Agenda Session 10 – 09.30 Wednesday 17 October 2018 Matter 8 – Allocations Cheadle

This matter considers the housing, employment and mixed use allocations in Cheadle (H2, E2, DSC1, DSC2, DSC3 and DSC4).

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, MM47-54).

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 Cheadle 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 Cheadle? The Council refers to the Green Belt Review Study (SD22.4).

1.3 Does the LP provide for a range of sites of different sizes in Cheadle? The Council notes that the allocations provide sites ranging from 32 to 430 dwellings together with a windfall allowance.

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

The Council refers to a hybrid application relating to Cheadle North SDA (not yet determined) and an outline application for Cecilly Brook SDA which is also awaiting a decision.

2. Cheadle North SDA (DSC1)

2.1 Is the development in a location that is or can be made sustainable? The Council points out that the site is intended to provide a new primary school which will reduce the need for trips across town.

2.2 Should the site allocation be adjusted to incorporate land to be used for open space/surface water mitigation and/or land covered by the planning application? M47 clarifies the position.

2.3 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker? The policy requirements have been modified by MM36 and MM48.2.4 Should the policy include a requirement for the phasing of the school site? See MM48.

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

The Council refers to progress since the CS including work with the County Council on the school and the submission of the planning application.

2.6 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. Cecilly Brook SDA (DSC2)

3.1 What is the justification for including the two separate sites within the same SDA other than their proximity to Cecilly Brook? The Council refer to the sharing of bespoke requirements (see MM36).

3.2 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker? The policy requirements have been modified by MM36 and MM50.

3.3 Should land beyond the site to be used for open space/surface water mitigation be included within the allocation? M49 clarifies the position.

3.4 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. Mobberley Farm (DSC3)

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? See MM51.

4.3 Is the Council satisfied that landscape, green infrastructure, biodiversity,

heritage, highway, transport and flood risk impacts can be mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?

The Council refers to the various reports and consultations carried out in relation to the impacts.

4.4 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker? The policy requirements have been modified by MM36 and MM53.

4.5 Should land beyond the site to be used for open space/surface water mitigation be included within the allocation? See MM52.

4.6 Should the disused railway line to the north of the allocation be included as GI? The Council suggests that the railway line could be added to the GI delivery plan.

4.7 Would delivery of sufficient housing numbers in Cheadle, the site and the link road be assisted by the inclusion of additional land within the allocation? The Council considers that additional land is not required.

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

The Council notes that there are 2 separate ownerships but cooperation is taking place. The Viability Study considers that the site is viable.

4.9 Are the density assumptions reasonable?

The Council indicates that densities reflect the need for a buffer strip, potential link road and other considerations.

4.10 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.

5. Land north of New Haden Road (DSC4)

5.1 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker? See MM54.

5.2 Can a safe and suitable access be achieved to the site? SCC has no objections subject to improvements.

6. Housing allocation at Stoddards Depot (CH015)

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

The viability study considers that the site is viable taking into account additional costs associated with the redevelopment.

7. Infrastructure

7.1 Will the infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed in Cheadle be provided in the right place and at the right time, including that related to transport, the highway network, health, education and open space? The Council refers to Policy SS12 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

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

The Council notes that Policy DSC3 does not require the construction of the link road but that the route is safeguarded, hence it is 'desirable'.

7.3 Will development lead to severe residual highway impacts in Cheadle taking into account improvements that can be undertaken to the transport network? SCC has not objected to the quantum of development in Cheadle. A package of mitigation measures are recommended in the Cheadle Town Centre Transport Study Phase 2 Assessment (SD31.7).

8. Green Infrastructure

8.1 Should Friars Court be safeguarded as GI?

9. Settlement Boundaries

9.1 Does Cheadle's Town Boundary reflect commitments?

Main Evidence Base

SD8 – Infrastructure Delivery Plans
SD13.3 – Site Allocations Topic Paper Cheadle
SD17 – Employment Land Studies
SD21 – Infrastructure Studies
SD26 – SHLAA
SD31.6 and 31.7 – Cheadle Transport Studies
EL1.002b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions on allocations
EL3.001a - Schedule of Modifications

Participants

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC) Cheadle Town Council Councillor Peter Wilkinson Cheadle Unite LPS429 JMW Planning for Mr T A J Campbell LPS86 Persimmon Homes LPS484 Harris Lamb for Muller Property Group LPS542 WW Planning LPS323 & LPS327 Mr J Steele LPS141 Richard Goodall LPS534 Cllr. Peter Wilkinson Emery Planning for Mr and Mrs Webb LPS354 Cllr. Richard Allcock Howard Sharp & Partners LLP

Statements

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC)	EL2.055
Cheadle Unite LPS429	EL2.030
JMW Planning for Mr T A J Campbell LPS86	EL2.020
WW Planning LPS323	EL2.035
WW Planning LPS327	EL2.022
Persimmon Homes LPS484	EL2.041a
Persimmon Homes LPS484	EL2.041b
Persimmon Homes LPS484	EL2.041c
Harris Lamb for Muller Property Group LPS542	EL2.069
Mr J Steele LPS141	EL2.074