

**Schedule of omission sites submitted in response to the Local Plan Submission Version**

**Biddulph**

<b>Ref Info/Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>Comments</b>
LPS44/LPS45 K Ross B Ross	ADD04	<p>Land at Conway House is not within the respondent's ownership and the landowner has not made representations supporting the inclusion of his land in the plan at this stage.</p> <p>ADD04 was included in the Preferred Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet, published in 2016. It was suggested for inclusion in the consultation responses to the previous consultation in 2015.</p> <p>The two main reasons why it was not included in the Preferred Options Local Plan (2017) are that the site adjacent to Wharf Road (BDNEW) is considered to be preferable due to its more central location and to help bring forward the rest of the Wharf Road site for redevelopment. Also, the potential harm to Knypersley Hall identified in the Council's Historic Impact Assessment. Additionally, the site is of high landscape sensitivity.</p> <p>Knypersley Hall is a Grade II* Listed Building. Recent conversions on the site have made no difference to this status. National planning policy contains strict guidelines requiring the Council to avoid harm to heritage assets unless there are exceptional circumstances. The Council's Heritage Impact Assessment concludes that the whole of ADD04 "could not be developed without substantial heritage impacts."</p> <p>The Council's Green Belt Review assesses the land as part of a wider parcel consisting of the whole area north of Mill Hayes Road. The study considers that the land cannot be readily sub-divided because of an absence of clear internal boundaries. Whilst it recommends that the whole area is considered for release from the Green Belt, exceptional circumstances would still need to be demonstrated.</p> <p>Objections from earlier stages covered a whole range of issues – not just a possible new first school.</p>
LPS183	BD069	This site was included as an option in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation and in the

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
(Weaver / Eastwood – Walsingham Planning)	Knypersley Garden Centre	<p>2016 ‘Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries’ consultation. However, following the results of heritage impact evidence and the emergence of an alternative more preferable site, this site was removed from the plan in 2017.</p> <p>The Council’s Heritage Impact Assessment raises concerns about the impact of new development on this site on neighbouring Knypersley Hall, a Grade II* Listed Building. This is a significant constraint. In relation to the objector’s Heritage Impact Assessment by Richard K Morris and Associates, it is considered that this assessment understates the significance of historic features in the site, which comprise the walled garden and rock feature including the grotto, and their contribution to the setting and significance of Knypersley Hall. The original conclusions presented in the 2016 Study that development on the site would highly likely cause substantial adverse effects to the setting remains valid. The intensive redevelopment of the site to accommodate 30 dwellings would significantly weaken the ability to understand the site as a walled garden that was intrinsic to the development of works and ideas by Bateman. However, on the results of a detailed site visit and on consideration of the enhanced mitigation measures put forward by Richard K Morris and Associates, conclusions could be drawn that this harm could be reduced to a lower degree in the range of less than substantial harm, if the number of dwellings was significantly reduced. Notwithstanding this, the finding of less than substantial harm does not equate to a less than substantial planning consideration. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act (1990) requires the decision maker, when considering applications which affect the significance of a Listed Building, to have “special regard” for the preservation of that listed building or its setting. This is amplified in the NPPF, where “great weight” is required. Following the recent High Court decisions (Barnwell, Forge Field and Mordue), there is a strong presumption against planning permission being granted where harm to a listed building through impacts to its setting is found. It remains that other sites highlighted for allocation within Biddulph were assessed as suitable for development in heritage terms. When compared to this site in heritage terms, they would be less constrained, and have a greater ability to meet housing figures. (Full analysis of the Richard K Morris &amp; Associates report can be found in the evidence document entitled: Landscape, Local Green Space &amp; Heritage Impact Study: Review of Representations May 2018).</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>The Submission Version Local Plan seeks to deliver Biddulph's housing requirement whilst ensuring that Green Belt release is kept to a minimum. Approximately, 255 homes are now planned in land currently designated as Green Belt in Biddulph (part of Wharf Road and Tunstall Road sites) compared to 480 in the 2016 consultation. This has been achieved by amendments to the proposed allocations with consideration given to their respective planning merits. Considering these factors collectively, it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances to release these sites from the Green Belt.</p> <p>An alternative approach of allocating a series of smaller sites around Biddulph for Green Belt release was considered but the Council felt that focussing development in two strategic areas had locational advantages – close to the town centre and Victoria Business Park and would form part of a wider regeneration opportunity to bring forward sustainable mixed use sites to benefit the town.</p> <p>All the sites included in previous consultations have been assessed against Government policy and the evidence base, undergone consultation and sustainability appraisal. On planning balance the Council has concluded that the selected sites are the most appropriate solution for Biddulph.</p>
LPS310 (Gez Willard for client)	BD138a/BD138b	<p>BDNEW was assessed in the Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisals published in April 2017 and was considered suitable for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>BD138a and BD138b were included in the Site Options Consultation Booklet published in July 2015. The wording in the booklet makes it clear that this list of sites potentially suitable for development formed the basis of public consultation and the inclusion of a site on the list at that stage did not imply the Council's support for that site as an allocation. It also stated that not all of the sites included would be needed and the list would be refined into preferred options following feedback from consultation.</p> <p>These sites were not included at the next stage, ('Preferred Sites and Boundaries' published in 2016) because the Council's Green Belt Review (published in November</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		2015) did not recommend the sites for release from the Green Belt due to visual intrusion and the openness of the Green Belt being compromised.
LPS372 – 378 (Howle - Knights)	Land at Brook St Works	<p>BD118, BD109 and BD144 were included in the Site Options Consultation Booklet published in July 2015. The wording in the booklet makes it clear that this list of sites potentially suitable for development formed the basis of public consultation and the inclusion of a site on the list at that stage did not imply the Council's support for that site as an allocation. It also stated that not all of the sites included would be needed and the list would be refined into preferred options following feedback from consultation.</p> <p>None of these sites were included at the next stage (Preferred Sites and boundaries published in 2016) because the Council's Green Belt Review (published in November 2015) did not recommend them for release from the Green Belt due to them being poorly contained physically and visually and making a significant contribution to the Green Belt purpose of preventing encroachment.</p>
LPS391 (Seabridge Developments – Advance Land Planning)	BD062	<p>There are still opportunities for small and medium sized builders to develop in Biddulph through windfall sites which are positively promoted in the plan (refer to Policy H1). A windfall allowance has been incorporated into the housing land supply tables in Policy SS4.</p> <p>Site BD062 was included as an option in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation and in the 2016 'Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries' consultation. However, following the emergence of an alternative more preferable site, this site was removed from the plan in 2017. Also, in their response to the Submission Version Local Plan, United Utilities (whose water treatment works is immediately adjacent to the site) states that "United Utilities wishes to reiterate its preference for sensitive uses such as residential to be located away from our existing operational infrastructure. This is particularly relevant to our wastewater treatment works which are key operational infrastructure." (LPS391)</p> <p>The Submission Version Local Plan seeks to deliver Biddulph's housing requirement whilst ensuring that Green Belt release is kept to a minimum. Approximately, 255 homes are now planned in land currently designated as Green Belt in Biddulph (part of Wharf Road and Tunstall Road sites) compared to 480 in the 2016 consultation. This has been</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>achieved by amendments to the proposed allocations with consideration given to their respective planning merits. Considering these factors collectively, it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances to release these sites from the Green Belt.</p> <p>An alternative approach of allocating a series of smaller sites around Biddulph for Green Belt release was considered but the Council felt that focussing development in two strategic areas had locational advantages – close to the town centre and Victoria Business Park and would form part of a wider regeneration opportunity to bring forward sustainable mixed use sites to benefit the town.</p> <p>All the sites included in previous consultations have been assessed against Government policy and the evidence base, undergone consultation and sustainability appraisal. On planning balance the Council has concluded that the selected sites are the most appropriate solution for Biddulph.</p>
LPS521 (No 5 Chambers - Mr Simcock)	BD068 / BD087	<p>Sites BD068 and BD087 were included as an option in the 2015 ‘Site Options’ consultation and in the 2016 ‘Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries’ consultation. However, following the emergence of an alternative more preferable site, these sites were removed from the plan in 2017. Also, in their response to the Submission Version Local Plan, United Utilities (whose water treatment works is immediately adjacent to BD068) states that “United Utilities wishes to reiterate its preference for sensitive uses such as residential to be located away from our existing operational infrastructure. This is particularly relevant to our wastewater treatment works which are key operational infrastructure.” (LPS391)</p> <p>The Core Strategy Inspector states that sites in the Green Belt at Gillow Heath ‘could’ form the basis for small urban extensions. He also states that “it would clearly be premature and therefore inappropriate to give detailed consideration to those sites at this stage”.</p> <p>The Council’s Core Strategy acknowledges that some Green Belt release is necessary to enable sufficient housing growth in Biddulph. This document already allocates the part of</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>the site not within the Green Belt as a broad location for housing. BDNEW is an expansion of this existing allocation. The Submission Version Local Plan seeks to deliver Biddulph's housing requirement whilst ensuring that Green Belt release is kept to a minimum. Approximately, 255 homes are now planned in land currently designated as Green Belt in Biddulph (part of Wharf Road and Tunstall Road sites) compared to 480 in the 2016 consultation. This has been achieved by amendments to the proposed allocations with consideration given to their respective planning merits. Considering these factors collectively, it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances to release these sites from the Green Belt.</p> <p>BD068, BD087 and BDNEW have all been assessed as being suitable for release from the Green Belt subject to demonstration of exceptional circumstances in the Council's Green Belt Review. In determining which sites should be included in the Local Plan, the Council must balance relevant evidence, Government planning policy and public opinion.</p>
LPS474 (Renew Land Developments – Ben Wetherley Knights)	Newpool Farm	<p>This large area of land has 3 separate SHLAA records because only a small part of it – BD063a – is categorised as being potentially suitable for development in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The rest is C class (i.e. undeliverable) due to its scale as well as having no clear external boundaries to prevent unchecked incursion into the Green Belt.</p> <p>Green Belt release around Biddulph has been minimised in the Local Plan and the capacity of this whole area would far exceed the level needed to meet Biddulph's housing needs to 2031.</p> <p>BD063a has been included in previous consultations – Site Options and Preferred Sites and Boundaries (as a smaller variant in line with the recommendation in the Council's Green Belt Review). However, its inclusion is not clear cut as the Green Belt Review states that “a smaller variant of this site (BD063a), bounded by an unmade road to the west (off Newpool Road) might be acceptable, but there are better options to the west of Biddulph.”</p> <p>BDNEW is an expansion of an existing allocation. The Submission Version Local Plan</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>seeks to deliver Biddulph's housing requirement whilst ensuring that Green Belt release is kept to a minimum. Approximately, 255 homes are now planned in land currently designated as Green Belt in Biddulph (part of Wharf Road and Tunstall Road sites) compared to 480 in the 2016 consultation. This has been achieved by amendments to the proposed allocations with consideration given to their respective planning merits. Considering these factors collectively, it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances to release these sites from the Green Belt.</p> <p>An alternative approach of allocating a series of smaller sites around Biddulph for Green Belt release was considered but the Council felt that focussing development in two strategic areas had locational advantages – close to the town centre and Victoria Business Park and would form part of a wider regeneration opportunity to bring forward sustainable mixed use sites to benefit the town.</p> <p>All the sites included in previous consultations have been assessed against Government policy and the evidence base, undergone consultation and sustainability appraisal. On planning balance the Council has concluded that the selected sites are the most appropriate solution for Biddulph.</p>
LPS474 (Renew Land Developments – Ben Wetherley Knights)	Hurst's Quarry	<p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in the policy. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		sites for residential development in the Rural Areas. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.

### Cheadle

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
LPS59 Providence Land	Rest of Thorley Drive	<p>This area was considered at the earlier site options stage and is of high landscape sensitivity (Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment) and (Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study). It was not taken forward to the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries stage.</p> <p>The Council considers that the plan includes sufficient sustainable and deliverable sites to meet the housing needs for Cheadle. No amendments to the town boundary to accommodate additional allocated sites are required.</p>
LPS67 Mr Robert James Piers-leake	Abbot's Haye Cherry Lane CH083	<p>Abbot's Haye is outside the settlement boundary and remote from main urban area. It is identified in the Landscape &amp; Settlement Character Assessment as forming part of remnant historic landscape and there is a potential impact on setting of adjacent Hales Hall listed building.</p> <p>The site is not considered suitable as a housing allocation in the Local Plan.</p>
LPS79 (& others) Mr Campbell JMW Planning John Wren	CH093	<p>CH093 was considered as part of the Green Belt Review Study and the overall impact of development on the purposes of the Green Belt was considered to be moderate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Check unrestricted sprawl – contribution</li> <li>○ Prevent towns merging – limited contribution</li> <li>○ Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Setting of towns – contribution</li> </ul> <p>The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and although concludes that it could be considered for release, exceptional circumstances would need to be justified.</p> <p>The Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study considers the site to be of high landscape sensitivity. Some screening is provided by woodland to the south, particularly when viewed from the A522, however the land rises up from the woodland and visual prominence increases. The site does not fit well within existing settlement pattern and development of the site would adversely affect the existing settlement pattern and edge, and encroach on countryside.</p> <p>It is considered that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify amendment of the Green Belt boundary in this location. There are other housing sites available in Cheadle not located in the Green Belt.</p>
LPS124 Mrs Moreton (Resident)	(Leek Road near JCB)	Land to the north of Cheadle near JCB is located in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment.
LPS329 Gez Willard	Park Lane, Cheadle	<p>Although the site is in a sustainable location close to the town centre the site lies within the Green Belt. Forming part of Parcel S13 (Green Belt Study) it is considered that it makes a contribution to the Green Belt as the area is vulnerable to urbanisation, given its proximity to Cheadle and also the setting and special character of the town. The land is also identified as important landscape setting to Cheadle in the LCA.</p> <p>The plan can support development requirements for Cheadle without further Green Belt release.</p>
LPS468 Mr Bullock (Ben Wetherley Knights)	Park Lane, Cheadle CH165	<p>CH165 was considered as part of the Green Belt Review Study and the overall impact of development on the purposes of the Green Belt is considered to be significant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Check unrestricted sprawl – contribution</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Prevent towns merging – limited contribution</li> <li>○ Safeguarding from encroachment – significant contribution</li> <li>○ Setting of towns – significant contribution</li> </ul> <p>The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment.</p> <p>Although the site is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and development would be of a much more limited scale (5 dwellings compared to an indicative 26 dwellings) the Green Belt review considers that development in this location would create an unacceptable intrusion into open countryside on rising land. It is considered that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify amendment of the Green Belt boundary in this location. There are other housing sites available in Cheadle not located in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Land is identified as important landscape setting to Cheadle in the LCA.</p>
--	--	---

**Leek**

<b>Ref Info/Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>Comments</b>
LPS93-98 Emery (Mr Thorneycroft)	Eaton House Buxton Road Leek and adjacent 'Roche Villa' children's day nursery	<p>The submission version Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for the District as a whole will be achieved by a combination of allocations within and around the towns; and within/around rural villages (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites are therefore not required.</p> <p>Subsequent schemes upon this site for the uses suggested (housing /officing /retail) would be assessed on their merits and applying all other relevant Local Plan Policies (including Pol E3) and NPPF</p>

		<p>Policy.</p> <p>Policies in the plan should be read in conjunction with each other. Not all sites will be suitable as housing windfall as Policy E3 safeguards suitable employment sites.</p> <p>Note that some of the uses referred to in the representation (eg retail, leisure) are additionally affected by town centre protection policies, and may therefore require a sequential demonstration for their creation when not located in a town centre. Note that the site falls <i>outside</i> of the Leek town centre boundary as defined in map A1.3 of the submission version Local Plan.</p> <p>Proposals to develop the children's day nursery would need to be justified against all applicable Local Plan policies including C1 (loss of community facilities).</p>
LPS278 (Dean Lewis)	Buxton Road, Leek	<p>The Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for the District as a whole will be achieved by a combination of allocations within and around the towns; and within/around rural villages (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites are therefore not required.</p> <p>The site is too separated from existing town boundary; large area likely to have landscape impact (including Peak Park). May also be heritage impacts. HRA states proximity to European sites would need to be considered. SA refers to negative heritage effects and site inaccessibility to services/ facilities/ employment.</p>
LPS100 John Pigott (Resident)	Fowlchurch Landfill Site	<p>The entire Fowlchurch site is a 'Site of Biological Importance', a County-level nature conservation designation. Refer to Policy NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources.</p> <p>The Council consults with the Environment Agency during local Plan preparation. The EA raise concerns regarding the potential</p>

		contamination of the site and advise that in extreme circumstances site may not be developable. County Highways also raise concerns about how this land could be satisfactorily accessed.
--	--	---

**Rural Areas**

<b>Ref Info/Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Larger Villages</b>		
<b>Alton</b>		
LPS13 Bain	Land between Town Head and Back Lane, Alton (Low cost housing)	The site suggested is adjacent to the settlement boundary and in the Conservation Area, there are potential heritage constraints. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages.
<b>Biddulph Moor</b>		
LPS289 LPS368 LPS345 Emery for Martin Webb	Land between Rudyard Road & Hot Lane Biddulph Moor BM013	<p>Most of the site is included in SHLAA site BM013, which is classed as a B site. It was included in the Site Options consultation 2015; a reduced area was included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation 2016. It was not carried forward to the Preferred Options consultation 2017.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p>
<b>Blythe Bridge</b>		
LPS174 David Nixon C Nixon & Partners	BB42 BB43	<p>Both BB042 and BB043 are in the green belt and were classed as C sites in the SHLAA.</p> <p>They were not considered suitable for development. They were identified in the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008) as important to the landscape setting of Blythe Bridge. The Green Belt Study assessed the parcel of land to the north of Forsbrook (parcel S10) and found it made a contribution to the following green belt purposes: checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and to assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict/urban land.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicabl174e in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas, including the Blythe Vale site in Blythe Bridge. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p>
LPS2 Charles Okell	Land adjacent to Uttoxeter Road Blythe Bridge	The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas, including the Blythe Vale site in Blythe Bridge. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p>
LPS49/LPS68 W H Stanley	BB045 & BB064 and adjoining fields	<p>The omission site includes two SHLAA sites and a number of adjoining fields. All the land is within the green belt.</p> <p>The SHLAA sites are BB045 a small area to the north of New Close Avenue and BB064 to the north of this.</p> <p>BB064 was classed as a C site in the SHLAA. It was considered unsuitable for development as it would significantly extend Blythe Bridge into open countryside and is not well related to the existing settlement form. It was also considered to have an impact on the landscape setting of the area.</p> <p>BB045 was included in the Site Options consultation 2015 as a potential housing option site. It was not carried forward. The Green Belt review recommended the site was not suitable for release from</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>the Green Belt. The Landscape &amp; Settlement Character Assessment 2008 identified the site as being important to the setting of Blythe Bridge.</p> <p>This omission site is a large site located to the north east of Blythe Bridge all of which is in the green belt. The Landscape &amp; Settlement Character Assessment 2008 identified the site as being important to the setting of Blyth Bridge.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas, including the Blythe Vale site in Blythe Bridge. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances</p>



Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p>
<p>LPS222/LPS534/LPS535/ LPS533 Goodall D Brough. Belcher &amp; Malpass</p>	<p>North of Blythe Bridge BB027 BB28</p>	<p>Sites BB027 and BB028 were previously included the Site Option consultation 2015 but were not taken forward. The sites are within the green belt. The Green Belt Study Review provides a detailed site based assessment of land which could be considered for review and concluded that these sites were not suitable for release from the green belt.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas, including the Blythe Vale site in Blythe Bridge. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p> <p>The Highway Authority advised that the access road to the site was unadopted and would need to be improved. The Phase 1 Ecological Study highlighted there was a Biodiversity Alert Site (BAS) immediately to the south of the site and recommended the creation of a landscaped buffer between the site and BAS.</p> <p>The Blythe Vale site is not in the green belt and its allocation contributes towards the Local Plan meeting the housing requirement in line with the principles of the Spatial Strategy without removing a significant number of sites from the green belt.</p>
<b>Brown Edge</b>		
LPS25 Debbie Evans	Brown Edge BE032	<p>The site suggested is within the green belt. It was in the Site Options consultation 2015 consultation but was not taken forward.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p> <p>It is noted that the respondent has offered an additional area of land to the Council for community recreational use. It is not considered this constitutes exceptional circumstances to justify the release of BE32 from the green belt. This land is also within the green belt.</p>
LPS528 Harlequin Development Strategies (Knights)	BE041 Brown Edge	<p>The omission site is within the green belt. It was in the Site Options consultation 2015 and the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation 2016 but was not taken forward.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p> <p>The Brown Edge Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) was to advise Brown Edge Parish Council (BEPC) on housing need at a local level in order to inform the Neighbourhood Plan policies. The HNA was carried out in line with PPG guidance and is an assessment of need based on facts and unbiased evidence but it does not apply constraints to the assessment of need. The report recognises that there are numerous supply side constraints.</p> <p>Green Belt is a significant constraint in Brown Edge. It is considered that sufficient provision can be made elsewhere in the District to support development requirements. It is understood that the neighbourhood planning group is looking to assess housing needs in the Parish in more detail to inform the neighbourhood plan.</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
LPS323/LPS331/LPS332 Gez Willard	BE037 Site off Sytch Road Brown Edge	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The site in Brown Edge is part of a larger area of land which was designated as Visual Open Space (VOS) in the Local Plan 1998 (this designation remained in force in the Core Strategy) and is SHLAA site BE037. This was assessed as a C site. It was not considered to be suitable for residential development due to amenity value of land as visual open space and 'natural and semi natural open space'.</p> <p>It was included in the Site Options consultation 2015 as a potential open space site and in the Preferred Options Sites &amp; Boundaries consultation 2016 as a Public Open Space and Visual Open Space site.</p> <p>The Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 reassessed the VOS designations to identify which sites were suitable for LGS designation; green infrastructure based designation or were unsuitable for designation as open space. The Study concluded that the part of the VOS site that comprises this omission site was unsuitable for a designation.</p> <p>The Preferred Options consultation 2017 did not take forward the VOS designations instead had a combination of Open Space and LGS designations. In line with the findings of the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 the omission site did not have any designation.</p> <p>In the Local Plan the site is unallocated land within the development boundary. Policy H1 supports housing development on sites within the development boundaries. Policies SS8 and H1 allow for residential development through windfalls within the development</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		boundaries of larger villages. Any development would need to be in accord with the Spatial Strategy and other Local Plan policies.
<b>Cheddleton</b>		
LPS42 T Bode	CD017 Cheddleton	<p>The housing requirement of 320 dwellings per annum is close to the top end of the range of the objectively assessed need for housing (235-330 dpa). The requirement is considered to be positively prepared on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It fully meets demographic housing needs and helps to address the affordable housing need. It also increases the scope to provide specialist housing such as Self-Build and Custom Build</li> <li>• It supports the provision of approximately 870 additional jobs up to the year 2031. This will help to set a positive economic strategy for the District in line with to Paragraph 21 of the NPPF.</li> <li>• The Council has considered the scope to accommodate unmet housing needs in relevant neighbouring authorities but is unable to do so due to a constrained land supply. This is set out in the Duty to Co-operate Statement.</li> </ul> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal provides a detailed assessment of alternative possible options including the spatial distribution of development.</p> <p>The Local Plan does not specify housing targets for individual larger villages. The indicative housing requirement for settlements in the Site Options Consultation 2015 was included as a guide based on the information at the time. It was estimated using the following data;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Strategy policy SS3 relating to the spatial distribution of development between the towns and rural areas.</li> </ul>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population/facilities of settlements</li> <li>• Sites identified in the SHLAA</li> </ul> <p>The Local Plan policies and site allocations were refined during the plan making period as more information became available. The Local Plan does not specify housing targets for individual larger villages.</p> <p>The site was in the Site Options consultation 2015 and the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation 2016 but was not taken forward.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site suggested from the green belt.</p>
<p>LPS323 LPS332 Gez Willard</p>	<p>CD002/CD003 Cheddleton</p>	<p>CD002 and CD003 are within the green belt. They were in the Site Options consultation 2015 and the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation 2016 but were not taken forward.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in</p>



Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p> <p>An outline planning application has been submitted on 15/1/2018 for residential development on this site comprising 65 dwellings. The decision is pending. Application number SMDC/2018/0004.</p>
<b>Endon</b>		
<p>LPS101 Ken Wainman for Mrs Gibbins &amp; S Gibbins</p>	<p>Endon EN030</p>	<p>The Local Plan does not specify housing targets for individual larger villages.</p> <p>The indicative housing requirement for settlements in the Site Options Consultation 2015 was included as a guide based on the information at the time. It was estimated using the following data;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Strategy policy SS3 relating to the spatial distribution of development between the towns and rural areas.</li> <li>• Population/facilities of settlements</li> <li>• Sites identified in the SHLAA</li> </ul> <p>The Local Plan policies and site allocations were refined during the plan making period as more information became available.</p> <p>The omission site is within the green belt. It was in the Site Options consultation 2015 but was not taken forward. The Green Belt Study assessed this site and the adjacent one EN125 together it recommended they were not suitable for release from the green belt. It concluded that “ these sites play a significant role in maintaining the open character of the village along its northerly aspect”</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt. The Green Belt Study recommended that the site was not suitable for release from the green belt.</p> <p>Policy H3 sets out how affordable housing will be delivered. In the villages a target of 33% affordable housing should be provided on sites that could accommodate 5 dwellings (0.16 hectares) or more. Rural exception sites for small schemes of 100% affordable housing</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		will be permitted on suitable sites in or on the edge of villages where a need exists in the local area which cannot otherwise be met.
<b>Upper Tean</b>		
LPS447 Richard House Gladman 150 dwellings	Wallfield Close, Upper Tean	<p>The omission site is a large site to the south of Upper Tean. A small part of the site was in the SHLAA, site UT024, which was assessed as a B site and was included in the Site Options consultation 2015. The site was identified in the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008) as important to the landscape setting of Upper Tean. It was not taken forward to the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation 2016.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Local Plan includes a residential allocation in Upper Tean and there have been resolutions to grant approval for two planning applications for residential development SMD/2016/0811 Land off Tenford Lane 49 dwellings (awaiting S106) and SMD/2015/0424 approval for up to 67 dwellings.</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		It is considered that the Local Plan allows for the sustainable growth of Upper Tean in line with the spatial strategy.
<b>Werrington</b>		
Grant Anderson for Fradley Estates LPS493	WE042 WE043 Site off Langton Court/Tregaron Court Werrington	<p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas including the land off Ash Bank Road in Werrington which is in the green belt. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances justify the release of the site off Langton Court/Tregaron Court from the green belt.</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>The Local Plan includes a residential allocation in Werrington in the green belt. It is considered there are exceptional circumstances regarding this site which justify its release from the green belt to contribute to meeting the District's housing requirement.</p> <p>Werrington is defined as a larger village in the policy SS2 Settlement Hierarchy. The Green Belt Study considered the residential allocation in Werrington is suitable for release from the green belt if there are exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The Green Belt is tightly drawn around Werrington and there is limited capacity in the settlement for further growth. The settlement has a number of facilities and services and is considered to be a sustainable location to support some growth. The allocated site in Werrington is owned by the Ministry of Justice and is due to be transferred to Homes England via an approved land transfer programme. Homes England are proposing to carry out work to ensure the delivery of the housing through an appropriate developer. (See LPS337).</p>
LPS115 Manjit Singh	Werrington Big Ash Farm WE027	<p>The omission site WE027 is in the green belt, the Local Plan proposes no changes to this designation. It was assessed as a B site in the SHLAA. It was included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation 2016. The site contains some existing development. The NPPF allows for the development of brownfield sites in defined circumstances.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p> <p>The Environment Agency identified potential flooding issues for this and the adjoining site WE013 in their comments to the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation 2016 and that the flood risk to the site should be quantified as it may affect the deliverability of the site. Staffordshire Lead Local Flood Authority have it on their records as a 'Flooding Hotspot'</p>
LPS63 K Wainman (Mr Friesner)	WE013 Little Ash Farm Werrington	The omission site WE013 is in the green belt and was assessed as a B site in the SHLAA. It was included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>consultation 2016. The site contains some existing development. The NPPF allows for the development of brownfield sites in defined circumstances.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas including the land off Ash Bank Road in Werrington which is in the green belt. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>The Council acknowledges the significant need for affordable housing in the Staffordshire Moorlands identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Policy H3 seeks to support the provision of affordable housing across the District through a range of measures which includes a range of measures which includes a proportion of affordable housing on appropriate residential sites.</p> <p>The Environment Agency identified potential flooding issues for this and the adjoining site WE027 in their comments to the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation 2016 and that the flood risk to the site should be quantified as it may affect the deliverability of the site. Staffordshire Lead Local Flood Authority have it on their records as a 'Flooding Hotspot'</p> <p>The Local Plan includes a residential allocation in Werrington in the green belt. It is considered there are exceptional circumstances regarding this site which justify its release from the green belt to contribute to meeting the District's housing requirement.</p> <p>Werrington is a defined as a larger village in the policy SS2 Settlement Hierarchy. The Green Belt Study considered the residential allocation in Werrington is suitable for release from the green belt if there are exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The Green Belt is tightly drawn around Werrington and there is limited capacity in the settlement for further growth. The settlement has a number of facilities and services and is considered to be a sustainable location to support some growth. The allocated site in Werrington is owned by the Ministry of Justice and is due to be transferred to Homes England via an approved land transfer programme. Homes England are proposing to carry out work to</p>



Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		ensure the delivery of the housing through an appropriate developer. (See LPS337).
<b>Smaller Villages</b>		
<b>Blackshaw Moor</b>		
SA35 Mr Paul Holdcroft	OC050 Former Anzio Camp	Policy SS10 allows for the regeneration of unused major developed sites in the countryside. For the Anzio Camp at Blackshaw Moor suitable uses are considered to be employment, extra care housing and tourist accommodation.
<b>Dilhorne</b>		
LPS66 K Wainman (Mr Wheat)	South of Ash Cottage Dilhorne	<p>The site is in the green belt in a Smaller Village.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p> <p>Of the 29 Smaller Villages identified in Policy SS9, 18 do not have a boundary identified on the 1998 Local Plan Proposals Map. Accordingly, 11 village boundaries are proposed to be removed. The new Local Plan seeks to ensure that all Smaller Villages are managed in the same way, subject to differences where green belt is applicable.</p> <p>However, of the 11 village boundaries to be removed, 4 villages are inset within the green belt (not "washed over"). The green belt boundary is not proposed to be amended in these villages and so the green belt boundary will remain as identified in the 1998 and Submission Version Policies Maps. Dilhorne is washed over by the Green Belt.</p> <p>A criteria based policy approach is proposed for the Smaller Villages rather than infill boundaries as previously suggested or site allocations. This principle is set out in Policy SS9 (Smaller Villages) with the detail provided in Policy H1 (New Housing Development). H1 supports limited infill development of an appropriate scale and character for the Spatial Strategy. It also requires that development is well related to the existing pattern of development, will not create or add to ribbon development or lead to a sporadic pattern of development. In the green belt, NPPF policy in respect of Green Belt will also apply.</p> <p>Whilst the 2015 Site Options Consultation and 2016 Preferred</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation document did identify draft infill boundaries for the Smaller Villages, this approach was replaced by the criteria based policy approach in the 2017 Preferred Options Local Plan and subsequently the 2018 Submission Version. Consultation feedback on the appropriateness of the draft infill boundaries was inconclusive. However, feedback did indicate that a flexible infill approach to development in the Smaller Villages was suitable. This approach allows the Council to carefully consider the impact of infill proposals at the application stage when more details are available regarding the scale and visual impact of development are known. This will enable the sustainable organic growth of the Smaller Villages and provide a clear policy to manage such development.</p> <p>Policy H3 sets out how affordable housing will be delivered. In the villages a target of 33% affordable housing should be provided on sites that could accommodate 5 dwellings (0.16 hectares) or more. Rural exception sites for small schemes of 100% affordable housing will be permitted on suitable sites in or on the edge of villages where a need exists in the local area which cannot otherwise be met. Policy H1 allows for dwellings that meet an essential need including agricultural workers dwellings.</p>
<b>Leekbrook</b>		
LPS553 Wain Homes (Emery)	Wardle Gardens, Leekbrook	The northern employment element of the 2003 mixed use approval may have expired without submission of reserved matters. However, the site is still considered an employment site by virtue of E3 of the Local Plan. The grounds for refusal for recent housing application SMD/2017/0387 included that the applicant had not produced robust evidence to demonstrate that the site would not be viable or suitable for continued employment use, as required by the Council's employment land retention policy.

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>Most of the site is covered by Flood Zone 3. The Council would apply its Flood Risk policy SD5 and applicable NPPF policies in determination of proposals. The Council's natural environment policies are set out in Pols NE1 and NE2.</p>
<b>Longsdon</b>		
<p>SA35 Mr Paul Holdcroft</p>	<p>TR024: New Inn, Longsdon</p>	<p>Of the 29 Smaller Villages identified in Policy SS9, 18 do not have a boundary identified on the 1998 Local Plan Proposals Map. Accordingly, 11 village boundaries are proposed to be removed. The new Local Plan seeks to ensure that all Smaller Villages are managed in the same way, subject to differences where green belt is applicable.</p> <p>However, of the 11 village boundaries to be removed, 4 villages are inset within the green belt (not "washed over"). The green belt boundary is not proposed to be amended in these villages and so the green belt boundary will remain as identified in the 1998 and Submission Version Policies Maps.</p> <p>A criteria based policy approach is proposed for the Smaller Villages rather than infill boundaries as previously suggested or site allocations. This principle is set out in Policy SS9 (Smaller Villages) with the detail provided in Policy H1 (New Housing Development). H1 supports limited infill development of an appropriate scale and character for the Spatial Strategy. It also requires that development is well related to the existing pattern of development, will not create or add to ribbon development or lead to a sporadic pattern of development. In the green belt, NPPF policy in respect of Green Belt will also apply.</p> <p>Whilst the 2015 Site Options Consultation and 2016 Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation document did identify draft infill boundaries for the Smaller Villages, this approach was</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>replaced by the criteria based policy approach in the 2017 Preferred Options Local Plan and subsequently the 2018 Submission Version. Consultation feedback on the appropriateness of the draft infill boundaries was inconclusive. However, feedback did indicate that a flexible infill approach to development in the Smaller Villages was suitable. This approach allows the Council to carefully consider the impact of infill proposals at the application stage when more details are available regarding the scale and visual impact of development are known. This will enable the sustainable organic growth of the Smaller Villages and provide a clear policy to manage such development.</p> <p>Site granted approval for residential development SMD/2012/0669.</p>
<b>Rudyard</b>		
<p><b>LPS519</b> Harvest Properties (Rob Duncan)</p>	<p>Land east of the New Galleon (former public house) Rudyard Road. RU20</p>	<p>The omission site is in the green belt in a Smaller Village.</p> <p>The site was in the Site Options consultation 2015. The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p> <p>Of the 29 Smaller Villages identified in Policy SS9, 18 do not have a boundary identified on the 1998 Local Plan Proposals Map. Accordingly, 11 village boundaries are proposed to be removed. The new Local Plan seeks to ensure that all Smaller Villages are managed in the same way, subject to differences where green belt is applicable.</p> <p>However, of the 11 village boundaries to be removed, 4 villages are inset within the green belt (not "washed over"). The green belt boundary is not proposed to be amended in these villages and so the green belt boundary will remain as identified in the 1998 and Submission Version Policies Maps.</p> <p>A criteria based policy approach is proposed for the Smaller Villages rather than infill boundaries as previously suggested or site allocations. This principle is set out in Policy SS9 (Smaller Villages) with the detail provided in Policy H1 (New Housing Development). H1 supports limited infill development of an appropriate scale and character for the Spatial Strategy. It also requires that development is well related to the existing pattern of development, will not create</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>or add to ribbon development or lead to a sporadic pattern of development. In the green belt, NPPF policy in respect of Green Belt will also apply.</p> <p>Whilst the 2015 Site Options Consultation and 2016 Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation document did identify draft infill boundaries for the Smaller Villages, this approach was replaced by the criteria based policy approach in the 2017 Preferred Options Local Plan and subsequently the 2018 Submission Version. Consultation feedback on the appropriateness of the draft infill boundaries was inconclusive. However, feedback did indicate that a flexible infill approach to development in the Smaller Villages was suitable. This approach allows the Council to carefully consider the impact of infill proposals at the application stage when more details are available regarding the scale and visual impact of development are known. This will enable the sustainable organic growth of the Smaller Villages and provide a clear policy to manage such development.</p>
<b>Stockton Brook</b>		
LPS258 Dennis Weston	SB016 Land at Stanley Road, Stockton Brook	<p>Stockton Brook is defined as a Smaller Village in policy SS9. It is washed over by the green belt. SHLAA site SB016 was included in the Site Options consultation 2015 as a potential housing site but was not taken forward as a proposed housing allocation in the subsequent consultations.</p> <p>Policy SS2 defines the Settlement Hierarchy. The Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan is to focus development in the towns and larger villages and this is reflected in the proposed housing allocations. The Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. No green belt removal is proposed around Leek. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment.</p> <p>Of the 29 Smaller Villages identified in Policy SS9, 18 do not have a boundary identified on the 1998 Local Plan Proposals Map. Accordingly, 11 village boundaries are proposed to be removed. The new Local Plan seeks to ensure that all Smaller Villages are managed in the same way, subject to differences where green belt is applicable.</p> <p>However, of the 11 village boundaries to be removed, 4 villages are inset within the green belt (not "washed over"). The green belt boundary is not proposed to be amended in these villages and so the green belt boundary will remain as identified in the 1998 and Submission Version Policies Maps.</p> <p>Criteria based policy approach is proposed for the Smaller Villages rather than infill boundaries as previously suggested. This principle is set out in Policy SS9 (Smaller Villages) with the detail provided in Policy H1 (New Housing Development). H1 supports limited infill development of an appropriate scale and character for the Spatial Strategy. It also requires that development is well related to the existing pattern of development, will not create or add to ribbon development or lead to a sporadic pattern of development. In the green belt, NPPF policy in respect of Green Belt will also apply.</p> <p>Whilst the 2015 Site Options Consultation and 2016 Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation document did identify draft infill boundaries for the Smaller Villages, this approach was replaced by the criteria based policy approach in the 2017 Preferred Options Local Plan and subsequently the 2018 Submission Version.</p>



Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>Consultation feedback on the appropriateness of the draft infill boundaries was inconclusive. However, feedback did indicate that a flexible infill approach to development in the Smaller Villages was suitable. This approach allows the Council to carefully consider the impact of infill proposals at the application stage when more details are available regarding the scale and visual impact of development are known. This will enable the sustainable organic growth of the Smaller Villages and provide a clear policy to manage such development.</p>
<p>LPS51 K Wainman for Mr N Mountford</p>	<p>Stockton Brook AD08</p>	<p>The Local Plan does not specify housing targets for individual larger villages.</p> <p>The indicative housing requirement for settlements in the Site Options Consultation 2015 was included as a guide based on the information at the time. It was estimated using the following data;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Strategy policy SS3 relating to the spatial distribution of development between the towns and rural areas.</li> <li>• Population/facilities of settlements</li> <li>• Sites identified in the SHLAA</li> </ul> <p>The Local Plan policies and site allocations were refined during the plan making period as more information became available. The Local Plan does not specify housing targets for individual larger villages.</p> <p>Stockton Brook is defined as a Smaller Village in policy SS9. It is washed over by the green belt. The site was put forward as a site suggestion in the responses to the Site Options consultation 2015. It was not taken forward. The Green Belt study considered it was not suitable for release from the green belt.</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>The Local Plan allocates sites for residential development in order to meet the District's housing requirement. The distribution of development is detailed in policy SS3, development will be located in accordance with Spatial Strategy across the towns and Rural Areas. The distribution of development is broadly in line with the Core Strategy with minor adjustments to the Rural Areas and Cheadle, which reflects green belt constraints and the availability of suitable sites outside the green belt around Cheadle. The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4. Policies SS 8, SS 9 and H1 allow for residential development in defined circumstances in the larger villages and modest growth on the smaller villages. Development should be of an appropriate scale for the Spatial Strategy and where applicable in accord with national green belt policy.</p> <p>The Rural Areas is heavily constrained by the green belt. The Local Plan allocates six sites for residential development in the Rural Areas. In line with government policy the Local Plan only seeks to remove land from the green belt for residential development where exceptional circumstances exist. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Housing White Paper Fixing our Broken Housing Market (February 2017) reiterates this commitment. It is considered there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the green belt.</p> <p>Of the 29 Smaller Villages identified in Policy SS9, 18 do not have a boundary identified on the 1998 Local Plan Proposals Map. Accordingly, 11 village boundaries are proposed to be removed. The new Local Plan seeks to ensure that all Smaller Villages are managed in the same way, subject to differences where green belt is</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>applicable.</p> <p>However, of the 11 village boundaries to be removed, 4 villages are inset within the green belt (not "washed over"). The green belt boundary is not proposed to be amended in these villages and so the green belt boundary will remain as identified in the 1998 and Submission Version Policies Maps. Stockton Brook is washed over by the Green Belt.</p> <p>A criteria based policy approach is proposed for the Smaller Villages rather than infill boundaries as previously suggested or site allocations. This principle is set out in Policy SS9 (Smaller Villages) with the detail provided in Policy H1 (New Housing Development). H1 supports limited infill development of an appropriate scale and character for the Spatial Strategy. It also requires that development is well related to the existing pattern of development, will not create or add to ribbon development or lead to a sporadic pattern of development. In the green belt, NPPF policy in respect of Green Belt will also apply.</p> <p>Whilst the 2015 Site Options Consultation and 2016 Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation document did identify draft infill boundaries for the Smaller Villages, this approach was replaced by the criteria based policy approach in the 2017 Preferred Options Local Plan and subsequently the 2018 Submission Version. Consultation feedback on the appropriateness of the draft infill boundaries was inconclusive. However, feedback did indicate that a flexible infill approach to development in the Smaller Villages was suitable. This approach allows the Council to carefully consider the impact of infill proposals at the application stage when more details are available regarding the scale and visual impact of development are known. This will enable the sustainable organic growth of the</p>

Ref Info/Name	Site	Comments
		<p>Smaller Villages and provide a clear policy to manage such development.</p> <p>Policy H3 sets out how affordable housing will be delivered. In the villages a target of 33% affordable housing should be provided on sites that could accommodate 5 dwellings (0.16 hectares) or more. Rural exception sites for small schemes of 100% affordable housing will be permitted on suitable sites in or on the edge of villages where a need exists in the local area which cannot otherwise be met.</p>
<b>Countryside</b>		
<p>LPS76 The Winterton Lodge Partnership SJ Foster Planning (Ms Sarah Foster)</p>	<p>Cotton College site, Cotton</p>	<p>The Cotton College site is a brownfield site in the countryside located to the north of Oakamoor. Policy SS10 relates to development in the other Rural Areas which is countryside and green belt out the development boundaries and open countryside surrounding the Smaller Villages. It states these areas shall provide development which has an essential need to be located in the countryside and supports the rural areas. It facilitates the appropriate redevelopment of major developed areas where the proposed development brings positive benefits to the area. Policy H1 allows the conversion of buildings to residential use in defined circumstances.</p> <p>The net housing requirement will be met from site allocations set out in in policy H2 and windfall allowances for each area based on past trends set out in policy SS4.</p>