### Agenda Session 9 – 13.30 Tuesday 16 October 2018 Matter 8 – Allocations Biddulph

This matter considers the housing, employment and mixed use allocations in Biddulph (H2, E2, DSB1, DSB2 and DSB3).

The Council proposes modifications to the Strategic Development Site Policies to remove generic requirements which are covered by other policies of the LP but include bespoke requirements and to explain the exceptional circumstances justifying Green Belt release (MM36, MM43-MM46).

#### Issues

#### 1. Identification of Sites

1.1 Is the approach within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to assessing the suitability and screening of sites in Biddulph robust? The Council notes that the SHLAA assesses the availability, suitability and deliverability of potential housing sites and sets out a clear methodology.

1.2 Do the Green Belt assessments support the allocations in Biddulph? The Council refers to the Green Belt Review Study (SD22.4) and the additional site update (SD22.7) relating to land to the west of Biddulph Valley Way.

1.3 Does the LP provide for a range of sites of different sizes in Biddulph? The Council notes that the allocations provide for sites ranging from 57 to 588 dwellings and that there is also provision for windfalls.

1.4 What is the up to date position in relation to planning permissions affecting the proposed allocations? No applications/permissions affect the allocations.

#### 2. Wharf Road Strategic Development Area (SDA) (DSB1)

2.1 Have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt to the west of Biddulph Valley Way (BVW)?

2.2 If exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated have these been clearly articulated in the LP? The Council refers to MM42.

2.3 In what ways would the release of land to the west of BVW assist in bringing forward the Wharf Road SDA? The Council refers to the increase in critical mass achieved by the additional land

making the site more attractive to the development industry.

2.4 Is the Council satisfied that the landscape, heritage, mining legacy, biodiversity, access, transport and flood risk constraints are capable of being mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?

The Council refers to the various studies and consultations which have informed the allocation.

2.5 What are the implications of providing access across the BVW for its value as a sustainable transport route?

The Council points to the responses of Staffordshire CC and the fact that the BVW is already crossed elsewhere.

2.6 Are the density assumptions realistic taking into account market signals? The Council refers to the range of density assumptions across the site.

2.7 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker? The policy requirements have been modified by MM36 and MM43.

2.8 Is the site deliverable taking into account the multiple ownerships involved and constraints such as the mining legacy?

The Council refers to the viability study which concluded that the site would be viable. Reference is also made to its intentions to be proactive.

2.9 Are the assumptions about the rate of delivery of houses from the allocation realistic?

The housing trajectory illustrates the expected rate of delivery informed by the viability study and local knowledge.

#### 3. Biddulph Mills (DSB2)

*3.1 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?* The policy requirements have been modified by MM36 and MM44

3.2 Are the assumptions about the rate of delivery of houses from the allocation realistic?

The housing trajectory illustrates the expected rate of delivery informed by the viability study and local knowledge.

### 4. Tunstall Road SDA (DSB2)

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

4.2 If exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated have these been clearly

articulated in the LP?

The Council refers to MM45.

*4.3 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?* The policy requirements have been modified by MM36 and MM46.

4.4 Is the site deliverable taking into account the multiple ownerships involved? The Council refers to the viability study which concluded that the site would be viable. Reference is also made to its intentions to be proactive.

4.5 Should the extent of the allocation be amended as part of it is controlled by an unwilling landowner?

The Council indicates that it is willing to exclude parts of the site (MM18, MM46 & MM67).

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

The housing trajectory illustrates the expected rate of delivery informed by the viability study and local knowledge.

#### 5. Infrastructure

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

The Council refers to Policy SS12 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (SD8.2).

#### Main Evidence Base

SD8 – Infrastructure Delivery Plans
SD13.2 – Site Allocations Topic Paper Biddulph
SD17 – Employment Land Studies
SD21 – Infrastructure Studies
SD22.4, 22.6 and 22.7 – Green Belt Studies
SD26 – SHLAA
EL1.002b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions on allocations
Schedule of Modifications
Participants
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC)
Madelaine Lovatt LPS291
Advance Planning for Seabridge Development Ltd LPS384
Walsingham Planning for Mr Weaver LPS181
Nina Pindham for Robert Simcock LPS521
WW Planning LPS323

WW Planning LPS323

Emery Planning for Mr and Mrs Webb LPS354

Barbara Forster LPS516

Statements	
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC)	EL2.054
Advance Planning for Seabridge Development Ltd - LPS384	EL2.003
Walsingham Planning for Mr Weaver LPS181	
Nina Pindham for Robert Simcock LPS521	EL2.068
WW Planning LPS323	EL2.034
Barbara Forster LPS516	