



Site Options and Development Boundaries Consultation – Response Form

Name:

Address:
.....
.....
.....

E-Mail contact:
.....

Agent (if applicable).....

Please return this form by **5pm on 14th September 2015** by:

Email to: forward.plans@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk or by post to:

Freepost RRLJ-XCTC-JBZK
Forward Plans
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Regeneration Services
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek
ST13 6HQ.

Further information: www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/siteallocations

1. Site Options

Please submit a separate response for each individual site that you wish to comment on.

SITE REFERENCE (see consultation map)

SETTLEMENT.....

Do you support or object to this site? *(Please select one answer)*

Support..... Object..... General Comment.....

Reasons for response

Please identify the issue(s) relevant to your response. *(Please select all that apply)*

- Infrastructure – schools
- Infrastructure - traffic/transport
- Infrastructure - other
- Landscape
- Nature conservation
- Flood risk
- Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light)
- Scale of development
- Listed building / conservation area
- Government policy
- Other

Do you have any comments?

2. Development/ Infill Boundary

Do you consider that an amendment to a proposed development or infill boundary is required? (Please select one answer)

Yes..... No.....

Settlement.....

(Please submit a separate response if you are suggesting more than one alteration).

Please state your reasons. (Please attach a scale plan to the rear of this response form to illustrate your suggested amendment).

3. Open Space

Are there any other areas that you consider should be included as open space that are not identified in the plan? (Please select one answer)

Yes..... No.....

Settlement.....

(Please submit a separate response if you are commenting on more than one area of open space).

If your answer is “yes”, please clearly state the location of this area and the reasons for including it. (Please attach a scale plan identifying the site, to the rear of this response form.)

Please specify any other comments regarding open space identified on the plans:

4. Town Centre Maps

Do you consider that an amendment is required to any of the proposed town centre boundaries? *(Please select one answer)*

Yes..... No.....

Settlement.....

(Please submit a separate response for each town centre boundary amendment you are suggesting).

Comments. (Please attach a scale plan to the rear of this response form to illustrate your suggested amendment.)

Do you consider that an amendment is required to any of the proposed primary and/or secondary frontages? *(Please select one answer)*

Primary frontages.....

Secondary frontages.....

Primary and secondary frontages.....

No amendments required.....

Town (Leek/Biddulph/Cheadle).....

(Please submit a separate response if you are suggesting more than one frontage amendment).

Comments. (Please attach a scale plan to the rear of this response form to illustrate your suggested amendment.)

5. Review of Policy Areas

Are there any Policies/ Policy areas contained in the current adopted 2014 Core Strategy that you consider should be reviewed in the light of new evidence or guidance? **YES**

Policy area – **Spatial Strategy – Housing Requirements**

Reasons:

Your Target housing Provision for Cheadle of 1350 houses to 2031 is not reflective of local demand, is excessive and works against the will of the Community. A total of 6000 is excessive across the Staffordshire Moorlands

SMDC have delivered minimal information to residents and have failed to notify that you may intent to ignore previous representations on your flyer. The assumption therefore exists with many residents that previous objections are still valid (which of course they should be). The new Site Allocations and ‘urban extensions’ are by and large a cut and paste of the old ‘Broad Locations’, This is acknowledged not only by local residents, but by the Town Council. The same issues remain as do the vast majority of objections.

As SMDC are aware, in response to petition P001411, the Housing Minister Brandon Lewis MP responded (29th Jan 2015) regarding housing provision with the statement;

‘The Framework only asks local councils to identify and plan to meet the objectively assessed needs of their communities based on robust evidence.’

The Community of Cheadle and the local areas have through numerous representations and petitions over 5 Years made it clear to SMDC in no uncertain terms that they object to significant over-development of Cheadle. It is our understanding that various historic facts and documents may be missing and/or omitted or inaccessible as part of this consultation and therefore for clarity this document includes information that should be considered as new evidence by SMDC.

As far back as the ‘Local transport Plan for Staffordshire 2000 ‘[1] there were clearly identified road infrastructure improvement needs for Cheadle.

None have been forthcoming for various cost constraint, deliverability and effectiveness reasons, so much so that references to the needs for road improvements have been conveniently dropped, while residents regularly live with 20 minutes delays crossing the town.

The Loss of Greenfields and Agricultural land, strain on local resources in Schools, Doctors dentists along with Health and Safety Concerns from Diesel Fume emissions in a gridlocked town, along with identity and tourism aspirations have been clearly documented for example the Cheadle Unite DPD submission January 2010 [2].

In June 2010 SMDC published Appendix_K [3] detailing a summary of representations to the Core Strategy across Staffordshire Moorlands. Of the 102 Pages, **Representations from Cheadle residents account for 75% of the document (Pages 14-91) detailing the strong sentiment against excessive housing development across Cheadle.**

Consequently, our call to reduce planned housing was agreed through the then ‘Regional Spatial Strategy’, reducing our allocation by 500 dwellings.

In response, Stoke-on-Trent City Council wrote a letter to SMDC (5th July 2012), the letter included Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council stating; *'Both Council's were supportive of Staffordshire Moorlands reduction in their housing figure by 500 dwellings., which in part will strengthen the conurbations ability to bring forward previously developed sites'*.

An aggressive development strategy by SMDC would clearly work against regeneration of the Potteries, drawing potential developers away from sustainable affordable family housing. Many Brownfield sites lay waste to this day as detailed in the Brownfield site document [4] we have already sent to you.

While you propose 1350 houses for Cheadle on Greenfield and Agricultural land our local City suffers, the S-o-T Council document goes on to state.

'our own housing trajectory as set out in the adopted Core Strategy and Annual Monitoring reports, will in itself prove challenging particularly given the existing weak housing market'.

With a change of Government and the introduction of the pro-development Localism Act, SMDC have not yet adopted the established wishes of the Community and wider regeneration of the Potteries with a target figure of 1350 houses to 2031. A proposed figure that not only re-introduces the 500 dwellings detailed above, but works against the declining local population and ignores the increasing road and infrastructure issues with the town.

Under the localism act you have a duty to co-operate and despite numerous requests residents have not had details of how this is happening with the Potteries and have indicated any such process is closed and not open to the public. Cheshire East Council have been talking to S-o-T regarding their housing we have been asking SMDC to do this for 5 years now, with our support.

In December 2014 Over 1000 residents Signed petition P001411[5] Presented in the House of Commons by Sir Bill Cash MP calling for a reduction in housing numbers for Cheadle and for SMDC to work with the Potteries. You have not to date recognised this petition and therefore the signatures will be resubmitted by the Cheadle Together Action groups of Cheadle along with this representation to highlight the call for significantly reduced housing numbers.

As has been stated above, the Government only asks to *'plan to meet the objectively assessed needs of their communities based on robust evidence.'*

Cheadle Unite wrote to you on the 19th of February 2015 [6] and the 16th August 2015 [7], highlighting the declining population, down from 13,458 (14.1%) to 4800 (5%) taken from your own core strategy document along with **new 2012 Office for National Statistics (ONS) Sub National Population Predictions (SNPP) where the figures fall even further to a population growth of only 2600 to the year 2031.**

In addition, the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) adopted the above ONS 2012 SNPP Figures into their Household Predictions for England 2012 -2037 and onto their tables. The figures for all SMDC between 2016 and 2031 show a housing demand of 2573 houses between 2016 and 2031 (Not the 6000+ that you are proposing). This relates to build rate of 171.5 dwellings per annum. A proportionate reduction in line with these Official Government Figures and given the Sentiment and aspiration for Cheadle residents would be a total of 580 dwellings to 2031 for Cheadle not 1350 as is being proposed.

The detailed documents above and the aspirations of Cheadle residents collaborating with our local city along with the latest Government 2012 ONS Population Predications and the 2015 DCLG Figures for housing requirements are in themselves sufficient to provide a robust evidence base that SMDC can justify a much reduced housing provision to 2031. The Preferred figure for Cheadle would be 580 houses to 2031 as detailed above.

6. Call for Sites

Do you have any suggestions for additional site options (not already identified by the Council)? *(Please select one answer)*

Yes..... No.....

Settlement.....

Site area.....

(Please submit a separate response for each additional site you are suggesting).

Suggested land use(s): *(Please select all that apply)*

Residential.....

Employment.....

Retail.....

Mixed uses.....

Traveller Sites.....

Do you own this site, or do you know who the owner(s) is?

Please explain why you consider this site should be included as an option for the land use(s) selected (eg access, location, site history etc): **Please attach a scale plan identifying the site, to the rear of this response form.**

7. **Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)**

Are there any sites in the published SHLAA documents that you consider should be reclassified according to their deliverability? *(Please select one answer)*

Yes..... No.....

(Please submit a separate response for each site you are commenting on).

SHLAA Site reference number.....

Please provide your reasons:

Do you consider that there are any amendments needed to any of the details in the published site assessment forms in the SHLAA documents? *(Please select one answer)*

Yes..... No.....

(Please submit a separate response for each site you are commenting on).

SHLAA Site reference number.....

Please provide details of what changes are required, and why:

8. Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

Are there any further changes you consider should be made to Section 5 of the Council's adopted 2014 SCI? (Please select one answer)

Yes

Consultations should be carried out by SMDC and not third party developers.

This should include full consultation with affected residents for large scale developments of over 10 houses.

Residents should be given equal balanced support to oppose planning applications

Planning officers should be allocated to the local community in equal measure to developers and their availability clearly detailed to residents at the start of any consultation.

All correspondence between SMDC and Developers should be freely accessible to residents as part of the consultation. This has not happened in the past with Freedom of Information Requests being refused and ignored.

The SCI document should not be classed as final and should be open to modification in line with community requirements. It should not be necessary to make a high court appeal to amend this document when the community request change.

Further

On the SMDC Website page there is a document titled 'SCI Proposed Amendments for Consultation - July 2015'.

This proposal document appears to infer that instead of carrying out a formal consultation for Major housing developments (10 or more houses), that formal consultation is only needed for very large scale development (>200 houses). **This excessively high figure would in effect take all probable housing developments out of any formal consultation process and is not considered appropriate.**

Further **the proposed reduction in consultation from 35 days to 21 days is not appropriate.** Residents require more time to respond to a consultation not less, given the complexities involved.

Thank you for your response.