mr & Mrs McAuley  
Mr Risbey  
Mr Woodhouse  
Mr Bell  
Mr Hill  
Mr Neal  
Mr Sullivan  
South Staffordshire PCT  
Mr Corfield  
Mr Cheadle  
Mr Walker  
Mr James  
Mr Wanless  
Mr Brough  
Mr Mitchell  
Mr Bosson  
Mrs Jones  
Mr Smith  
Mr & Mrs Round  
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners  
Mr Gulliver  
Mrs Gulliver  
Dr Calhaem  
Mrs Newbury  
Mr Owens  
Mr Moore  
Mrs Moore  
Mrs Boden  
Mrs Renshaw  
Mrs Johnson  
First Plan

Sport Across Staffordshire  
St Modwen Properties Plc  
Mr and Mrs Bradley  
Mr Barrett  
Mr / Mrs Beasley  
Mr Bostock  
Mr Price  
Mr Bennett  
N B Lloyd  
Mr & Mrs Gill  
Mr Larkin  
Ms Pestel  
Mr Crombie  
Mr Roberts  
Mr Hawley  
Mrs Buck  
Mr Phazey  
Cllr O'Connor  
B Kelly-Bush  
Ms Evans  
G Walker  
Mr Archer  
Ms Macdermott  
Mr Wheeler  
Mr Anthony  
Mr & Mrs Shaw  
The Ecclian Society  
Dr Downward  
Mr Hancock  
Staffordshire University Estates  
Mr Newman  
Mr and Mrs Smith  
Ms Clarke  
Mr and Mrs Turner  
Mr & Mrs Appleton  
Mr & Mrs Freshwater  
Ms Sephton  
Mr Marriott  
Milwich Action Committee  
Mr Coulman  
Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley  
Estates  
Mr Smith  
Ms Almond  
Mr P Neviris & Ms J Walton  
Staffordshire County Council - Social  
Care  
Mr and Mrs Davies  
Ms Martin  
Ms Moeller

Mr & Mrs Dowle  
Mr & Mrs Neeld  
Mr & Mrs Richards  
Mr Warrilow  
Mr Hodson  
Mr Boden  
Hallam Land Management Ltd  
Mr Pepperell  
Mr Collier  
Mr Kendrick  
Mr Pickstock  
The Outdoor Pursuits Co-op  
Mr Baskerville  
Freeth Cartwright  
Mr Reynolds  
Mr Horton  
Messrs Rawthorne  
Mr and Mrs Bowen and Madders  
Ms Grainger  
Mr Morris  
Mr Mason  
Mr Holden  
Mr Mitchell  
Mr Shuker  
Mr Meyers  
Ms Wilson  
Miss Gittings  
M Dickinson  
Mr Woolrich  
Mr Jackson  
Sport England  
The Coal Authority  
Gregory Gray Associates  
PNPennell Planning Consultant  
G G & A J Smith  
S R Abercrombie  
Mr Price  
Kent Family  
Mrs Spibey  
Mr & Mrs Jayes  
Mr Venables  
Mr A Pym of Mr Jonathon Lloyd  
Mr Betts  
Mr Buchholz  
Mr Gibbons  
Mr Grime  
Mr Hemmings  
Mr & Mrs Clark  
Ms Garnett  
Mr Pine

Cala Homes Ltd  
Mr Clark  
Mr Farrow  
Mr Rhodes  
Mr Farmer  
Mr Mellor  
Mr Bowyer  
Mrs Cockbill  
Mr Devall  
Mr Marks & Ms Stokes  
Mr Mitchell  
Mr Goodsell  
Mr and Mrs Richardson  
Mr & Mrs Whittall  
Mr Dee  
Mr & Mrs Smith  
Pritchard Group  
Miss King  
Mr Fletcher  
Mr Thorley  
William Davis Ltd  
Mr Malpass  
Mr & Mrs Fletcher  
Ms Handley  
Mr Eley  
Mr Dawes  
CAMRA  
Mr Deakin  
Mr Grigg  
Mr Taylor  
Mr Savage  
Mr Turnpenny  
Mrs Seaborne  
Ms Gray  
Mrs Smith  
Mr and Mrs Beach  
Mr & Mrs Rowe  
Mr Bolton  
Barnett Ratcliffe Partnership  
Mrs Hytch  
Mrs Uttridge  
Mr and Mrs Williams  
Mr Johnston  
Mrs Knight  
Mrs Knight  
Mr Pyatt  
Mrs Davidson  
Mr Smith  
Mr Hocknell  
Ms Booth

Mr / Mrs McFarlane  
Mr White  
Mrs Jones  
Mr Woods  
Ms Chell  
Ms Tyson  
Mrs Brassington  
The Sudlow Family  
Mrs Thomas  
Jones  
Ms Law  
Mr Howard  
Mr Mellenchip  
Ms Schofield  
Mr Watkins  
Mr Eld  
S Jones  
Mrs Jones  
Fusion Online  
Mrs Johnson  
Mr & Mrs Brown  
Mr Guilfoyle  
Nova Captial Management  
Mr Pestel  
Mr / Mrs Davies  
Mr Legg  
Mr & Mrs Latimer  
Mr Bloor  
Mr Last  
Mr & Mrs Smith  
Wardell Armstrong for Adlington  
Estates  
Wardell Armstrong for J T & D C  
Goucher  
Wardell Armstrong for Fox Land &  
Property  
Wardell Armstrong for Gladman  
Property Ltd  
Dr Nakash  
Mr Holt  
Mr & Mrs Ward  
Gallagher Estates  
Mr Spibey  
Ms Perkins  
Ms Stagg  
Hixon Resident  
Mr Peters  
Mr and Mrs Dugmore  
Mr Cooper  
Mrs Tate

Berrys Property and Business  
Stoke-on-Trent Rugby Club  
Mrs Cartwright  
Mrs Hughes  
Mrs Hughes  
Mr Elsey  
Mr Martindale  
Friends, Families and Traveller Law  
Reform Project  
Mr Felstead  
Mr Storrow  
Mr Hodson  
Mr Vockins  
Network Rail  
Miss Hilliard  
Mr Barnfather  
Mrs Plant  
Ms Shaw  
Mrs Smith  
Ms Tyzack  
Mrs Brettell  
Mrs Wallsi  
Mr Shenton  
Mr Coles  
Mr and Mrs Billington  
Mrs Gough  
Mr Whitehurst  
Mrs Ashton  
Mr Seneviratne  
Mr and Mrs Tyler  
Ms Matthews  
Cottage Furniture  
Mr Love  
Mr Ward  
Mr & Mrs Smart  
Mr Ives  
Mr Moss  
Mr Shepherd  
Mr Thomas  
Mr and Mrs Buss  
Mr Featonby  
Persimmon Homes  
Mr & Mrs Sagar  
Mr Lawrence  
Mr Hodson  
Mr Midgley  
Dr Andrews  
Howard Sharp & Partners LLP  
Mr Hammersley-Fenton

Staffordshire County Council -  
Property  
Mr Roe  
Mr Allen  
Mrs Matthews  
Mr Houghton  
Mr Wilson  
Armstrong Burton Planning  
Miss Richardson  
Ms Bicknell  
Ms Kading  
Ms Hall  
Mr Wagstaff  
Mr Griffiths  
Mr Barlow  
Mr Simpson  
Mrs Wells  
Mr Davis  
Mr and Mrs Wheatley  
Mr Read  
Mr Ives  
Mrs Ricketts  
Mr Winter-Wright  
Mr Jakeman  
Mr Conaghan  
Mrs Wostenholme  
Mr Piwko  
Zigmund Slosmanis & Associates Inc.  
First City House  
British Waterways  
English Heritage  
Stone Town Council  
South Staffordshire District Council  
Mrs Chapman  
Centro  
MoD Stafford  
Highways Agency  
Mr Knott  
Colliers CRE  
Mr Pharoah  
Barton Willmore Planning  
Mr Frost  
Turley Associates  
Fisher German  
Mr Dodds  
Aragon Land and Planning  
Tweedale Limited  
Mr Willard  
Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o King Sturge

First City Limited  
Pegasus Planning Group  
Hinson Parry & Company  
H & H Bowe Ltd  
George F White  
Ms Sewell  
Mr Ryder  
Tarmac Ltd c/o First City Ltd  
Cuttlestones  
McWhorter  
McDyre and Co on behalf of G  
Edwards & Haszard Family  
RPS Planning  
Mr Burton  
Lord Stafford's Estate  
Les Stephan Planning Limited  
Mr Woodford  
RTRP  
Hallam Land Management Ltd  
Manby Steward Bowdler  
Terence O'Rourke Ltd  
K J D Freetch Llp  
DTZ  
Cerde Planning  
Blithfield Parish Council  
Rugeley Town Council  
Stoke-on-Trent City Council  
Mr Heath  
Mrs Phillips  
A Young  
Mrs Bromfield  
Mr Cairns-Lawrence  
Mr Dartford  
Dr Randall  
Mr Mountford  
Mr Perkins  
The Haywood Society  
Mr Barnes  
Ms Margetson  
Mrs Middleton  
Miss Turner  
Mrs Borgman  
Cllr Cooper  
Staffordshire Football Association  
Community Council of Staffordshire  
A Beardmore  
Dr Burns  
Dr Robotham  
Ms Jones  
Mr Hunt

Mr Mans  
Ms Partridge  
Mr King  
Mr Cooke  
Mrs Toovey  
Mrs Richards  
Mr. Owen  
Mr Basford  
Mr Apps  
R D Dilmitis  
Mr Egerton  
Bellway Homes  
Indigo Planning  
Mr Alder  
Mr and Mrs Dewberry  
Mr Phillips  
Mr Lee  
Ms Sammons  
Mr Bowley  
Mr Wiseman  
Mr. Broom  
Mr Bateman  
Mr Calder  
Mr Griffin  
Mr Coventry  
Mr & Mrs Mckeown  
Mr & Mrs Burrows  
Miss Forster  
Mrs Capjon  
Mrs Mitchell  
Mrs Phillips  
Mr Campbell  
Cllr C Simpson  
Cllr C Baron  
Mr Boote  
Ms Boyes  
Mr Francis  
Mr Cheadle  
Ms Renshaw  
Mrs Baggott  
Mrs Crockford  
Canal & River Trust  
Ms Wall  
Colwich Parish Council  
Hilderstone Parish Council  
Mr Blount  
Cllr M M Heenan  
Mr Stafford Northcote  
Mr Marchant  
Mr Butt



Mr Collins  
Mr Harrowby  
Mr Evans  
Mr Bennet  
Lt Col Dale  
Mr Cooper  
Forster & Company  
Mr Sleight  
Mr Barber  
Mr Woolridge  
Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation  
Trust  
Mr Howes  
Highways Agency  
Mr Pownall  
Mr Robinson  
Mr Worrall  
Mr Green  
Mr Dewhurst  
Mr Maddocks  
Mr Dawson  
Mr Mountford  
Sqn Ldr Skelland  
Ms Litchfield  
Mr Martin  
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group  
Mrs Smith  
Mr and Mrs Dean  
Mr Webb  
G L Hearn Holdings Ltd  
Mr Kemp  
Ms Tomlin  
Mr / Mrs Tweed  
Mrs Haynes  
Mr Brown  
Mr Shannon  
Mr Houghton  
Mr Boston  
N J Gumbley  
Mr. Wyatt  
Mr OKeef  
Mrs L. Westerman  
Ms Huyton  
Mr Andress  
Staffordshire & Worcestershire Canal  
Society  
Mr Loadwick  
G Tummey  
Mr Jones  
Mr Hancox

Mr Mitchell  
Mr Hough  
Mr Hough  
Mr Felton  
Mr. D'Arcy  
Mr & Mrs Lemoine  
Mr White  
Mrs Langlois  
Mrs. Evans  
First City Limited  
Mr Lotay  
Mr Hall  
Mrs Boardman  
National Farmers Union  
Addleshaw Goddard LLP  
Ms Chadwick  
Mrs Billingsley  
Mrs Adams  
Mr & Mrs Lockwood  
Mr Higginson  
Mr Lee  
Mr Lewis  
Mr Bonner  
Mr Wildblood  
Mrs Hulme  
Miss Parry  
Mr Jones  
Building Research Establishment  
British Waterways  
Mr Mcconimiskie  
Mr Price  
Mr Boulton  
Mr & Mrs Moore  
Mr / Ms Simmons  
ISE Estates Ltd c/o Dean Statham  
Mr Shipley  
Mr Nunn  
Mrs Mayes  
Mr Pattinson  
Miss Baker  
Mr Hinson  
Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough  
Council  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
Mr Hennie  
Mrs Kingsland  
Dr Essex  
Mr / Ms Salt  
Mr Robinson  
Mr Power

Major Prendergast  
Mr / Ms Cross  
Mr Upton  
Mrs Winkle  
Mr Milln  
Mr Slann  
Mr Hodgkiss  
Mr Harbottle  
Miss SIMPSON  
Mr Preston  
Ms Mason  
Ms Toft  
Mr Harper  
Mr Gardiner  
Mr / Ms Batchelor  
Mr Coate  
J E Mosley  
Mr Kelly  
Mr Hartshorne  
Mr Donnelly  
Mr Bloor  
J Ross Developments  
Mrs Rennie  
Councillor Tabernor  
Mrs Poulteney  
Mrs Kelsall  
Ms Curtin  
Mrs Walker  
Woodland Trust  
Mr Stevenson  
J Y Carruthers  
Mr Dugmore  
Miss Phillips  
Mr & Mrs Edwards  
Mr Walker  
Miss Sewell  
RPS Planning & Development  
Ms Mitchell  
Mrs Ong  
Action Parkside Residents Committee  
K C Butler  
Mr Lancaster  
Mr Costello  
Mr Wicks  
K Jones  
Ms Young  
Ms Kettle  
Mr Lawrence  
Miss Parry  
L Scott

Mr Liveing  
Swynnerton Parish Council  
Ms Robinson  
Mrs Pickering  
Mr Serjeant  
Ms Furber  
Dr Furber  
Mr & Mrs Ellison  
Mr Lyons  
Ms Scott  
Mr Lycett-Smith  
Mrs Macdonald  
Ms Wassall  
Mr Biard  
Mrs Gray  
Mr Dauncey  
Mr Smith  
Dr Oliver  
Mr S  
Mr Russell  
Mr Claxton  
Mr Adams  
Mr Young  
Mr Gardner  
M Chapman  
Mrs Adcock  
Mr McAuley  
Mr Cooksley  
Mr Wellock  
Mr Simpson  
Mr Hughes  
Mr Slaney  
Mrs Bennett  
Mr Parker  
Mr Smith  
Objective Corporation  
Mrs Walford  
Mr & Mrs Campion  
Ms Millington & Ms Windsor-Pye  
Mr Smith  
Mr Spencer  
Mr Bostock  
Mr Fletcher  
Transition Town Stafford  
Mr Gill  
Mr Riley  
Mr Larkin  
Mrs Roberts  
Mr Stainforth  
Dr Ireson

Mr Davies  
Mrs Smith  
Mrs Walker  
Mr Dyke  
Mr Bertram  
Ms Terry-Short  
Mr Baldwin  
Mr Spivey  
Mr Rennie  
Mr Pittard  
P A Walchester  
Cllr Jones  
Mr Startup  
Mr Edwards  
Mrs Hallas  
Mr Bowen  
P Cronin  
Mr Lewis  
Mr Berry  
CT Planning  
Dr Revell  
Mr Phillip  
Ms Kreuser  
Adlington Planning  
Ms Waddell  
The Coal Authority  
Mr Mills  
Mr Chadwick  
Mr Evans  
Mr Rhodes  
Ms Housam  
Mr Foxley  
How Planning  
Mr McBeath  
William Davis Ltd  
Councillor Kenney  
Mr Fletcher  
Mr Hine  
Mrs Grime  
National Trust  
Mr Whittaker  
Mr Oldfield  
Mr Venables  
Mr Stephens  
Mr Lovell  
Ms Easton  
S Farmery  
Ms Williams  
Mr Johnson  
Mr Benn

Mr Smith  
Residents Association Castlefields  
Mr Lancaster  
Mr Shaw  
Mrs Cooper  
Mr Jones  
Stowe by Chartley Parish Council  
Mrs Greenhalgh  
Mr Machin  
Ms Wood  
Mr Cooper  
Geroge White  
Fulford Parish Council  
Ms Johnson  
F F T Planning  
Mr Greenhalgh  
Mrs Haenelt  
Ms Poxton  
Ms Boardman  
Mr Knight  
Miss Currivan  
Mr Talbot  
Mr Clegg  
Mr Pick  
Mr Pick  
M Potter  
Mr Tibbitts  
Ms Wigfall  
Providence Land Limited  
Rev Jeffries  
Housing Plus  
Mr Price  
Mr Turner  
Mr Jeffries  
South Staffordshire Housing  
Association  
Mr Treadwell  
Mr Turner  
Mrs Turvey  
Mr James  
Mrs Evans  
Mrs Darlington  
Homes and Communities Agency  
Miss Young  
Mr Mahil  
Mr Capjon  
Castlefields Residents Association  
Cantrill Family  
Haughton Parish Council  
Mr Read

Stafford Historical & Civic Society  
Mr Winnington  
Mr Winter-Wright  
Community Council of Staffordshire  
Hixon Parish Council  
Bradley Parish Council  
Adbaston and High Offley Parish  
Councils  
Hyde Lea Parish Council  
Stone Town Council  
Swynnerton Parish Council  
Standon Parish Council  
Haughton and Ranton Parish  
Councils  
Natural England  
Telford and Wrekin Council  
Staffordshire Moorlands District  
Council  
Department for Transport - Rail  
Staffordshire Badger Conservation  
Group  
Equality and Human Rights  
Commission  
National Grid Transco  
Network Rail  
National Farmers Union (West  
Midlands)  
Waterloo Housing Association  
Midland Heart  
Stafford District Voluntary Services  
Stafford Trades Union Council /  
MASUWT  
Rising Brook Baptist Church  
Berkswich Parish Office  
Stafford District Arts Council  
Mr Leaker  
Mr Murray  
Mrs Crane  
FPD Savills  
Strutt & Parker  
Mr McDonald  
Andrew Martin Associates  
Mr Taylor  
DPDS Consulting Group  
Emery Planning Partnership  
CLA West Midlands  
Akzo Nobel UK Ltd c/o Jones Lang  
LaSalle  
Robert Turley Associates  
Mr and Mrs Smith

Mr Thomason  
Barnett Ratcliffe Partnership  
Powis Hughes and Associates  
King Sturge  
Knight Kavanagh & Page  
Kemberton Consulting  
Fusion Online Ltd  
Leith Planning  
Mrs Hill  
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners  
Mr Maddock  
Addleshaw Goddard LLP  
Armstrong Burton Planning  
Mr Melling  
Mason Richards Planning  
Midland Building Design  
Savills  
Tetlow King Planning  
The Shrewsbury and Newport Canals  
Trust  
Charterhouse Standard Holdings Ltd.  
BAE Systems Properties Ltd  
Dolphin Land  
FPD Savills  
Mr Cope  
Lichfield District Council  
Ms Baker  
Hallam Land Management Ltd  
David Wilson Homes (South  
Midlands)  
Emery Planning Partnership  
Drivers Jonas  
Mr Rimmer  
RPS Planning and Development  
Mr Fletcher  
Seddon Homes  
Emery Planing Partnership  
National Farmers Union  
Bellway Homes  
Madeleine James Chartered  
Surveyors  
Cannock Chase Council  
Brindley Heath Parish Council  
Colton Parish Council  
Dunston with Coppenhall Parish  
Council  
Lapley Stretton & Wheaton Aston  
Parish Council  
Penkridge Parish Council  
Whitmore Parish Council

Mr and Mrs Clowes  
Mrs Faulkner  
Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd  
Mr Talbot  
Mr Leese  
Mr Harbottle  
Marston Parish meeting  
H&H Bowe  
J Ross Developments  
Messrs Taylor  
Mr & Mrs A Buzzard  
Mr Bowen and Mr & Mrs Madders  
Mr J Rawsthorne  
Mr Keen  
Mr and Mrs York  
Carers Association Southern Staffs  
Terence O'Rourke  
Ancer Spa (Midlands) Ltd  
St Peter's Church  
Stafford Police Station  
Sandon and Burston Parish Council  
Weston Road High School  
Staffordshire University  
Dr Nolan  
Dr Mills  
Dr Macleod  
WSP Environmental  
Rural Planning Consultancy  
Dr & Mrs Whittows  
Dr and Mr Newell  
Dr and Mrs Dasgupta  
Dr and Mrs Coombs  
Dr and Ms Hewlett and Avis  
Fr D Rostron  
Harris Lamb Ltd for Bentley Homes  
Ms Parker  
Messrs Ricketts  
Messrs Hartley  
Milwich Action Committee  
Miss Sandwell  
Miss Moulton  
Miss Middleton  
Miss Matthews  
Miss Hubball  
Miss Harmer  
Miss Harding  
RPS Planning Transport and  
Environment (on behalf of BT plc)  
Miss Briggs  
Miss Archer

Miss and Mrs Hollins  
Mr Wright  
Mr Wren  
Mr Worth  
Staffordshire Buddies  
Mayflower Control Ltd  
Mr Woodward  
Mr Woodhouse  
Wood Frampton  
Minim Investments Ltd.  
Mr Wood  
Mr Winnett  
Mr Wilson  
Mr Wilson  
Stafford College  
Williams & Sons  
Staffordshire and Birmingham  
Agricultural Society  
South & Stubbs Chartered Surveyors  
Brookland School  
Mr M W Williams  
Mr P Williams  
Mr Willard  
RSPB Midlands Regional Office  
Mr D Wilkinson  
Mr P Wilkinson  
Mr Wiggins  
Mr Wibberley  
Mr Whyte  
Mr Whitehouse  
Mr White  
Mr Whistaner  
Mr Wheat  
West Midlands Highways Agency  
Cameron Homes  
Mr Waygood  
Stone LPU Neighbourhood Watch  
Mr Watson  
Mr Waterfall  
Mr Wassall  
Mr Wason  
Hallam Land Management Limited  
Staffordshire Police Authority  
Mr Wallace  
Walker London Developments  
Peacock & Smith  
P G Properties Ltd  
Mr D Walker  
Mr A T Walker  
Mr K Walker

Mr M E Walker  
Mr Vyer  
Mr P Turner  
Mr R Turner  
Mr Tucker  
Blymhill & Weston under Lizard Parish  
Council  
Mr Tortoiseshell  
Mr Tonna  
CT Planning (Town Planning)  
Mr Timmis  
Mr A G Tilley  
Mr S Tilley  
Wolseley Hall Farm Estate  
Mr Thurston  
Mr Thorpe  
Mr Thorenivs  
Mr Thomson  
Royal Mail  
Mr H W Thompson  
Mr P Thompson  
Mr P Thompson  
Property Tectonics  
Chris Thomas Ltd  
Axis  
Planning Services Bassetlaw District  
Council  
Mr Tebay  
RSPB  
Perkins Engines  
Mr D J Taylor  
Mr M Taylor  
Mr R J Taylor  
Mr J P Taylor  
Mr P M Taylor  
Mr Tapp  
Talbotts Biomass Energy Systems Ltd  
Mr Taft  
Mr Swift  
Mr Swan  
M Sutcliffe & Associates  
Job Centre Plus District Office  
Mr Stubbs  
Mr Stringer  
Redfern Developments  
Mr Storr  
Mr Stones  
Mr Stone  
Mr Stewart  
Mr Stevenson

Balfours  
Mr Staunton  
Stafford Heritage Society  
Staffordshire University  
East Staffordshire District Council  
Planning Inspectorate  
Mr Smythe  
Blessed William Howard Catholic High  
School  
Mr J Smith  
Mr J Smith  
Mr R A Smith  
Mr T Smith  
Mr B Smith  
Mr R Smith  
Mr M Smith  
Mr M Smith  
Mr Smart  
HM Prison  
Mr Skolik  
Stafford LPU  
Land Associates  
Mr Simpson  
Mr Simpson  
Mr Shiff  
Mr Sheriff  
Mr Sheppard  
Mr Shenton  
Stafford Friends of the Earth  
Stafford College  
Mr Sharples  
Dennis Singer Associates  
Stafford Road Club  
Friends of the Earth  
Seabridge Developments  
Mr J A Scott  
Mr D Scott  
Mr Schaack  
Mr Sargent  
Newport Road Service Station  
(Stafford) Ltd  
Rowe Precision and General  
Engineers Ltd  
M G Sanders Ltd  
Severn Trent Water Limited  
Mr Salt  
Katherine House Hospice  
RPS Planning  
Stafford Stores Committee  
Mr Ruscoe

Mr Rumary  
Leasowes Junior School  
Barratt Homes  
Mr Rouse  
Mr Rook  
Peter Rogers Ltd  
Aspire Housing  
Mr C Robinson  
Mr P Robinson  
Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service  
Mr J W Roberts  
Mr C A Roberts  
Bovis Homes  
Mr Risbey  
Staffordshire and Black Country  
Business Innovation Centre Ltd  
Mr Riley  
Mr Richardson  
Staffordshire University Vice  
Chancellor's Office  
Timothy Rendle  
Mr Reid  
Ramblers Association  
Stone Crime Prevention Group  
The Stafford Historical and Civic  
Society  
Asda Stores Ltd  
Mr Rawsthorne  
Mr Ratcliffe  
Urban Aspects  
Mr Ralph  
British Waterways  
Mr Rabjohns  
Mr R  
Mr Pynenburg  
Mr Pyatt  
Derrington Action Group  
Mr Prior  
Warwickshire County Council  
Mr Prichard  
Mr R Price  
Mr R Price  
Mr C Price  
Mr R Price  
Stafford Probation Service  
Mr Preece  
South Staffordshire Primary Care Trust  
Mr Powell  
Trent and Mersey Canal Society  
Police Authority

M J Pope Design Consultant  
Travel West Midlands  
The Woodland Trust  
Mr Plumb  
Peter Plants Jewellers  
ACORUS Wolverhampton  
Staffordshire Housing Association  
Shrewsbury and Newport Canals Trust  
Inland Waterways Association  
William Sutton Housing Group  
Mr Pike  
Guildhall Shopping Centre Manager  
Cannock Chase District Council  
GVA Grimley  
Loggerheads Parish Council  
Mr Perry  
Mr Perm  
Mr Perks  
Tillington Hall Hotel  
Areva T & D  
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust  
Mr Pauline Shale  
Frederick Parr Associates  
Mr Parkinson  
Fulford Village Hall Management  
Committee  
Mr Owen  
Smiths Gore  
Mr O'Rourke  
Mr O'Leary  
Rowley Park Action Group  
Ove Arup & Partners  
Residents of Cowley Lane / Wharfe  
Road  
Barbers  
Action Organics  
Mr Norton  
Mr Norris  
Nicolsons  
Mr Nicholls  
Chemical Business Association  
Mr Newman  
Mr C Newell  
Mr R Newell  
Mr Nee  
Mr Narrainen  
Mr Mynors  
Mr Murray  
Mr C Murphy  
Mr J R Murphy

Mr Mullee  
Mr Mountford  
Mr L Mottershead  
Mr Mottershead  
Allan Moss Associates Ltd.  
Chase & Partners  
E Heaton & Sons  
Chebsey Village Trust  
GPU Power UK  
Mr Moores  
John Moore (Tractor Parts) Ltd  
Derrington Action Group  
Mr Moore  
Bromford Housing Association  
Mr M Mitchell  
Mr S & R Mitchell  
Mr C Clowe & Miss C Attfield  
Rowley Park Action Group  
K & S Milner Ltd  
Mr Milne  
Persimmon Homes North West  
Chetwynd Parish Council  
Mr Middleton  
Mr Mellors  
SCHOTT (UK) Ltd  
Barlaston Residents Association  
Stafford Borough Sports Council  
Mr McCrorie  
Mr McCormick  
Mr McCabe  
Mr McArdle  
Dixon Webb Surveyors  
Mr Mathams  
Andrew Martin Associates  
Mr Martin  
Bellway Homes  
Mr Marshall  
Southern Staffordshire Partnership  
Mr Maratta  
Mr Manners  
Mr Manders  
Mr Malpass  
Mr Madge  
Mr Macy  
Mr Macklin  
Mr Machin  
Boot & Son  
Mr Lucker  
Mr Lowey  
Mr B Lowe

Mr V Lowe  
Mr Lovatt  
Mr Lockyer  
Mr Lockley  
Mr Loch  
Mr H Lloyd  
Mr H E Lloyd  
Mr Livesey  
Mr Licozish  
The Lewis Partnership – Moat House  
Stafford Tourism Bureau  
Mr Letts  
Cyril Leonard & Co.  
Persimmon Homes (West Midlands)  
plc  
Mr Leighton  
Mr Legge  
c/o Safex House  
Fisher German  
Mr Leather  
Mr Leadley  
Stafford Trades Union Council /  
NASUWT  
Mr Lawton  
Mr Lavelle  
Mr Large  
Mr Lane  
Mr Landon  
Mr Lambert  
Barratt West Midlands Ltd  
Mr Knight  
Environment Agency  
Mr Kinnibrugh  
Mr Kingsland  
Southern Staffordshire Partnership  
Mr King  
Mr Kerr  
D Kemp  
Mr Kelsey  
Mr Kelly  
Mr Keeble  
Mr Keay  
Mr Jukes  
Sow and Penk Internal Drainage  
Board  
Mr Judd  
Mr Joyner  
Mr G Spencer & Miss J Holt  
Stars News Shop  
Shropshire County Council



Schott Glass (UK) Ltd  
Mr A Jones  
Mr D Jones  
Mr D Jones  
Virgin Trains  
South Staffordshire District Council  
Mr R H Johnson  
Mr W Johnson  
Collegiate Church of St Mary  
Mr R W Johnson  
Mr J Johnson  
Mr C Johnson  
New Testament Church of God  
Mr Jogg  
Mr Jenkinson  
Mr Jeffries  
Mr Jefferies  
Mr Jayne  
Mr Jarrett  
Mr F D J James  
Mr I H James  
Newport Town Council  
Mr Jackson  
Mr Irwin  
Mr Ikin and Diwell  
Lingreen Properties Limited  
Chant House Associates  
Hyam & Co.  
Mr Huxley  
Hutsby Mees Solicitors  
Asda  
Mr Hurst  
Mr Hunt  
Mr Hulme  
Railfuture (Midlands Branch)  
Mr P Hughes  
Mr M Hughes  
Mr Hubble  
Mr Howes  
Mr Howells  
Talbotts Biomass Energy Systems Ltd  
Mr Horsley  
Mr Hoppe  
Mr Hope  
Mr Holt c/o Tweeddale Ltd  
Mr G A Holt  
H & H Holman Properties Ltd  
A Holmes and Son  
Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy  
Mr Hollinshead

Mr Holiday  
National Grid Land and Development  
Amec on behalf of Transco Land &  
Development  
Mr Holding  
Mr Hoeth  
Mr Hodgson  
Mr Hodgkinson  
Mr Hobbs  
Friends of the Earth  
Mr Hilton  
Mr S Hill  
Mr N Hill  
Mr Hilden  
Mr Higgott  
Mr Higginson  
Forestry Commission  
Mr Hickey  
Raleigh Adhesive Coating Ltd  
Ridgefield Land Investments  
Mr Henderson  
Lambert Smith Hampton  
Mr Heather  
Mr Heathcote  
Tweeddale Ltd  
Mr Hayward  
Mr Hawthorne  
Mr Hawkins  
Mr Haubus  
Mr Haswell  
Mr Hassall  
Mr Hartshorne  
Mr Hare  
Mike Hardy Consultants  
Mr Harbour  
Mr Hansford  
Dialogue  
Roger Tym & Partners  
Mr Hamore  
Haywoods Surveyors  
Mr Halliday  
British Ceramics Confederation  
Mr L M Hall  
Mr D Hall  
Mr G Hall  
Mr S Hall  
London Midland  
Mr Gumm  
The Garden History Society  
Mr Griffiths

Mr Griffin  
Mr Greaves  
Mr Grant  
Bigwood Associates Ltd  
Derrington Action Group  
Goodwins Removals (Stafford) Ltd  
CPRE - National Office  
Mr Gogerty  
Mr Godwin  
Entec UK  
Mr Gittins  
Stone Ramblers and Stafford Borough  
Walking Working Group  
Mr Gillam  
Mr Giles  
Mr L Gilbert  
Mr P Gilbert  
Mr Gerrish  
Mr Gerrard  
Mr Geoghagan  
Mr Gates  
Mr A D Garner  
Mr G Garner  
Atisreal  
Mr Galovics  
Radleigh Homes  
Mr Gallagher-Hughes  
Mr Gall  
Mr Furber  
Stone Youth and County Education  
Centre  
Framptons  
South Staffordshire Primary Care Trust  
Mr Fownes  
Sustrans  
Mr Foster  
Mr G C Forrester  
Mr Forrester  
Mr Foden  
Mr Flower  
Mr Fletcher  
Lloyds Bank  
Mr Fitzpatrick  
The Lawn Tennis Association  
Mr Field  
Mr Fernyhough  
Mouchel Consulting Limited  
Transport 2000 Staffs  
HSBC  
Hawksmere Ltd

Mr Farrington  
Mr Farr  
Mr Farnworth  
Mr Farmer  
Stone Gold Club  
GeraldEve  
Mr P Evans  
Mr V M Evans  
Mr P Evans  
Mr R Clift & Miss E Abbots  
Mr T Enough  
Mr Emery  
Mr Emberton  
Mr S Elmond  
Butters John Bee  
Mr Elliot  
Mr Ellerton  
Mr D Elkin  
Mr Elkin  
Raleigh Hall Properties Ltd  
Mr Edmunds  
Mr Edmondson  
SBT&RF  
Mr M Hardenburg & Miss J Ebrey  
Mr Eaton  
Bailey Dyson Int Consultants  
Mr Dyke  
Mr J A Dyche  
The Brockway Dunn Partnership  
Mr Dunmore  
Mr Dorset  
Mr Donohoe  
Mr Dodson  
Friog Management Services Ltd  
Peter Diffey and Associates  
Mr Dickens  
Legal & General Assurance Society  
Limited  
Mr Deighton  
Mr Deegan  
Mr Deavin  
Mr Deavall  
Mr Deakin  
In-Staffs  
Mr Davis  
Valuation Office  
Stafford Friends of the Earth  
Mr Davies  
Mr R Davies  
Mr L Davies

Mr Davey  
Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service  
Mr Dart  
Mr R Darby  
Daniel & Hulme  
Moreton Developments Ltd  
Mr Dalton  
Mr R Dale  
Mr E Dale  
Mr G Dale  
Mr Cymbaluk  
Tarmac Topmix  
Stanley Bragg Partnership Architects  
Flint Bishop & Barnett Solicitors  
Mr Cross  
Property Options  
Mr Cox  
Mr Coulton  
Mr Cottrill  
Transco plc  
Mr A G Cooper  
Mr G Cooper  
South Staffordshire Health Care NHS  
Foundation Trust  
Mr Cook  
Mr Connell  
Mr Collins  
Mr Collier  
Mr Collard  
Mr Coleman  
Wheaton Aston Youth Centre  
Mr Clews  
Elegant Buildings Ltd  
Mr Clay  
Mr Clarke  
Mr Clancy  
Chumley Roberts Partnership  
Mr Christopher  
Mr Choudhury  
Mr Chisholm  
Mr Chew  
Stafford Women's Aid  
Mr Challinor  
Mr Chadwick  
Royal Bank of Scotland - Stafford  
Labour Party  
Mr Carver  
Mr Carter  
Mr Carrington  
Mr Capener

Mr B J Cantrill  
Mr J Cantrill  
Mr Buxton  
Mr Burrnos  
Mr Burgess  
The Wolverhampton & Dudley  
Breweries plc  
Mr Bunting  
Mr Bull  
Mr Buel  
Mr Buckingham  
Mr Buckenham  
Culture West Midlands  
Mr Bryan  
Stone Labour Party  
Brownhill Hayward Brown  
Inland Waterways Association  
GA and A Brown and Son  
Mr D Brown  
Mr R Brown  
Mr J Brown  
Mr R Brown  
Mr Broom  
Mr Bromley  
Mr Brocklehurst  
Balti Bike Club  
Witness Support Group  
Mr Bray  
Mr Bracegirdle  
Mr Bowyer  
Mr Bowers  
Community Link Stafford & District  
Mr Bowen  
Mr Bowden  
Mr Bourne  
Stafford and District Access Group  
Leigh Parish Council  
Mr Bostock  
Sandonhall and Park Enterprises  
Mr N Bloor  
Mr D Bloor  
Mr Bland  
Mr Blagbrough  
Mr Blacklock  
Mr Birt  
Freight Transport Association  
Mr Bird  
Mr Biggs  
Mr Biard

Gnosall & Haughton A518 Action  
Group  
Trafalgar-Europe Developments  
Mr Betts  
Mr Bertram  
CgMs Consulting Hartwell plc  
Mr D Bennett  
Mr A Bennett  
Trent Vision  
Mr B H Bell  
Mr R Bell  
Mr Beecham  
Hinson Parry & Co  
Mr C Beardmore  
Mr M H Beardmore  
Mr Baxter  
Mr Baughey  
Mr Basford  
Mr Barrett  
Mr Barnard  
Solihull Met Borough Council  
Mr Barlow  
Mr Barber  
Mr Banks  
Mr B Baldwin  
Mr D Baldwin  
Mr G Baldwin  
Mr A Baldwin  
Mr Baldry  
Whitebridge Estates  
Mr Bailey  
David Bagshaw Homes  
Mr Baddeley  
Mr Babb  
Mr Atkin  
New Horizons Land Ltd  
Mr Archer  
North Shropshire District Council  
Mr Anthony  
The Edward Anderson Practice  
Kent Jones & Done  
Mr Anderson  
Mr Amison  
Mr M Allen  
Mr J Allen  
Mr Allcock  
Mr Allan  
Mr Alder  
Rodbaston College  
Mr Air

Mr Adnitt  
Renewable UK  
Mr Adamson  
Redrow Homes (West Midlands Ltd)  
Beth Johnson Housing Group  
Yeomans and Plant  
Mr A Robotham & Miss D Sheldrate  
Mr N Giles & Miss L Marshall  
Mr J White & Miss L Williamson  
Mr K Morgan & Miss D Harris  
Mr & Mrs Wilson  
Mr & Mrs Williams  
Mr & Mrs Pilley  
Mr & Mrs Miller  
Mr & Mrs Lawton  
Mr & Mrs Howells  
Mr & Mrs Hawley  
Mr & Mrs Cornwell  
Mr & Mrs Bolton  
Mr T Burgess and Miss J French  
Mr P Davies and Miss O Harvey  
Mr D Robson and Miss P Middleton  
Mr N Collins and Miss T Amos  
Mr M Bond and Miss C Smith  
Mr D Matthias and Miss J Wassell  
Mr J Thomson and Miss L Parry  
Mr and Mrs Wootton  
Mr and Mrs Woodhall  
Mr and Mrs Winstanley  
Mr and Mrs Williamson  
Mr and Mrs Williams  
Mr and Mrs Wheat  
Mr and Mrs Weston  
Mr and Mrs Wesley  
Mr and Mrs Weaver  
Mr and Mrs Watson  
Mr and Mrs J & G Watson  
Mr and Mrs Watkins  
Mr and Mrs Vernon  
Mr and Mrs Tyrie  
Mr and Mrs Twigg  
Mr and Mrs Tunnicliffe  
Mr and Mrs Timms  
Mr and Mrs Timmins  
Mr and Mrs Thacker  
Mr and Mrs Taylor  
Mr and Mrs Tate  
Mr and Mrs Tams  
Mr and Mrs Sutton  
Mr and Mrs Starkey

Mr and Mrs Spencer	Mr and Mrs Lunn
Mr and Mrs Snape	Mr and Mrs Lumley
Mr and Mrs N A Smith	Mr and Mrs Lucas
Mr and Mrs Smith	Mr and Mrs Loney
Mr and Mrs Sincup	Mr and Mrs Lomas
Mr and Mrs Simpson	Mr and Mrs Lockley
Mr and Mrs Silvester	Mr and Mrs Lock
Mr and Mrs Sant	Mr and Mrs Lloyd
Mr and Mrs Ryde	Mr and Mrs Linden Hilditch
Mr and Mrs Rooney	Mr and Mrs Lewis
Mr and Mrs Rogers	Mr and Mrs Lenton
Mr and Mrs Roe	Mr and Mrs Leek
Mr and Mrs Robson	Mr and Mrs Large
Mr and Mrs W M Roberts	Mr and Mrs C & V Lane
Mr and Mrs Roberts	Mr and Mrs Lane
Mr and Mrs Riley	Mr and Mrs Kinnersley
Mr and Mrs Richards	Mr and Mrs Kincaid
Mr and Mrs Raine	Mr and Mrs Kilkenney
Mr and Mrs Pymm	Mr and Mrs Kilford
Mr and Mrs Price	Mr and Mrs Kibble
Mr and Mrs Powner	Mr and Mrs Kettle
Mr and Mrs Powell	Mr and Mrs Kenyon
Mr and Mrs Powell	Mr and Mrs J Kelly
Mr and Mrs Pitt	Mr and Mrs Kelly
Mr and Mrs Pickard	Mr and Mrs Jones
Mr and Mrs Perkin	Mr and Mrs R F & C L Jones
Mr and Mrs Pearce	Mr and Mrs Jones
Mr and Mrs Parker, Richards and Warwicker	Mr and Mrs Johnson
Mr and Mrs Palmer	Mr and Mrs Johns
Mr and Mrs Otwed	Mr and Mrs Jobson
Mr and Mrs Oakley	Mr and Mrs Jefferies
Mr and Mrs Nicholls	Mr and Mrs Jahn
Mr and Mrs Myatt	Mr and Mrs Jacques
Mr and Mrs Murray	Mr and Mrs Jackson
Mr and Mrs Morris	Mr and Mrs Isherwood
Mr and Mrs Moore	Mr and Mrs Hunt
Mr and Mrs Mockett	Mr and Mrs Hughes and Rundle- Hughes
Mr and Mrs Mitchell	Mr and Mrs Hughes
Mr and Mrs Miller	Mr and Mrs Hudson
Mr and Mrs Middleton	Mr and Mrs Horwill
Mr and Mrs McComiskie	Mr and Mrs Horton
Mr and Mrs T F & J C Martin	Mr and Mrs Horrocks
Mr and Mrs Martin	Mr and Mrs Holmes
Mr and Mrs Mans	Mr and Mrs Holdcroft
Mr and Mrs Maltby	Mr and Mrs Hodgkins
Mr and Mrs Main	Mr and Mrs M V & J I Hill
Mr and Mrs Macmillan	Mr and Mrs Hill
Mr and Mrs Mackay	Mr and Mrs Hewletts
Mr and Mrs Macdonald	Mr and Mrs Herring

Mr and Mrs Herbert	Mr and Mrs Clews
Mr and Mrs Hender	Mr and Mrs Clements
Mr and Mrs G N & G Hawkins	Mr and Mrs M & S Clark
Mr and Mrs F & R Hawkins	Mr and Mrs I & A Clark
Mr and Mrs Hastilow	Mr and Mrs Cheadle
Mr and Mrs Harvey	Mr and Mrs Chapman
Mr and Mrs Harrison	Mr and Mrs Castillo
Mr and Mrs Hardey	Mr and Mrs Cartwright
Mr and Mrs Griffiths	Mr and Mrs Caddick
Mr and Mrs Greaves	Mr and Mrs Byatt
Mr and Mrs Gray	Mr and Mrs D Butters
Mr and Mrs Goodwin	Mr and Mrs Butters
Mr and Mrs Gillard	Mr and Mrs Burrows
Mr and Mrs Gibbons	Mr and Mrs Bullard
Mr and Mrs Garfield	Mr and Mrs Brown
Mr and Mrs Galley	Mr and Mrs Brocklehurst
Mr and Mrs Gale	Mr and Mrs Bridgett
Mr and Mrs Frost	Mr and Mrs Bridge
Mr and Mrs Fox	Mr and Mrs Brew
Mr and Mrs Fowell	Mr and Mrs Brettell
Mr and Mrs Forrester	Mr and Mrs Breeze
Mr and Mrs Finney	Mr and Mrs Bramall
Mr and Mrs Findlay	Mr and Mrs Brailsford
Mr and Mrs Fielding	Mr and Mrs Bradley
Mr and Mrs Farshbaf	Mr and Mrs Bradberr
Mr and Mrs Farmery	Mr and Mrs Bott
Mr and Mrs Farmer	Mr and Mrs Bloor
Mr and Mrs Evans	Mr and Mrs Bird
Mr and Mrs Evans	Mr and Mrs Biggar
Mr and Mrs Elden	Mr and Mrs Berrisford
Mr and Mrs Edwards	Mr and Mrs Bennett
Mr and Mrs Eardley	Mr and Mrs Bellamy
Mr and Mrs Dykes	Mr and Mrs Bell and Henshall-Bell
Mr and Mrs Dunk	Mr and Mrs J Bell
Mr and Mrs Duffy	Mr and Mrs Bedford
Mr and Mrs Dodd	Mr and Mrs Beardmore
Mr and Mrs Dobie	Mr and Mrs Beadle
Mr and Mrs Dickinson	Mr and Mrs Bayley
Mr and Mrs Dickens	Mr and Mrs Baskeyfield
Mr and Mrs Dentith	Mr and Mrs Baskerville
Mr and Mrs Dawson	Mr and Mrs Barton
Mr and Mrs Crampton	Mr and Mrs Barnett
Mr and Mrs Cox	Mr and Mrs Bakewell
Mr and Mrs Cowlshaw	Mr and Mrs Bagnall
Mr and Mrs Copestick	Mr & Mrs J Austen
Mr and Mrs Cope	Mr and Mrs Atkinson
Mr and Mrs Collyer	Mr and Mrs Astwood
Mr and Mrs Collins	Mr and Mrs Astle
Mr and Mrs Collins	Mr and Mrs Arnot
Mr and Mrs Clifford	Mr and Mrs and L Dixon

Mr and Mrs Amos  
Mr and Mrs Allen  
Mr and Mrs Acraman  
Mr and Mrs Boote  
Mr. Abbott  
Mr. and Mrs Clowes  
Pegasus Planning Group  
Mrs Wragg  
Mrs Wootton  
Mrs Woodward  
Derrington Millennium Green Trust  
Mrs S Williams  
Mrs E Williams  
Mrs Wilcock  
Mrs Whitehouse  
St Paul's House  
Maer and Aston Parish Council  
Mrs Wedge  
Staffordshire Association of Senior  
Citizens  
Mrs G Ward  
Mrs E M Ward  
Mrs Walker  
Mrs Umerah  
Mrs Trickett  
Mrs Towner  
Mrs Tooth  
Mrs Tomkinson  
Mrs Tildesley  
Mrs Thompson  
Mrs Thomas  
Mrs Sumner  
Mrs Stubbs  
Mrs Stuart  
Mrs Stimpson  
Alleyne's High School  
Forsbrook Parish Council  
Mrs Smithson  
Mrs Smith  
Staffordshire Supporting People Team  
Staffordshire Social Services  
Mrs Shilmit  
Mrs Shepherd  
Foster Nurseries Ltd  
Mrs Shackman  
Stewart Ross Associates  
Mrs Roper  
Mrs Roberts  
Mrs Richardson  
Mrs Reynolds

Mrs Rayson  
Mrs Randles  
Mrs Quarrie  
Mrs Proctor  
Mrs Price  
Mrs Poyser  
Mrs Pitchford  
Mrs Piggott  
Kingstone Parish Council  
Mrs Pickervance  
Mrs Phillips  
Mrs Parton  
National Playing Fields Association  
Mrs Palmer  
Mrs Osbourne  
Mrs O'Neil  
ChildTalk  
Mrs Nichells  
Mrs Newbould  
St Leonard's Primary School  
Mrs Murphy  
Mrs Moss  
Mrs Morris  
Mrs Moran  
Brimble Lea and Partners  
Community Residents Association of  
the North End (CRANE)  
Mid-Staffordshire General Hospitals  
NHS  
Knights Solicitors LLP  
Mrs Marles  
Mrs Lockley  
Mrs Lockett  
Mrs Lloyd  
Mrs Lindores  
Mrs Lear  
Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish  
Council  
Mrs Lawrence  
Mrs Lambert  
Mrs Lago  
Walton High School  
Mrs Kidney  
Mrs Kelly  
Mrs Kearns  
Acton Trussell Bednall & Teddesley  
Hay Parish Council  
Mrs Jones  
Mrs Jefferson  
Mrs Jarvis

Mrs James  
Mrs Ison  
Mrs Iqbal  
Mrs Ingram  
Mrs Hulse  
Mrs R Hughes  
Mrs G Hughes  
Caverswall Parish Council  
Mrs Horwill  
Mrs Horton  
Mrs Hood  
Mrs Holland  
Mrs Hodson  
Mrs Hitchin  
Mrs Hirst  
Mrs Hill  
Chapel and Hill Chorlton Parish  
Council  
Mrs Harvey  
Mrs K Harris  
Mrs H Harris  
Mrs M Hall  
Mrs Gregory  
Mrs Gibson  
Mrs Franks  
Mrs B A Foster  
Mrs R Foster  
Mrs Forrest  
Mrs Fletcher  
Amerton Farm  
Mrs Felstead  
Mrs Faulkner  
Staffordshire Parish Councils  
Association  
Draycott in the Moors Parish Council  
Mrs Edwards  
Mrs Dyke  
Mrs Dunbavand-Jones  
Mrs Dobbins  
Mrs Dickerson  
Mrs Derry  
Mrs Darlington  
Mrs Dakin  
Mrs Dainty  
Mrs Cox  
Mrs Corbett  
Mrs Cooke  
Mrs Cols  
Mrs Collett  
Mrs Coleman

Mrs Clendon  
Mrs Clay  
Mrs Clarke  
Mrs Clarke  
Customer First  
Mrs Champion  
Mrs E J Chambers  
Mrs S Cartwright  
Mrs J M Cartwright  
Mrs Cartlidge  
Mrs Carmichael  
Stafford Castle Golf Club  
Mrs Byrne  
Mrs Burrows  
Mrs Burley  
Mrs Burge  
Mrs Bunting  
Mrs Brys  
Mrs Bryan  
Derbyshire Wildlife Trust  
Cheswardine Parish Council  
Mrs Brown  
Mrs Brooke  
Mrs Bricknell  
Mrs Bray  
Mrs Braun  
Mrs Bowyer  
Mrs A M Boulton  
Mrs S Boulton  
Mrs Boulton  
Graham Bolton Planning Partnership  
Mrs Boardman  
Mid Staffordshire Group of the  
Ramblers Association  
Mrs Banham  
Mrs Baldry  
Mrs Baines  
Mrs Ashford  
Mrs Apps  
Mrs Allsopp  
Mrs Allman  
Mrs Allen  
Mrs Allan  
Mrs Aldred  
Mr and Mrs Skelton  
Mrs Breeze  
Mr and Mrs Wilson  
Mrs Webber  
Ms Wood  
Ms Wonnacott



Mount Peniel Advice Centre  
Mobile Operators Association  
National Federation of Women's  
Institutes  
Ms Williams  
Ms Whitehurst  
Ms Wetton  
Ms Webb-Bowen  
Ms Watson  
Ms Warrilow  
Barton Willmore Planning  
Ms Wakeman  
Ms Udall  
Terence O'Rourke Ltd  
Ms Thatcher  
Ms Summer Smith  
Ms Sudlow  
Ms Sturgers  
Environment Agency  
Acorus Rural Property Services  
Sport England West Midlands  
Express and Star  
Ms Slater  
Ms Slack  
Merriman Ltd  
Ms M Simkiss  
Ms D Simkiss  
Harron Homes (North West) Ltd  
Real Nappies Network  
Stafford Chamber of Commerce &  
Industry  
Ms Scott  
Home Start Stafford and District  
Ms Rob  
Ms Rimmer  
Ms Rider  
Ms Rees  
Ms Redfurn  
Ms P Ray  
Ms V A Ray  
Flash Lea Primary School  
Pritchard Associates LTD  
Ms Polthan  
Ms Pine  
Ms Phillips  
The Tyler Parkes Partnerships  
Ms Palmer  
Ms Owen-Lord  
Community Council of Staffordshire  
Ms Overton

Ms Norris  
Stafford CAB  
Ms Munro  
Fields in Trust  
Ms Moore  
Ms Metcalfe  
Ms McWhorter  
Ms McDonnell  
Ms Marcraft  
Ms Main  
Ms Lynne  
Ms Lutwyche  
Arts Council West Midlands  
Staffordshire Housing Association  
Ms Lofty  
Ms Legge  
Ms Lawrence  
J V H Town Planning Consultants  
Diane Fossey Gorilla Fund  
Smart Planning Ltd  
Ms Kilkenny  
Ms Kelly  
Ms Jones  
Ms Ironbridge  
Ms Ingram  
Ms R Inglefield  
Ms Inglefield  
Ms Hyland  
Ms Hunt  
Yarnfield Village Forum  
Ms Hudson  
Malcolm Scott  
Ms Huahez  
Christians Against Poverty Rising  
Brook Baptist Church  
The Fairfield Partnership  
Ms Hopcroft  
Bond Pearce Solicitors  
Ms Holmes  
Ms Hockenhull  
Ms Higgs  
Ms Hie  
British Waterways Lands and Property  
Drivers Jonas  
Ms Harvey  
Women's Royal Voluntary Service  
Ms Groves  
Ms Graham  
Ms Goodson  
Ms Gill

Ms George  
William Sutton Trust  
Stonham Housing Association  
Ms Franklin  
Ms Flavell  
Ms Finlayson  
Housing 21  
Ms Finch  
Ms Felthouse  
Sanctuary Housing Association  
Action at Home  
Ms Emms  
MADE (Midlands Arch and Designed  
Env)  
Harper Adams University College  
United Co-operatives LTD  
Ms Edwards  
Stafford Area Action for Fair Trade  
Ms Duckworth  
Ms Draper  
Rocklee Residential Home  
West Midlands Local Government  
Association  
Friends of Riverway  
Property Search Group  
De Pol Associates  
Planning Potential  
Ms Daddolangois  
The Planning Bureau Limited  
Ms Craig  
Ms Cope  
Ms Colley  
Ms Clemson  
Ms Clements  
Staffordshire Cluster PCT  
Ms Chambers  
Ms Carroll  
Touchstone Heart  
Ms Cadogan  
Aspire Housing  
Network Rail  
Ms Broadbent  
Ms Brailsford  
Ms Bradley  
Ms Benton  
Ms Barker  
Stonham Housing Association  
Stafford and Stone Chronicles  
Ms Baker  
Stafford and Rural Homes

Ms Appleford  
Simona UK Ltd  
Ms Abrahams  
Bromford Housing Group  
Stone Rural Parish Council  
Community Police  
Professor and Mrs Randall  
Circuit Office  
Stafford Christian Life Centre  
Highfields Christian Centre  
Rev Preb Harding  
SHIRE  
Frank Humphries Chartered Architects  
BBC Radio Stoke  
Silvester  
Women's National Commission  
West Midlands Passenger Transport  
Authority  
The Inglewood Investment Company  
Ltd  
c/o First City Ltd  
The Eccleshall Alert Group  
The Wildlife Trusts  
The National Trust  
Taylor Wimpey/Bellway/St Modwen  
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Interests at  
Stone  
Strawsons Property  
Stan Robinson (Stafford) Ltd  
Staffordshire Blind Association  
Stafford West Consortium c/o Savills  
DSDC North – MoD Stafford  
St Modwen Properties plc  
St Modwen Developments  
Sports Across Staffordshire  
Solus Coaches  
Signal Radio  
Severn Trent Water Ltd  
Sandon Road Baptist Church  
Safeguarding DE Operations North  
RSPB  
Royal Mail  
Rowley Park Action Group  
The Crown Estate  
Post Office Property Holdings  
Play Space for Doxey  
Paul Dickinson & Associates (HM  
Prison Service)  
Nova Capital Management Ltd  
North British Housing Association

Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners  
MoD Stafford  
Millar Sandy  
McCarthy & Stone (Dev) Ltd.  
Mark Redler and Company  
London Midland  
London Gypsy & Traveller Unit  
Lichfield Diocesan Board of Finance  
Learning and Skills Council  
Josiah Wedgwood and Sons  
Institute of Directors  
Housing Corporation  
Health and Safety Executive  
Halletec Associates  
Hackberry Developments  
GVA Grimley  
Green Bus Service  
GPU Power Ltd  
G & C Leese Bros Ltd  
First  
Environment Agency  
Employment Services West Midlands  
Region  
Disability Unit Department for Works  
and Pensions  
Disability Rights Commission  
Department for Transport  
D&G Coach and Bus Ltd  
Commission for New Towns and  
English Partnerships  
Codsall Cars

Coal Authority  
Choice Travel  
Castle Homes and Properties Ltd  
Campaign for Real Ale Ltd  
Cable & Wireless  
BT  
British Geological Survey  
Bell Ingram Pipelines  
Arriva Midlands  
ARRIVA  
Airport Operators Association  
Age UK  
Age UK - Stafford  
Age Concern Stone and District  
Age Concern England  
ADAS Rural Property Services  
Accord HA  
Accent North West  
Aaron Chetwynd Architect Studio LLP  
County Councillor Butter  
County Councillor Winnington  
County Councillor Bloomer  
County Councillor Jennings  
County Councillor Jones  
County Councillor Parry  
County Councillor Barron  
County Councillor Francis  
County Councillor Heenan  
Mr Cash Esq MP  
Mr Lefroy Esq MP