

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO16	Mr Robert Moseley				Object	Building 420 per year within Staffordshire Moorlands and maintaining the green belt, and declaring yourself sustainable-is by definition is not sustainable and will lead to further Greenbelt erosion. 420 homes per year is growth. Alternatives; how many homes are empty? How many are rental and empty? How many homes do the people of Biddulph, not nationally to they need?
PO42	Mr P Rushton				Object	The housing requirement considered during the Whitehead examination in 2013 was, I believe, based on a 2011 census which has since been shown erroneous by a later prediction revealing a requirement of only 2500 homes. There is now no evidence to support the Government and SMDC determination to concrete over the green belt and to destroy the characters of Staffs Moorlands villages.
PO62	Ms Wendy Birks				General comment	Given the changing climate (increasingly intense precipitation) and , pressure to build on floodplains, slopes etc. I believe that all proposed developments, for both residential and employment, should be designed to reduce the rapid runoff off rainfall (in the current jargon "slow the flow") in order that existing properties and the new builds should be protected from the threat of flooding. For example sustainable urban drainage systems and green roofs. I would also like to see opportunities for wildlife to benefit from any developments, therefore stipulations to incude features such as cavities for birds, bats and bees incorporated into buildings and wildlife gardens surrounding them could be included in planning permissions. Likewise all opportunities to install renewable energy generating equipment such as solar panels, hydrothermal heating etc. should be specified by planners.
PO149	Miss Carly Chilton				Object	Having just spent a beautiful weekend in the Staffordshire Moorlands I am outraged at the development plan to urbanise this area of outstanding beauty. We regularly take a ramble through the land designated for development - BD063a we are outraged at this, this particular stretch of land is greenbelt area and as such should be fiercely guarded. We are strong conservationists and abjectly object to the development of greenbelt. The overall impact on wildlife and the landscape would be unforgiveable. Please do not build on one of our favourite country rambles.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO242	Mr Robert Stockley				Object	I believe that decisions are being made without adequate consultation with the population of Staffs Moorlands. The planners are identifying sites from maps, without even bothering to visit the locations for future development. The councillors had to try long and hard to even get the planners out of there offices in Leek, and when they did visit, they were not aware of the potential for the Victoria Colliery site. Newcastle BC have met with Biddulph Councillors, and have agreed that a joint site at the Victoria location in Brown Lees would be beneficial to both councils. Therefore, why haven't the planners included this site in the Local Plan?
PO282	Mrs Sandra Walley				Object	I object to the proposals of building new houses on Green Belt Land. Particularly when the Chancellor George Osborne MP stated in question time at the House of Commons 25th May 2016 "we will not be using Green Belt to build houses when other better options are available". There are several Brown Field sites within the Biddulph boundaries that have been highlighted to the planning committee, who have ignored the sites and are continuing with their Green Belt proposals. I find this totally unacceptable.
PO802	Mr Timothy Sproston					Whilst I am not convinced that the housing need is there, I appreciate that we have an ageing population and that that waiting lists for social housing are too long. I would see this proposal to build new houses as an opportunity to upgrade the current housing stock, tidy areas of brown field which are an eyesore in the town and improve the infrastructure of Biddulph where required. It does not make sense to lose Green belt land and miss the opportunity to make the positive changes outlined above.
PO625	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	I accept that to comply with National Government policy, a certain number of houses are required. I understood these to be mainly aimed at existing urban sites. Therefore, how come 30% are to be placed in rural locations? Is this figure not too high?
PO615	MRS ELLEN FAULKNER				Object	Yes it's too great. I don't think these houses are needed in Biddulph.
PO401	Mr David John Allen				Support	Looks fine to me. However, would propose that we try to reinstate dilapidated housing stock

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO552	MRS ANGELA Turner				Object	They are not in any way linked to the available land available in each locality. Having a presumption that land can be taken out of the Green Belt to fulfil what is a generalised figure of 20% or 30% is a poor method of setting targets and already shows an unbalanced appraisal in favour of economic development without any due regard to other issues. These targets should have firstly been set based on available land within the urban boundary or classed as brownfield. SMDC will not be fulfilling the aim of 'Sustainable Development' according to its' true definition by simply taking land out of the greenbelt, moving it into the town boundary and allocating it as a housing site.
PO601	DR William Callender				General comment	We need to provide affordable housing to support employment in the area and provide a demand for local amenities. Given its rural nature it would be better to disperse this development by allowing greater freedom for the conversion of existing buildings or addition of single homes adjacent to others rather than seeking to develop single large sites with many houses.
PO4498	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			General comment	The council has decided to plan for a middling level of housing growth. This is a complicated area of planning policy and the site owner [represented by agent] in this case wishes to reserve the right to object to it as the plan evolves and should they consider the figures unsound. [Refer to attached letter document and response form].
PO3928	Mr Phil Bamford	Gladman Developments			Object	This submission provides Gladman Development's written representations on the Staffordshire Moorlands Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation. These representations concern the following matters. Duty to Cooperate Sustainability Appraisal Objectively Assessed Housing Need Development Requirements and Distribution Green Belt Review Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries - Leek. [Refer to 2 submitted attachments].
PO3931	Mr Mike O Brien	WYG			Object	This representation has been prepared by WYG planning & Environment on behalf of Key Plant Automation Limited to support the allocation of land at Bode Business Park, Ball Haye Green, Leek for residential development. The owner of the site is to re-locate the Key Plant Automation business to an alternative location and is considering alternative uses for the present site. This representation aims to demonstrate that further consideration should be given to the allocation of the site for residential use. The attached Representations Report reviews the SMDC housing requirement, including historic delivery, as well as the assumptions that have resulted in the adjusted Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) and consequently the increased housing requirement to be achieved over the plan period. It also includes an analysis of the spatial distribution of housing across the district in the context of Leek specifically, and an assessment of SMDC's short term housing requirements within the next five years. The report also focuses on the Bode Business Park site with a review of its suitability for housing, as well as demonstrating that it is no longer a viable employment site. A number of changes to the Local Plan are therefore proposed in relation to: increasing District and Leek housing requirements consequently to allocate more Leek housing sites (including LE243) revisiting residential density expectations; and revisiting the proposed allocations in light of Policy SS5a of the Core Strategy which states that priority will be given to previously developed sites within the urban area.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO1620	Mr John Steele				Object	<p>The whole procedure is flawed on the following grounds: a) SMDC allege that the whole procedure is based on a Central Govt. build requirement, although our MP Karen Bradley and the Ministry state that local people must be the deciders of any plan. Since we have already been consulted it seems completely at odds with Govt. policy that our previous responses have largely been ignored. This is particularly true of the considered responses of the Parish Councils who are Statutory Consultees. b) The figure of 6080 additional homes needed by 2031, albeit discounted to 4158 by completions and commitments since 2011, is without sound foundation, because -the net immigration figures must be based on the Staffordshire Moorlands playing its part in housing the net immigration of the potential millions of people either coming from the less favoured parts of the EU or those persons gaining entry, legally or illegally to the EU from the middle east and elsewhere. There is nowhere else all these people could come from but the lack of transparency hides the fact that no provision has been made in terms of the additional expenditures required to settle such people in our environment. -the model used to calculate Labour Supply and it's effect on population used by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners is outdated and fails to take into account the need for the retirement age to evolve in line with increasing life expectancy and generally fitter and active older people. It also fails to account for the trends of working from home and outsourcing to home workers. So the link between labour requirements and population is wrong. In conclusion it seems that this whole plan is being driven the wrong way round. SMDC appear to have decided that the £1000 bounty per home built and the eventual Council Tax revenue as the real objective, so that all the studies are worked to achieve the figures required. Indeed, looking at the Council's future budget propositions the books won't balance without these incomes. If SMDC wish to enter into a serious consultation with residents they should start from the more realistic requirement based on the 2015 Dept. for Communities and Local Government prediction which indicate the need for ONLY 2573 new homes in the Moorlands. Once we have some honesty in the figures the housing allocation exercise would become a genuine and serious consultation meriting a cooperative response.</p>

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO2736 PO2748 PO2744 PO2683 PO2678 PO2655 PO2663 PO2724 PO2651 PO2715 PO2616 PO2638 PO2603 PO2607 PO2618 PO2719 PO2710 PO2674 PO2642  PO2765 PO2898 PO2879 PO2851 PO2761 PO2976 PO2810 PO2940 PO2935 PO2986 PO2971 PO2793 PO2815 PO2770 PO2778 PO2991  PO2830 PO2840 PO2647  PO2667 PO2611	Mr R Snow Mrs V Weston Mr J Weston Mr A Hide Mrs D Hide Mr R Owen-Jones Mr C Alcock Mr Albert Allen Mrs Lara Austin Mrs Karen Cartlidge Mr Alan Eaton Mrs Carole Edwards Mr Michael Feather Mrs Angela Feather Mr Damien Flynn Mr Andrew Gibson Mrs Karen Green Mr G Owen-Jones Mr And Mrs T & J Prince  Mrs J Weston Mr Alan Moss Mrs Margaret Moss Mr M Tunnicliffe Mr Andrew Weston Mr Jason Baggley A Brattley Mr Barry Fraser Mrs C Fraser Mr Ronald Fryer M Glover Miss A Gregory Mrs Vera James Mrs H Keeling Mr Stefan Lilleker Mr Ian Menzies Lingard Mrs B Massey Mrs Christine Pickin Mr And Mrs T & J Prince  Miss Lynne Sanders Mrs Ena Wetwood				Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO2659 PO2630 PO2634 PO2728 PO2732 PO2687 PO2691 PO2624 PO2753 PO3015 PO3020  PO3050 PO3045  PO2950 PO2774 PO3101 PO2870 PO3025 PO2757 PO2981 PO2803 PO2960 PO2911 PO2965 PO2996 PO3001 PO2955 PO2845 PO3040 PO3055 PO3247 PO3138 PO3237 PO3153 PO3096 PO3091 PO3133 PO3168 PO3128 PO3163 PO3158 PO3173	Mr A Emery Mrs R Green Mr Clive Green Mr John Elks Mrs Mavis Elks Mr Philip Simcock Ms M Kennaway Mrs J Whitefield Mr D Weston Mrs J Foster Councillor Helen Lingard  Mrs Eva Moulton Mr Kenneth George Moulton  D Pittman Mrs K Rogers Mrs J Seddon Mrs D Tunnicliffe Mr D Waring Mr Oliver Weston Mrs Susan Wiseman Mrs F Worsley Mrs P Griffiths Mr Raymond James Mr John Shipley Mr Michael Sposito Elvira Sposito Mr Ronald Griffiths Mrs Hazel Simcock Mrs Susan Clare Mr A Shenton Mr C Smith Mr N Watson Mrs M Snow Mrs J Titterton Mrs C Goodwin Mrs B Barks Mr A Ainsworth Mr D Ainsworth Mr G Clewlow Mr D Dunn Mrs P Dunn Mr D Ratcliffe	Cheadle Town Council			Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3221 PO3214 PO3086 PO3209 PO3204 PO3199 PO3194 PO3076 PO3071 PO3299 PO3304 PO3389 PO3543 PO3532 PO3584 PO3253 PO3608 PO3571 PO3428 PO3585 PO3455 PO3454 PO3429 PO3413 PO3324 PO3316 PO3380 PO3280 PO3117 PO3189 PO3242 PO3143 PO3035 PO3030 PO3106 PO2699 PO3148 PO3381 PO3325 PO3463 PO3396 PO3421	Mr D Ratcliffe Mr R Ball Mr A Hewitt Mr J Hewitt Miss K Pickford-Avery Mrs P Routledge Mrs A Rogers Mr W Wordsworth Mr J Lawler Mrs J Birks Mr M Birks Helen Abbey Mrs Michelle Plant Mr Lee Plant Ms Gina Boston K W Alcock Mrs Patricia Allum Mr Lee Austin Mr Craig Beardmore Mr Matthew Boston Mrs Susan Brindley Mr Darryl Brindley Mrs Christine Broad Mr Basil Brunt Mr Peter Brunt Mrs Hazel Brunt Mr Stanley Byatt Mr S Hassell Miss P Millward Miss S Ford Mr R Lees Mr And Mrs J Greenwood Mr & Mrs L & D Stevenson Mrs Angela Jones Mr D Gould Mr Eric Cartlidge Mrs J Davies Mrs Vera Byatt Mrs Jill Callear Mrs Joyce Campbell Miss L Chadwick Mrs M Clewes				Object	The council’s assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3364 PO3258 PO3356 PO3365 PO3341 PO3373 PO3317 PO3412 PO3404 PO3340 PO3269 PO3263 PO3397 PO3405 PO3291 PO3184 PO3066 PO3178 PO3061 PO3231 PO3112 PO3123 PO3226 PO3275 PO4773	Mr Harvey Cope Mr Roger Davis Mr D Fernihough Mr Tommy Frost Mr Colin Hayes Mrs F R Hayward Mrs Mary Jones Mrs Brenda Mills Mr David Tavernor Mr S Waring Mrs J.F. Eaton Mr A.R. Eaton Mr Saul Cutler Mrs Sara Tavernor Mr David Renshaw Mrs P Wordsworth Mr C Foster Mr P Hollywood Mrs A Hollywood Mr N Hewitt Mr I Millward Mr B Clare Mr P Heath Mr and Mrs A Brown Mr A Copcutt				Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.



**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3285 PO3290 PO3420 PO3667 PO3632 PO3625 PO3462 PO3601 PO3438 PO3439 PO3507 PO3500 PO3580 PO3592 PO3531 PO3488 PO3515 PO3633 PO3487 PO3447 PO3446 PO3478 PO3609 PO3562 PO3617 PO3675 PO3547 PO3616 PO3524 PO3570 PO3563 PO3593 PO3496 PO3495 PO3508 PO3348 PO3471 PO3470 PO3516 PO3357 PO3372 PO3308 PO3333	Mrs C Moseley Mrs B Heesman Mr A Massey K W Alcock Mr Neville Brooks Mrs Pauline Brooks Mr Duncan Campbell Mr K Davall Mr George Davall Mrs Isabel Davall Mr Robert Dennis Mrs Sylvia Dennis Mrs Karen Drummond Mr Alistair Drummond Mr J Edwards Mr Malcolm Elvidge Mrs Anne Fox Mrs Heather Frame Mr Frank Harding Mrs Pamela Johnson Mr Roger Johnson Mr & Mrs D Keates Mrs H Keeling Mr K Mannion Mr Darren Potts Mrs Giovanna Potts Mr & Mrs J & C Smith Mr David Thomas Maria Turley Mrs Jennifer Vasselin Miss Rachel Vasselin Mr Kenneth Weston Mrs Avril Woodward Mr David Woodward Millicent Stevenson Mr Christopher Jones Mr D Hancock Mrs J M Hancock Master J Kennaway Mr David Kennaway Mrs M E Nicholls Mr M Burton Ms Allison Keates				Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3264 PO3523  PO3554 PO3555 PO3309 PO3349 PO3653 PO3640 PO3855 PO3660 PO3676 PO3683 PO3684 PO3691 PO3697 PO3704 PO3705 PO3711 PO3715 PO3718 PO3726 PO3727 PO3734 PO3735 PO3742 PO3743 PO3750 PO3751 PO3758 PO3759 PO3766 PO3767 PO3774 PO3775 PO3782 PO3783 PO3790 PO3791 PO3798 PO3799 PO3806 PO3807 PO3815 PO3816	Mr Alan Keates Mr Henry James Gibson  Mr John W Bossons Mrs R H Bossons Mr A Gough Mrs J Hewitt Mr K Whitefield Mr David Renshaw Mr Philip Silk Mr and Mrs V M Elks Mr G Hodgkinson Mrs K Smith Mr I Crawford Mrs J Crawford Mr JA Hayes Mr M Shirley Mr and Mrs M Nadova Mr P Cope Mrs J Cope Mr W Elks Mr D Richards Mr M Nad Ms T Janete Miss T Boulton Mrs J Sagers Mr C Loving Mr T Loving Mrs J Richardson Mrs C Hopkinson Mr and Mrs S Abbey Mrs P Richards Mr B Johnson Miss K Beardmore Mrs J Richards Mr R Broad Miss E Clough Mr P Clough Mr G Barks Mr A Wilson Mr P Titterton Miss K Wilson Miss R Oulsnam Miss R Allen Miss J Seddon				Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3823 PO3824 PO3646 PO3831 PO3832 PO3839 PO3840 PO3847 PO3848 PO4793 PO4799 PO4814 PO4798 PO4779  PO4813 PO7467 PO7454 PO7461	Mr A Fox Miss T Millward Mr K Pickin Mr A Millward Mr R Turley Mrs D Harrison Mr A Wright Mr D Tomkinson Mrs J Tomkinson Mr Richard Gallagher Jean Horsley Mrs Gillian Smith Mr Keeling Mr and Mrs R & J Lovatt  Mrs R Johnson Mr Jack Dempsey Mr C Machin Ms Linda Powell PO7461				Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.
PO4823	Ms Mary Walchester				Support	no comment made
PO7074	MRS PENNY PLANT				Object	I object to the overall housing numbers for Staffordshire Moorlands.
PO7070	Mr Alex Plant				Object	I object to the overall housing numbers for Staffordshire Moorlands.
PO7078	M Ellicock				Object	I object to the housing numbers that have been allocated for Cheadle and Staffordshire Moorlands in general. Particularly the greenfield spaces that fall within the area that has been defined as a Cheadle town boundary. These are the areas that most need the greenfield spaces to prevent oversized blocks of housing and maintain the open and green character enjoyed and used by so many of the existing residents daily.
PO6878	Unknown	Stoddards Ltd	Mr G Willard		Object	The council has decided to plan for a middling level of housing growth. This is a complicated area of planning policy and the site owner in this case wishes to reserve the right to object to it as the plan evolves and should they consider the figures unsound.

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO6932	Mr M Bullock		Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Object	<p>The latest consultation seeks views on the proposed annual housing requirement, which is proposed to be increased from 300 dwellings per annum to 320 dwellings per annum on the basis of updated OAN figures. In response to the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement from 300 dwellings per annum in the adopted Core Strategy, to 320 dwellings as part of the review being carried out as part of the Preferred Options Consultation, our client supports the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement, as this increase is considered to be justified by the latest evidence of housing need contained in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment. With regard to the proposed distribution of housing across the district, we would support a greater proportion of housing being allocated to Cheadle mindful that - as set out in summary within these representations and in more detail in our earlier representations to the SHLAA and Site Options Consultation - we consider that part of our client's land at Park Lane, Cheadle (site ref: CH165) is a suitable additional housing allocation. As well as asserting the suitability of our client's site itself for housing development, we consider Cheadle has the infrastructure and facilities to accommodate additional housing/growth (with our client's site being in close proximity to the town centre) and that it would have knock-on benefits from provision of additional housing to that currently proposed. Such benefits would include local economic benefits through additional spending in the town centre and at other local facilities and ultimately additional support for the future sustainability and growth of local services.</p>
PO6811	(unknown)		Mr G Willard		Object	<p>The council has decided to plan for a middling level of housing growth. This is a complicated area of planning policy and the site owner in this case wishes to reserve the right to object to it as the plan evolves and should they consider the figures unsound.</p>

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO6897	unknown	Mosaic Estates	Mr Cameron Austin-Fell	RPS Planning & Development	Object	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the above consultation. This response is made by RPS Planning and Development (RPS) on behalf of our clients Mosaic Estates (Mosaic), who is promoting land to the north of Cheadle. The principal focus of the Preferred Site Allocations (PSA) document is the proposal of land allocations to meet the requirements set in the 2014 Core Strategy. In addition to this, the PSA also addresses issues relating to housing need which is addressed as part of this response.</p> <p>Housing Need The housing requirement for the District was established in the 2014 Core Strategy, identifying a provision for 6,000 dwellings between 2006 and 2026. In his report on the 2014 Core Strategy, the Core Strategy Inspector indicated that an early review of the Core Strategy would be required, on the basis that the housing requirement for the Core Strategy was based on older evidence of need, derived from the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (WMRSS). It is recognised that this 'policy on' document does not constitute an Objectively Assessed Need for housing (OAN) as required by the NPPF and NPPG. The NPPG advises that OAN should be based on the most up to date evidence of housing and population need. The Council's January 2016 SHMA update is based on forecasts from the Sub-National Population and Household Projections (SNPP/SNHP), updated biennially, however rely on the 2012 projections. The 2014 SNPP were published in late May 2016 and the complimentary 2014 SNHP is expected on 12 July 2016. It is somewhat unfortunate that the Council has gone out to consultation soon after the publication of new evidence, however by the time that the PSA is ready for submission, there can be no doubt that the implications of the 2014 SNHP will be the most up-to-date evidence. On this basis, it is strongly recommended that the Council revises its evidence of housing need once the 2014 SNHP is published, which can be offered for consultation prior to submission. As the evidence underpinning the OAN needs to be revised, it is not proposed to offer an in-depth critique of the SHMA, however Mosaic do offer the following observations: The Council has opted for an OAN of 320 dwellings per annum (dpa), between 2012 and 2031. This figure is somewhat of a mid-point of the dwelling range 250-440dpa proposed by the 2016 SHMA update. The figure of 320dpa has not adequately accounted for the uplifts required to the demographic projections as a result of forecast employment growth and does not represent OAN. Figure 5.1 of the Council's 2016 SHMA Update includes 5 employment led models of future dwelling need, indicating a range between 319 and 520. The proposed 320 dwellings is only marginally higher than the lowest employment projection in the SHMA (Scenario H) of 319 dwellings. The lowest figure of 319 dwellings is forecast on the assumption that jobs remain static (based on 2012 figures) across the plan period, adjusting only for the changing demographic structure arising from the increases in the ageing population. This is not considered to be a realistic expectation of future growth, which does not account for economic forecasts utilised in other scenarios. As there is currently little certainty of approach, a more appropriate mechanism would be to consider a mid-point between the 5 economic scenarios presented in the SHMA. This would favour a position of 420dpa, as a midpoint between 319 and 520dpa, as a more robust estimation of need. In RPS' view, failure to do this may ultimately result in the plan being found unsound, a situation which is everyone's interest to avoid. In summary, Mosaic welcomes the progress made on the Site Allocations document to date, following on from the 2014 Core Strategy. In RPS' experience, the process of quantifying OAN can be timely and often the subject of intensive scrutiny as part of the Examination process. To avoid unnecessary delays, it is advised that a refresh of the 2016 SHMA Update is undertaken after 12 July 2016 when the latest household projections are available. This will ensure that the Council's strategy for housing growth is grounded in the most up to date evidence. Additionally, the Council should be mindful of the employment projections and ensure that the preferred approach taken is justified and positively prepared.</p>

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO6903	unknown	Mosaic Estates	Mr Cameron Austin-Fell	RPS Planning & Development	General comment	<p>Mosaic supports the Council's strategy for distribution to Cheadle, which recognises the sustainability of the town and represents a principal location for future development. Table 3.2 of the Council's PSA indicates that the Council has not performed well against housing requirements to date, noting that there have been only 82 completions to date in Cheadle, along with 205 commitments in the system. This is broadly reflective of the current land supply in the District, as indicated in the Council's latest Housing Delivery Schedule, framed against the position at 31 March 2016 (published October 2015). The position in the latest Housing Delivery Schedule indicates a significant shortfall of housing, capable of meeting only 1.84 years of the housing requirement and far short of the necessary 5 years specified in the NPPF. There is clearly a need to bring sites forward which can deliver. The Council is rightly progressing with the Site Allocations document as a means of addressing this shortfall, however the Council should remain flexible in the allocations proposed, particularly where they are capable of delivering additional sustainable growth. It is therefore considered that preferred allocations proposed by the Council should be drafted as 'minimum' growth figures for each site. This will enable the plan to respond flexibly to local housing need and assist in delivering the Council's shortfall.</p>

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9039	Gallagher Developments Ltd	Gallagher Developments Limited			Object	<p>(Mark Rose, Define - Agent) We welcome the recent review of the housing need evidence base, and clearly that should be kept up-to-date throughout the plan making process. We also note the proposed increase in the annual housing requirements, but are concerned that the District Council are not seeking to meet the full objectively assessed need (OAN) in accordance with the NPPF to support the expected level of economic growth, and critically to ensure that the high level of affordable housing need identified in the Borough is addressed. A central tenet of the NPPF is the provision of sufficient housing to meet the needs of present and future generations and, in doing so, to widen the choice of housing (paragraphs 7 and 9). To achieve that it requires (paragraph 14) “ local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area ”, that “ Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change ”, and set out a “ clear strategy for allocating sufficient land ” (paragraph 17). Delivery is underpinned by paragraph 47, which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing requiring local planning authorities to “ use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area ” [my emphasis]. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update concludes (para. 5.40) that there is a housing OAN range of between 250 dpa and 440 dpa. It continues (para 5.43) to state that “ This OAN range provides a realistic level of housing delivery which will support economic growth and address potentially worsening housing market signals, whilst meeting the full demographically assessed need for housing in the District .” But notably it earlier states (para. 5.33) that: “ there is a clear need to uplift the figures to take account of the significant affordable housing need in Staffordshire Moorlands ”; and (para 5.36) that “ the previous SHMA (2014) identified a need for 707 affordable housing dwellings annually over the next five years. This must be taken into consideration by the Local Authority when deriving the most appropriate housing requirement for its Local Plan .” Furthermore at paragraph 5.38 point 8 it states “ To ensure that there is no disconnect between the housing OAN and the Council’s economic scenarios, in order to justify a figure below 438 dpa, SMDC would need to demonstrate how it would mitigate or avoid the adverse housing, economic and other outcomes that a lower growth approach could give rise to .” It later continues (para. 5.44) “ It would also need to evidence how the adverse impact of meeting housing need would ‘significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits’ [the Framework, §14] as well as make provision, through the duty-to-cooperate, for those needs to be met in full elsewhere within the wider HMA .” The consequences of not planning to meet the identified need would be dire. The Housing Strategy for England “Laying the Foundations” states in paragraph 1 that a “thriving, active but stable housing market that offers choice, flexibility and affordable housing is critical to our economic and social wellbeing.” It continues to highlight (paragraph 5) that “we have not built enough homes for more that a generation and the credit crunch has simply compounded this challenge”, and (paragraph 8) that “without urgent action to build new homes, children will grow up without the same opportunities to live near their families, young people will struggle to get a place to call their own and older people will not have the choice and support they need.” Furthermore, paragraph 9 states: “Housing is crucial for our social mobility, health and wellbeing – with quality and choice having an impact on social mobility and wellbeing from an early age, and our homes accounting for about half of all household wealth. Social housing should provide support for those who need it, when they need it, and should help vulnerable people to live independently. And opportunities for wealth must be open to all, with housing choices helping rather than hindering people’s ability to build assets and find employment.” On the basis of the evidence presented as part of this consultation it is apparent that the District Council has not justified how it would mitigate or avoid the adverse socio-economic impacts of their preferred lower growth approach, how the adverse impact of meeting housing need would ‘significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits’, or how those needs would be met elsewhere in the Housing Market Area. Consequently, my clients contend that the Local Plan Review should progress on the basis of seeking to deliver the full OAN of 440 dwellings per annum and 8,800 dwellings in total. We note the residual housing requirement of 885 dwellings for Biddulph identified in Table 3.2 of the consultation paper. However, in light of the District’s development strategy that focuses on the Market Towns including Biddulph, and the above comments in relation to the full OAN, that residual requirement can only be considered an absolute minimum figure for the town.</p>

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9043	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				General comment	(Agent - G Willard) The council have decided to plan for a middling level of housing growth. This is a complicated area of planning policy and the site owner in this case wishes to reserve the right to object to it as the plan evolves and should they consider the figures unsound.
PO9056	Mrs Joyce Tagell				Object	(Agent - Hourigan Connolly) Summary of comments - full version attached Covering letter and report promoting BD083 on behalf of Mr & Mrs Tagell. objecting to the Council's OAHN of 320 dwellings pa and supporting a figure of at least 440 dwellings pa accordingly objecting to the Council's published residual housing requirement for the rural areas as it should be increased to reflect 440 pa figure (at 28% of District total) criticising the Council's 5 year housing supply figure/housing delivery backlog and argues it is actually lower than published, through alternative calculation methodologies objecting to Council assumptions used in factoring in allowance for annual infill, when calculating how much land needs to be formally allocated in rural areas, and arguing this will result in failure to meet (rural) housing needs. accordingly, client's land (BD083) should be included as an additional site.
PO9079	Mr Greg Powell	Cheadle Unite			Object	The high level of housing provision to secure net migration into the area is not a sustainable model. In 2031 the population base will have increased, some of which will form an ageing population. What for 2031 - 2046 an net migration of 10,000? A sustainable approach counts for increased assisted living, longer working life and doesn't rely on drawing migrants from other areas. It is not possible to control who those migrants are, e.g. are they working age? The model doesn't account for these factors.



**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9061	Mr Greg Powell	Cheadle Unite			Object	<p>Summary of representation (see attached response). The local community should decide the level of housing that they require. SMDC have clear evidence in several previous consultations and petitions submitted that the local community are against the excessive housing levels proposed. SMDC have failed to reduce the allocation to Cheadle which does not reflect the 5500+ responses that SMDC received in 2015 and does not take into account road traffic congestion, long term sustainability, the environment, damage to agriculture and access to doctors and dentists etc. The 2012 ONS population projections project a much reduced levelling off of the population across the Moorlands. These figures came out after the 6000+ housing targets were set. It indicates a much lower housing requirement of 2573 compared with the 6000+ figure. SMDC have not seized on these figures to justify a reduction in our housing provision and have failed to disseminate this information. SMDC effectively justifies retention of high levels of housing using an Oxford Economics Model supplied as part of the 'additional work' that SMDC have commissioned, produced by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners. It draws the assertion that due to an ageing population to see a net gain of 85 jobs through to 2031 it is necessary to secure a net migration of 7,697 people into the area. This document has never been disseminated to or shared with residents or action groups as part of the consultation and been produced as evidence to justify retention of high housing figures. The officer response has been that Councils have to abide by over-riding National Policy, effectively making a mockery of any local opinion.</p>

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9068	Mr Greg Powell	Cheadle Unite			Object	Summary only (please see attached response) Failure to co-operate and promote an effective strategy for the region. Cheadle Unite have for over 6 years been asking SMDC to work closely with our Local City 'Stoke-on-Trent' (S-o-T) on the regeneration of brownfield sites and where affordable housing can be built for our younger generation. SMDC can play a key role by collaborating and setting an overall housing figure with S-o-T and the Potteries that reduces our allocation. S-o-T have acknowledged that development opportunities outside the regeneration areas draws developers away and creates uncertainty. Cheadle residents have made it clear that the allocation should be reduced and provision for this can be made under a duty to co-operate. SMDC continues to evade grasping this issue as is stated 'Stoke-on-Trent City Council is in the early stages of preparing a joint Local Plan with Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council. At this stage, the evidence to support the plan, including the capacity to meet housing needs has yet to be established'.
PO9624	Mr R Lloyd				Object	(Summary of comments - full version attached) Government housing allocations are excessive and unrealistic due to lack of modern infrastructure to support new development.
PO9264	Mr Lee Dawkin	Renew Land	Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Support	The latest consultation seeks views on the proposed annual housing requirement, which is proposed to be increased from 300 dwellings per annum to 320 dwellings per annum on the basis of updated OAN figures. In response to the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement from 300 dwellings per annum in the adopted Core Strategy, to 320 dwellings as part of the review being carried out as part of the Preferred Options Consultation, our client supports the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement, as this increase is considered to be justified by the latest evidence of housing need contained in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The district-wide and Biddulph-specific housing and other development requirements, including those established in the Core Strategy, have necessitated a review of settlement and Green Belt boundaries, and such a strategy for releasing sites from the Green Belt through the Local Plan process is supported.
PO9242	Mr Lee Dawkin	Renew Land	Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Support	In response to the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement from 300 in the adopted Core Strategy to 320 dwellings per annum as part of the Local Plan Review our client supports the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement as this increase is considered to be justified by the latest evidence of housing need contained in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9838	St Modwen Development Ltd	St Modwen Developments Limited	Ms Stacey Green	Barton Willmore	Object	<p>Email containing letter and Evidence Report submitted [both attached]: SMDC SHMA (2014) concluded that there was a need for 260-440 homes per year across SMDC plus affordable housing. The Consultation Document states at paragraph 3.10 that choosing the middle of the range would 'retain the same number of jobs as the present day'. However the Council have chosen a requirement of just 320 dwellings per annum, and this figure falls slightly short of the middle of the range position. The Staffordshire Moorlands 2012-based Sub-National Household Projections Update - January 2016 Revision provides a summary of the scenarios that were tested. All scenarios led to a decrease in job growth. A 10% uplift is then added in a second Scenario's table within the 2016 Update. the analysis within Appendix 4 of the 2nd March Council Assembly report does not justify why the full OAN of 440 dwellings per annum cannot be met, given that the report lists the benefits of delivering 440 dwellings. a requirement of 440 p.a. will provide affordable housing and economic benefits; 320 p.a. will not. In a District where there has not been a five year housing land supply for 6 years; and where affordable housing need is set to outstrip any market housing that will be delivered in the next 2 years at least, there can be no greater pressure for a LPA to choose to meet its full OAN. Therefore object to para 3.11 Preferred Options Consultation document which states 320 p.a.would ". .Sustain a modest increase in jobs over the plan period by increasing the size of the workforce in comparison with lower levels of housing growth ". To plan for economic growth, the Council must plan for the higher end of the range, i.e. 440 dwellings (minimum). consider that the Plan is internally inconsistent, confusing ie para 3.10 conflicts with para 3.11: "maintain jobs" v "modest increase in jobs". A less than midpoint figure means jobs would decrease. NPPF states..Where sites are available, suitable and achievable, with the support of a willing landowner – as in this case, then strong support should be given towards their development. St Modwen maintained the support for the allocation of the Blythe Vale site for employment use [since 2015]. St Modwen consider that the delivery of the Blythe Vale site is most achievable in circumstances where the development is of a mixed use, as opposed to the restricted use class that the RIS allocation supports [and restrictive planning conditions on existing consent]. The SHLAA methodology explains that sources of supply should include: 'land allocated in plans for employment and other uses' and 'unimplemented /outstanding planning permissions' however later states areas identified in the Employment Land Study as appropriate for retention, are excluded. The St Modwen site was not, (and should have been at the time of the SHLAA being prepared), assessed as a potential development site for housing. The NLP 2014 Employment Land Review does not, in reporting on the availability of land, state that the RIS must be retained and therefore we considered it should have been assessed within the SHLAA. NLP report states investment is needed to improve the quality of key employment sites. This will be possible where a scheme is viable and deliverable and it is through making these representations that St Modwen seek to achieve this for Blythe Vale. The SHLAA (2015) identifies the land that has been assessed as part of the Council's consideration of suitable housing land [excluded this site]. This approach was flawed, given that within the Local Plan Boundary, the St Modwen site (and the adjoining land south of the A50) is the only site at Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook that is not within the Green Belt. [Evidence Base Report includes comparative assessment of the site and this clearly demonstrates the suitability of the St Modwen site for allocation]. In respect of the potential for allocating the St Modwen site, we have reviewed the infrastructure capacity of the settlement of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook, and present a review of services and facilities within the accompanying Evidence Base Report. Given that neither the SMBC Local Plan consultation document nor its evidence base assesses the potential of the St Modwen site to deliver housing or a mixed use scheme, there has been no assessment of the balanced range of these environmental effects. We consider the most appropriate scenario to follow is the 'policy-off' economic-led scenario whereby the net commuting ratio is maintained at the existing level, and the level of housing required to support the Oxford Economics forecast is determined. Growth of at least 438 dpa (rounded to 440 dpa) is therefore considered justified.. as full OAN. [We acknowledge that this would have the effect of reducing the five year housing land supply position further from the 1.64 years..] We also consider that the distribution of housing requirement should be reconsidered and that a greater proportion should be afforded to the settlement of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook. If the Housing Requirement were increased to 440 dpa, this would equate to an additional 638 dwellings within the Rural Area. Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook receives 15% of the new allocations growth afforded to the Rural Areas. 15% of the increased Rural Area Growth would equate to circa additional 97 dwellings that could be required in Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook. Given the nature of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook and its tightly constrained boundaries, the rationale would be for any additional growth to be on an allocated site or sites, not a windfall. Our sustainability assessment of the village..clearly</p>

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
						demonstrates that a larger proportion, (and a larger proportion within an increased overall Housing Requirement) is justified. Council may wish to consider a new designation of 'Main Rural Centre' that could be afforded to certain Larger Villages [such as Blythe Bridge], recognisant of their role and potential for growth.
PO10250	Mr Andy Brown	Harlequin Development Strategies (Crewe) Limited	Mr Alan Knott	Knights LLP	Support	Support proposal for increased annual housing requirement from 300 dwellings per annum to 320 dwellings per annum. This increase is considered to be justified by the latest evidence of housing need contained in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The proposed distribution of housing across the area is also supported including providing 28% of the overall housing requirement in rural areas. The provision of additional housing in the rural area would enable the open market and affordable housing needs of rural communities to be met in areas local to them which would support the delivery of sustainable communities in terms of meeting housing needs and supporting local services.
PO4710	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			General comment	Response form and letter submitted, providing responses to questions 1, 33, 34 (ie Alton boundary), 37 and 41. Question 1 response: The council have decided to plan for a middling level of housing growth. This is a complicated area of planning policy and the site owner in this case wishes to reserve the right to object to it as the plan evolves and should they consider the figures unsound. The council are especially urged to be mindful of seeking affordable housing contributions on smaller and medium sized housing sites which may be either financially unviable or undeliverable because of the smaller number of units on site. Lower thresholds and accepting off site contributions may prove to be a more pragmatic means of achieving the delivery of affordable housing units whilst without preventing the delivery of adequate housing supply. Table 4.16 indicates that 13 new houses might be provided on this site (AL012) . The council have taken the figure from the submission of an indicative housing layout submitted with planning application SMD/2014/0824. The site may not be developed as set out on this indicative plan which itself provided for the retention of the existing house. The site is considered suitable for a variety of housing types and forms dependent upon the assessed needs of the market at the time and the intentions of the site owner (who may indeed choose to continue to live on site). Such uncertainties could mean that under 10 houses are actually provided on the site or as many as 20 or so. The council need to allow for such flexibility in their plan making.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO609	MRS ELLEN FAULKNER				Object	The infrastructure of biddulph first needs upgrading to meet demand of extra residents
PO548	Mr Terry Barber				Object	We have, in the Biddulph North ward, in the last three years, been subjected to a new housing estate of nearly 200 houses on the old Selectus Ribbon factory land. This new estate has already imposed pressure with traffic, education, policing and health needs onto the area. Greenbelt land is proposed to be lost on the land that stretches towards Biddulph Moor. Loss of soak up, in this area will increase the likelihood of flooding to the Biddulph North area and also to the lower lying areas of Biddulph (the lower end of Thames Drive and Pennine Way) which have suffered from flooding in the past. Any reduction in trees and soil will therefore impose unreasonable threats of environmental hazzards onto the inhabitants of this area and I would strongly recommend that residents take the council to the courts to persue summonses for reckless and irresponsible behaviour that ammounts to willful damage to the lifestyle and livelyhoods of the area's inhabitants.
PO387	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				Object	The proposed number of houses for Cheadle seems far too large and unsustainable for the town as it is. I would ask why stoke on Trent council were not taken up in their offer to take some of our allocation when they have land/areas that are prime for development?
PO9446	Mrs Anne Donaldson				Object	We are writing to register our objections to the proposed development in and around Cheadle. The scale of the proposed development is out of balance with the infra structure and employment opportunities that already exist. The proposed housing developments would create additional surface water issues that already cause Tean to flood. There is a potential of a further 2000/2500 vehicles resulting from building over a 1000 new homes in Cheadle. The roads are already inadequate to deal with the flow of traffic. The proposed link road will not ease this congestion as it will merely move the problem to another part of town. The Public Open Spaces shown on the map are largely playing fields linked to schools to which public have no access. Should the proposed development go ahead on the south west side of the town there will be a great need to public open space that can be accessed by the public, as this area houses predominately the older generation who would lose the open fields that the farmer currently allows access on for walking.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO1049	Mr John Bevan	Cheadle Unite			Object	At before & since the meeting of 17th May virtually eveyone in Cheadle agrees we dont want any more houses, apart from small scale infilling. Each house would mean an average of 2 or more people & 2 cars. The infrastructure of roads (particularly), doctors, schools, services etc cant cope now. However if we must have more houses the best place for them is a new estate around a new link road between the "new" JCB factory in Leek road and Brookhouses.Many would walk/cycle to JCB (saving the environment) most of the new estate & existing traffic would use the new road towards Cellarhead or Blythe Bridge for S-on-T, Leek & the A50, removing congestion from Cheadle centre, (furthermore if the road from Brookhouses to Draycott over New Haden was improved that would provide a superior route from Leek road, Cheadle to the A50 at Draycott.) You will say its Green Belt, well use the power that enabled you to allow JCB to build in the Green Belt at Leek road to allow this link road/estate scheme to go ahead,- its what the people of Cheadle want- move or use the green belt. Incidentally the proposed road from Brookhouses to Mobberley will not lessen traffic in Cheadle because traffic between Tean & Blythe bridge wont use it - obviously. Small villages need more houses to maintain local services- shops, pubs, schools, churches etc plus if they are on a main road can easily cope with extra traffic.
PO1504 PO1496 PO1511 PO1518	Mrs J L Taylor Mr J P Taylor Mr P Taylor Mr T A Taylor				Object	I object to the housing numbers that have been allocated for Cheadle and Staffordshire Moorlands in general. Particularly the greenfield spaces that fall within the area that has been defined as a Cheadle town boundary. These are the areas that most need the greenfield spaces to prevent oversized blocks of housing and maintain the open and green character enjoyed and used by so many of the existing residents daily.

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9052		Hourigan Connolly			Object	<p>Covering letter and report promoting land south of A52, Kingsley for housing (on behalf of Dean Lewis Estates) submitted in response to Questions 1, 33, 36, 37 and 41: objecting to the Council's OAHN of 320 dwellings pa and supporting a figure of at least 440 dwellings pa accordingly objecting to the Council's published residual housing requirement for the rural areas as it should be increased to reflect 440 pa figure (at 28% of District total) criticising the Council's 5 year housing supply figure/housing delivery backlog and argues it is actually lower than published, through alternative calculation methodologies objecting to Council assumptions used in factoring in allowance for annual infill, when calculating how much land needs to be formally allocated in rural areas, and arguing this will result in failure to meet (rural) housing needs. accordingly, client's land at A52 Kingsley, should additionally be allocated for residential (around 50 dwellings) Council's Green Belt Review lacks credibility and is not justified. queries Council's 'Suitability' assessment of SHLAA site KG032 submit Landscape and Visual Overview report that concludes client's site is suitable for allocation and preferable to other options sites, including preferred option KG049A. Consequently objects to KG049A. [Refer to attachments].</p>

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO855	Mr Daniel Noble				Object	<p>There are three main topics on which I object to these plans, specifically the draft potential allocations and reserve sites along Mount Road. Concerns that the local infrastructure cannot support the level of building proposed The spoiling of a popular amenity Concerns over flood risk Many of the proposed potentially developable sites are in the East of Leek, suggesting a large quantity of housing will be built in the east end to fulfill the proposed housing requirements. The east side of Leek is already stretched when it comes to critical amenities such as schools and County Education acknowledged this in the 2015 consultation. However I don't believe that any suggestions have been put forward by the District and County Council. I believe this to be a significant roadblock and should be addressed before continuing with the housing consultation. It should be clear that any significant building on this or any of the Mount sites will require improvements to the road including, but not limited to, widening and creation of pavements and better access from the Ashbourne Road end. Access for residents on this site will make the Mount much busier - especially considering my comments above that multiple proposed sites will need to be built on to support the plan. This will mean a popular "quiet lane" will become not only much busier but a "rat run" from the Buxton Road to the Ashbourne Road. This would be a hugely negative impact on an important local amenity i.e. The Mount. The Options Site Assessments report ( Options Site Assessments - Towns.pdf ) acknowledges that building on this site will require improvements to the badly potholed eastern end of Kniveden Lane, thus creating a through access for motor vehicles that doesn't currently exist in a satisfactory form. The estate taking in Kniveden Lane and Moorland Road is currently very quiet and is not generally used as a through route. This makes it a relatively safe place for children to play outside and I have significant concerns that losing this sense of security would be another reason to discourage children from playing outside. Our children need encouragement to be active, not discouragement through reduced safety. The Mount - particularly south of Kniveden Lane - is an extremely popular semi-rural location which is used by many for walking, cycling, horse-riding and running. It is a sound surface with superb far-reaching views, offering uniquely easy access to enjoy a stunning countryside location. Any building on the proposed LE128 site will spoil the views that extend to the Roaches, Shutlingsloe, the Cloud and beyond. With well-recognised concern that many people are not maintaining a satisfactorily healthy lifestyle, any spoiling or removal of a locally and culturally important leisure amenity would be a huge blow to not just the east end of Leek but the whole town. I am astounded that Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust responded to the 2015 consultancy claiming LE140 has no major views out. This plot is an extremely popular amenity and building on here would be a huge loss of an open space for local residents. Severn Trent Water have acknowledged that "t hey have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development." However I've not seen any specifics in the Options Site Assessments - Towns.pdf and this concerns me in relation to plot LE128a/b which continues to have significant drainage issues. Frequently rainwater can be seen draining off LE128b at the SW corner and onto Moorland Road. My concern is that if draft potential allocation LE128a is built on (regardless of whether reserve allocation LE128b is built on) this drainage problem will be exacerbated and I've seen no plan or evidence of how that will be remedied. As per my 2015 consultation response I should re-iterate that the land drains that lead off LE128 into the culvert under the gardens of the easterly Moorland Road properties already struggle to cope with the water run-off from LE128. I have grave concerns that the existing drains will not support the necessary drainage of the proposed housing development. This is especially pertinent since I'm resident at the SW corner of the proposed plot on the Moorland Road side and get the bulk of the water draining under and across our plot.</p>
PO3918		Hourigan Connolly			Object	<p>Hourigan Connolly is promoting land at Buxton Road, Leek for inclusion in the Staffordshire Moorlands District Local Plan as a housing allocation. [Report submitted that responds to Questions 1, 6, 10 and 14 from consultation document].</p>



**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3921	Mr John Coxon	Emery Planning Partnership			Object	Emery Planning is instructed by Wainhomes (North West) Limited to submit representations to the Preferred Option Site and Boundaries Consultation Booklet. The representations are made specifically with regard to our client 's site adjacent to Wardle Gardens, Leekbrook. [Report submitted which responds to consultation Questions 1,2,9,10,34.37,38].
PO63	Mr. and Mrs. Frederick and Nora Cartlidge				Object	<p>Firstly building on Greenbelt land is a complete no no for me. Especially as there is ugly brown field sites which could benefit our area were they used for development. It seems extraordinary that greenbelt is even being suggested as Prime Minister's manifesto stated that greenbelt land would be protected. Since March 2015 and in contradiction to the manifesto policy to , "protect the greenbelt," 25% more houses are planned on greenbelt land. It would make sense to make FULL USE OF BROWNFIELD SITES WITHIN BIDDULPH CONURBATION. i.e. CHATTERLEY WHITFIELD SITE. THE DAVERA FURNITURE BUILDING.(MINSTER MILLS) in the town centre. Could they be made an offer , to move onto another site so as to free up the huge building/area where they now reside? OLD MILL BUILDING ON STATION ROAD. OLD DYE WORKS CONGLETON ROAD. At this point it would seem absolutely the most efficient way in which to solve this problem. Indeed, an excellent chance to tidy up and definitely impress; the overall area of natural beauty such as is BIDDULPH, enhanced, made even more attractive for visitors to Staffs. Moorlands. We need to retain our greenbelt. Even our Prime Minister vowed "to protect the greenbelt" (Manifesto speech). Last week , in Parliament I witnessed George Osborne stating exactly this. In doing so we prevent urban sprawl and protect our wildlife, flora and fauna, an absolute must for our ECO SYSTEM. Dame Fiona Reynolds, previously Director General of the National Trust for eleven years, 2001-2012, stated in the Telegraph 8/5/16 that planning applications for these areas has risen by more than a quarter since last year`s election. To back this claim she quoted research carried out by the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) SHOWING274,792 homes are planned on Green-belt land in England, 55,000 more than were planned in March last year, proving the Government was contradicting their manifesto pledge to PROTECT GREENBELT LAND., THE RIBBON OF LAND STRETCHING AROUND TOWNS AND CITIES TO PREVENT URBAN SPRAWL. The Conservative Manifesto said some really good and positive things. The question is can it be sustained? The easier it is to nibble away at the green-belt the less effort gets put into imaginative regeneration. So, lets ALL make sure we protect the green-belt in and around Biddulph. Indeed, that goes for the whole of Staffs. Moorlands Once its gone we shall never get it back. But the ugly Brownfield sites will still remain. Dame Fiona Reynolds is now Master of Emmanuel College Cambridge.</p>

**Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?**

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO955	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	General comment	<p>It is contended that the Council's approach allocating particular proportions of development to the towns, villages and rural areas is too regimented and arbitrary and that allocations or requirements for specific areas rather being allocated on a percentage or formula basis should be based on the capacity of a town or village to absorb or provide for development without material harm. It is possible that some of the rural settlements could accommodate more houses than proposed by either extending development boundaries(incl. infill) or allocating sites. This could help relieve or avoid the issues associated with some proposed sites in the District, such as for example the Mount in Leek. More development could be accommodated in villages. This would be in accord with Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Framework which states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas housing should be located where it would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Locating more houses in the villages would help maintain them and enhance their vitality as well as possibly increasing services and facilities such as supporting village schools.</p>

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO1613	Mr Charles Harris				Object	<p>Without the detailed analysis it difficult to comment on the plan as a whole other than in general terms, however I am not convinced that the assessment of future housing need underpinning the plan is sufficiently robust and sensitive, nor does it take into account demographic change and other population trends. For example; Over 80% of the UK population lives in towns and cities; this ratio is expected to rise to c90% by 2035 (NB Concentrating populations can help to tackle climate change and reduce carbon emissions) The population growth in areas like Staffordshire Moorlands is likely to grow at a slower rate than for England as a whole Lower levels of per capita income in the area suggest there is a need for a greater emphasis on affordable housing The housing needs of an aging population are not adequately recognized - a missed opportunity as this could improve housing market opportunities for growing families Cuts in rural public transport services are a great concern to many. This has led to a greater use of private cars and is increasing isolation and deprivation for people without access to the own personal transport further. This supports the need to focus growth on towns and cities National policies and fiscal actions affecting second homes and the private rented sector have not been factored in The opportunity to bring existing vacant and derelict properties back into use is missed, greater emphasis should be placed on using brownfield sites - there is strong support for this from both local councillors and local people. One of the core principles of the NPPF is to “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that is it not of high environmental value”. This suggests to me that more dwellings are being planned for than will be needed over the lifetime of the plan. My concern is that this may lead to more building than is necessary; too many of the wrong sort of homes, in the wrong place, at the cost of a irreversible loss of green field and priority habitats. This is exacerbated by a narrow interpretation of sustainability, which gives insufficient weight to the importance and value of biodiversity and infrastructure. Biodiversity has a key role in defining the local Moorlands character and distinctiveness and is an important part of local cultural heritage. I have chosen to comment by e-mail rather using the on-line option, which is not particularly user friendly. I hope that this feedback can be taken into account in reviewing the plan.</p>