THE PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

LAND NORTH OF STAFFORD

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT LOCATION

MEETING NOTES 2012 – 2013

Meetings Held:

2 March 2012

23 April 2012

15 October 2012

15 January 2013

5 March 2013

20 June 2013

STAFFORD BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

LAND NORTH OF STAFFORD - ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 2 MARCH 2012

In Attendance:

Ted Manders (TM)	-	Head of Planning & Regeneration, Stafford Borough Council
Chris May (CM)	-	Director, Pegasus Planning Group
Jon Hickton (JH)	-	Director, Maximus Strategic
Fraser Sandwith (FS)	-	Associate Director, Jones Lang LaSalle
Iain Miller (IM)	-	Director, Cameron Rose Associates
John Flynn (JF)	-	Regeneration Group Manager, Staffordshire County Council
Alex Yendole (AY)	-	Planning Policy Manager, Stafford Borough Council

- Following a brief round of introductions TM introduced the purpose of the meeting in order to establish progress to date and the position for future collaborative working on land north of Stafford.

- AY provided an update on the Plan for Stafford Borough (Local Development Framework Core Strategy) and the consultation exercise which took place on the 'preferred options' stage during September and October 2011. The Plan for Stafford Borough identifies site boundaries for Strategic Development Locations including land north of Stafford as well as detailed policies and reflects changes in the Government's approach through the Draft National Planning Policy Framework. The Council is keen to deliver growth based on local needs with key transport schemes to the west and north as well as significant town centre developments coming forward in the near future.

- CM asked about the LDF timetable and Duty to Co-operate. AY stated that progress is continuing in the context of Regional Spatial Strategy revocation and anticipation of the final National Planning Policy Framework. TM explained that the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy and its evidence base will be considered in progressing the Plan for Stafford Borough. The Duty to Co-operate and impact on neighbouring authorities is an important requirement of the new planning system but the Council considers that development north of Stafford is not unreasonable in the context of the North Staffordshire area. CM asked about work on the Western Direction of Growth (Burleyfields) and it was explained that a strategic framework is being progressed based on evidence from the developers and through a series of community engagement events. In addition sub-groups are being progressed to address location specific issues, with a deliverable transport solution from Martin Drive to Doxey Road.

- CM queried progress of transport evidence for land north of Stafford with IM contacting Staffordshire County Council on latest evidence. Preparing the evidence base needs to be progressed and AY to contact SCC for timescales. TM emphasised that infrastructure is a key component of new development. A brief discussion took place regarding the latest position on new employment sites at Beacon Business Park and Redhill as well as housing development at Ministry

of Defence land in the near future. TM raised the issues of further Highway Agency modelling work on Junctions 13 & 14, M6. JF explained that in preparing the planning application for Redhill the Environment Agency had raised significant concerns about drainage on Marston Brook and reducing run-off by a factor of 16, which have had to be addressed. This issue would also have an impact on other development sites in the area. Early dialogue with the Environment Agency was advised. JF explained that traffic modelling work had been completed to support new development at Redhill with FS asking for co-operation and sharing of information. SCC has raised issues of education provision in the area. The Government is being asked to support increased growth at Stafford. FS stated the developers were keen on collaborative working through on-going discussions with the Council.

- AY introduced an interim report recently prepared following an internal officer meeting between Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council representatives setting out a draft vision and key objectives for the land north of Stafford and asked for reactions / amendments from those present. Furthermore the potential for a future community engagement event was introduced in order to gain local support for new development and objectives for a strategic framework to guide future planning applications.

- Representatives from the developer organisations gave a positive response to working in partnership with Stafford Borough Council on this project and providing the necessary resources to deliver a robust project. CM expressed support for a joint master plan / strategic framework approach. FS wished further discussion on phasing and delivery approach for new development sites in the context of employment land at Redhill anticipated in coming forward. CM raised the issue of delivery in advance of the adopted Local Plan.

- AY agreed to circulate the Council's evidence base to those present in order for the developers to consolidate the latest information and surveys before progressing to the community engagement exercise. There was support for a meeting of key community stakeholders in the near future to begin discussion on key issues and matters of concern including establishing a shared vision.

- All the representatives at the meeting agreed to work in partnership on this project and committed to active engagement leading towards delivery through an effective project management approach. It was agreed that other key parties should be included in future meetings including Staffordshire County Council.

- It was agreed that a definitive ownership plan of the site and any relevant adjacent land should be formulated and circulated to all, co-ordinated by CM.

- Date of Next Meeting – 10.00 a.m. on 19 April 2012 (TBC) at Stafford Borough Council's offices to update on the evidenced based work, approach for community engagement and progressing the strategic framework.

Note prepared by Alex Yendole
Date last revised: 14/08/2013
Forward Planning Section, Stafford Borough Council

STAFFORD BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

LAND NORTH OF STAFFORD – PROJECT STEERING GROUP MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 23 APRIL 2012

In Attendance:

Ted Manders (TM)	-	Stafford Borough Council
Chris May (CM)	-	Pegasus Planning Group
Mark Dauncey (MD)	-	Pegasus Planning Group
Jon Hickton (JH)	-	Maximus Strategic
John Aspery (JA)	-	Jones Lang LaSalle
Fraser Sandwith (FS)	-	Jones Lang LaSalle
Naomi Kellett (NK)	-	Jones Lang LaSalle
Iain Miller (IM)	-	Director, Cameron Rose Associates
Nick Dawson (ND)	-	Staffordshire County Council
John Flynn (JF)	-	Staffordshire County Council
Phil Atkins (PA)	-	Stafford Borough Council
Alex Yendole (AY)	-	Stafford Borough Council

- Following a brief round of introductions, including PA from the Development Management team of Stafford Borough Council, TM introduced the purpose of the meeting to update on the evidenced based work, approach for community engagement and progressing the strategic framework. The notes of the previous meeting were agreed with no amendments or matters arising raised.

- AY provided an update on the Plan for Stafford Borough informing that meeting that a Strategic Policy Choices document is being considered by Cabinet on 10 May 2012 for public consultation. The Strategic Policy Choices document will set out the Council's position, taking into account the National Planning Policy Framework and revocation of the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. AY stated that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is nearing completion, which will be useful for on-going discussions concerning infrastructure for the land north of Stafford. The IDP will be a 'living' document and will be subject to updating for phasing, revised costs and assumptions. Other evidence based work is taking place on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and year end monitoring. TM highlighted that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment are also being updated.

- Following a query from FS it was confirmed that a wide range of infrastructure had been considered through the IDP. CM asked about the timetable for the new Plan and AY confirmed that following the Strategic Policy Choices consultation during June & July 2012 the Plan would be reach Publication stage in Autumn 2012 followed by Submission and Examination in Spring / Summer 2013 and adoption by the end of 2013. FS raised concern about land north of Stafford not being delayed due to Council resources being focused on land west of Stafford. TM welcomed the progress being made on land to the north of Stafford and the Council's support for preparing a strategic framework for this area.

- CM asked about the Duty to Co-operate. AY stated that after the Strategic Policy Choices document has been published and the IDP specific dialogue with key stakeholders will take place during Summer 2012 concerning the Duty to Co-operate including terms of agreements etc... TM re-iterated the Council's commitment to land north of Stafford in light concerns from the City of Stoke-on-Trent about development north of Stafford and at Stone. CM stated that the 2010 population projections had recently been published, but awaiting the 2010 household projections. CM agreed to circulate relevant information.

- CM agreed to circulate a map showing the land ownerships north of Stafford. CM agreed to prepare an up-to-date report summarising the evidence based studies for land north of Stafford including timescales for any updates this year. JH stated that further work is being prepared, based on Ordnance Survey data, for river modelling and transport modelling. CM confirmed that the land owners had agreed levels of co-operation but no formal legal agreements. The parties have agreed to progress a strategic framework, work jointly on public engagement and support development objectives but reserve the right to act independently in the future if necessary. ND stated the County Council's wish to have a shared vision for transport north of Stafford which proves deliverability and is evidence based.

- JF confirmed that a planning application has been submitted for employment land at Redhill by Staffordshire County Council, including flood modelling information based on discussions with the Environment Agency. There is a wetland as part of this site and therefore the requirements for Factor 16 reductions in surface water run-off had been revised. FS asked about the Council's position concerning this planning application but TM stated that it is yet to be determined. CM asked for the planning application to be made available electronically. AY to action.

- CM introduced a paper on public engagement and consultation prepared for both Pegasus Planning and Jones Lang LaSalle for land north of Stafford. The paper emphasises a series of steps to enable discussion and dialogue rather than a public exhibition providing a final answer. It will be important to access key contacts, establish a Reference Group and engage discussion, with support from the Council. Experience from the planning application at HP13 will be used.

- TM raised concerns about an apparent lack of response from Hopton & Coton Parish Council but CM confirmed that only an initial approach had been made. It is important to engage with all parties for a dialogue about land north of Stafford. AY suggested making contact with Stafford town Ward Councillors at the same time as Parish Councils. In response to TM asking about the nature of public engagement events CM stated that this work is still progressing but the objective is to not only engage communities in the local area but also across the Borough due to the significance of the land north of Stafford. A wider engagement process is important together with early meetings with key stakeholders such as the Environment Agency, Natural England and Staffordshire County Council education. CM stated that a strategic framework should be produced without any pre-conceived ideas on the location's development to enable true community engagement. FS stated his client's support for this approach for a strategic framework established on this basis.

- TM emphasised that engagement must meet the new requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework for pre-application discussions through an effective methodology and re-iterated that the Council will not accept a planning application in advance of a strategic framework or the Development Plan. CM stated that the public engagement work must be capable of use to support a planning application and the Development Plan must keep to its timetable. A detailed timetable for the public engagement process will be prepared by Pegasus Planning with Council officers to be involved in the reference and topic groups as well as Councillors actively involved. A viable position must be established before the Plan's independent Examination. TM offered to involve Councillors in the project at the appropriate time. AY agreed to prepare a Draft Project Plan for land north of Stafford for discussion at the next meeting, based on similar work for land west of Stafford. At this stage the public engagement and consultation paper prepared by Pegasus should not be widely circulated.

- JH confirmed that Maximus had control over Mr Butter's land between the two proposed housing sites as well as the Brandon family's farm. In addition there are on-going discussions with Mr Lockley about land being made available, if needed. JA confirmed that a co-ordination plan between the adjacent landowners is needed. JF stated that the community had raised transport and visual impact concerns with the Redhill employment development.

- ND confirmed that more work is scheduled to assess the transport implications for land north of Stafford, including transport modelling. Work on land to the west of Stafford is nearing completion and land north of Stafford will be progressed in the next two months. The transport model has been updated with the new housing proposals and it is apparent that some key issues around highway capacity need to be addressed including a new perimeter road verses widening Beaconside which could cause severance issues. Walking and cycling links also need to be considered providing appropriate alternative modes of movement. IM stated that the boulevard approach had been applied through the HP13 planning application but ND emphasised that there had been community opposition. CM asked for the County Council model to use current development provision, with ND confirmed that the SATURN model was being used but also reference to the wider Stafford Town Transport Strategy and public transport. No specific methodology was being used but traffic impacts had to be minimised. It is important to work together on traffic modelling to produce an effective outcome and keep to relevant timescales, whilst considering the strategic allocations. JH supported that two month timescale as this would link in with the public engagement process and TM confirmed the importance of development being delivered north and west of Stafford town on the Development Plan's strategy. ND stated that increasing the number of traffic controls along Beaconside may not be an acceptable solution. CM asked about the Redhill transport solutions. TM confirmed that the Highways Agency has asked for further modelling to take place for M6 Junctions 13 & 14. This work is based on the following brief:

  - Base 2012 VISSIM model produced for M6 Junction 13. Flows for 2031 from the 2007 SATURN model used to factor up background growth. Two model runs (AM and PM) for all projected plan development in 2031.

- Latest development flows for M6 Junction 14 from Jon Jarvis at SCC to evaluate net change in flows compared to original Stafford growth plan for land north of Stafford, as a comparison. The magnitude of the change can be assessed to determine if the net change warrants any further testing, along similar lines to that being carried out for M6 Junction 13.

- JH confirmed that on-going discussions with the Environment Agency are taking place regarding flood modelling and Marston Brook with FS stating that the developers were working together to feed information into the strategic framework. It was emphasised that further work is needed on open space provision and the mitigation approach, with land requirements, for Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace and discussions with Natural England. TM emphasis that this work needs to link into the Council's PPG17 Assessment. In addition school capacity needs to be established together with primary and secondary provision. Discussions are also needed with Severn Trent Water in terms of clean water and waste water provision for land north of Stafford. This will need to link into Severn Trent Water's strategic plan for the next 10-15 years.

- TM updated the meeting on the Ministry of Defence BORONA project. 1,100 MOD personnel together with dependants are due to return from Germany to Stafford in Summer 2015. Despite the Defence Review commitment for this initiative has been maintained by Government. Minor amendments have been made to the planning permission for the MOD headquarters site at Stafford. Staffordshire County Council is due to sign the Armed Forces Covenant shortly. There is a need for 390 new family homes for MOD personnel at Stafford as well as 160 rented accommodation in the first 5 year period. MOD 1 site is currently being assessed for asbestos which may mean an alternative site is needed. MOD procurement division has confirmed new build or purchase rather than rental. There is an issue with primary education provision to be resolved. Opportunities for grant aid are being considered. Planning permission has been granted for employment development at Beacon Business Park with support from the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Growing Places Fund bidding process.

- Date of Next Meeting – 10.00 a.m. on 21 June 2012 (TBC) at Stafford Borough Council's offices.

Note prepared by Alex Yendole
Date last revised: 14/08/2013
Forward Planning Section, Stafford Borough Council

STAFFORD BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

LAND NORTH OF STAFFORD – PROJECT STEERING GROUP MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 15 OCTOBER 2012

In Attendance:

Ted Manders (TM)	-	Stafford Borough Council
Chris May (CM)	-	Pegasus Planning Group
Mark Dauncey (MD)	-	Pegasus Planning Group
Jon Hickton (JH)	-	Maximus Strategic
John Aspery (JA)	-	Jones Lang LaSalle
Fraser Sandwith (FS)	-	Jones Lang LaSalle
Naomi Kellett (NK)	-	Jones Lang LaSalle
Simon Tucker	-	DTA
Iain Miller (IM)	-	Director, Cameron Rose Associates
Nick Dawson (ND)	-	Staffordshire County Council
Jon Jarvis (JJ)	-	Staffordshire County Council
Phil Atkins (PA)	-	Stafford Borough Council
Alex Yendole (AY)	-	Stafford Borough Council

- TM welcomed attendees to the meeting and a brief round of introductions took place. The notes of the previous meeting were agreed with no amendments or matters arising raised.

- AY provided an update on the Plan for Stafford Borough informing the meeting that significant progress had been made since April 2012. The Plan for Stafford Borough - Strategic Policy Choices document was subject to a consultation stage during June and July 2012, taking into account the National Planning Policy Framework and revocation of the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. A number of responses were received to the Strategic Policy Choices document, which have guided preparation of the Plan for Stafford Borough – Publication.

- AY reported that the Plan for Stafford Borough – Publication has now been made public and considered by a Special Meeting of Stafford Borough Councillors on 26 September 2012. The Publication (pre-submission stage) will begin following Full Council approval of the document on 27 November 2012. CM asked about timescales and AY stated that progress would be made on the pre-submission stage as soon as possible after Full Council. CM stated that Pegasus Planning would take the opportunity to make formal representations at the next stage.

- AY also reported that significant progress had been made in terms of the evidence base with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan finalised in July 2012, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment due to be published shortly, as well as annual monitoring information including the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and work on updating the Employment Land Review. The IDP will be a 'living' evidence base and will be subject to updating for phasing, revised costs and assumptions.

- TM stated that Councillors had raised a number of key issues at their recent meeting, including critical transport infrastructure. Planning permission has now been given for employment development at Redhill, following a deferred decision due to highway design changes. TM stated that both Staffordshire County and Stafford Borough Councillors were in dialogue regarding transport infrastructure.

- TM stated the importance of resolving key issues and establishing the deliverability of the northern Strategic Development Location as soon as possible in order to reach the Submission stage of the Plan for Stafford Borough. A concept plan had been prepared for inclusion in the Publication document to illustrate deliverability of the site. TM invited the developers to provide changes to the concept plan by Friday 9 November 2012 prior to Full Council. It is vitally important for key questions to be resolved and timescales for delivery given. FS stated that Akzo Nobel were seeking a larger allocation of housing than currently in the Publication version and that the concept plan should reflect master planning work being progressed by the developer consortium. CM stated that master planning work and a public consultation exercise is due to take place at the end of November 2012.

- CM reported that master planning work had been commissioned. JH stated that detailed discussions had been taking place with the Environment Agency and full flood risk modelling investigations were complete, with positive outcomes for establishing the developable area and acceptable run-off rates of 4 litres per second. Conclusions will enable a mixed-use frontage scheme to be delivered onto Beaconside together with a neighbourhood centre and extra care scheme. AY stated that the Council supported on-going work with the Environment Agency to address on-site mitigation measures as well as positive benefits to address downstream issues on Sandyford Brook through a collective deployment of resources, including funding from the Environment Agency. Existing river modelling linked to the 2D approach. TM stated that it was vital for engagement with Natural England to resolve mitigation measures for the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation including Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace. Such measures had led to issues for other Strategic Development Locations in terms of land use, resources and confirming deliverability.

- FS stated that infrastructure set out in the IDP would be incorporated into the master planning exercise but it is important to understand highway issues. Concern was also expressed about the extent of open space required but delivery of the developer's approach is on schedule for end of November 2012. TM stated it is vital to establish the number of new houses that will be delivered. CM confirmed that the number of houses could be delivered within their landholding including green infrastructure requirements. AY stated the importance of progressing with viability work for land north of Stafford, taking into account the infrastructure costs and other plan requirements

- FS stated that the current planning permission at Beaconside has been marketed and preferred house builder identified. Subject to completion of the sale on 10 December 2012 it is anticipated that new houses will be built in the coming year. FS asked about progress on land west of Stafford, which has yet to engage with the public.

- MD stated that discussions had been held with the Ministry of Defence. The Publication version of the Local Plan identified a separate provision for military housing. It was confirmed that 1 Site was being used to deliver new housing, having sorted asbestos issues. TM had asked the MoD regarding the future of 4 Site next to Beaconside, offset distances and incorporation into the overall area. A response is awaited.

- ND gave a presentation on transport modelling work and options assessed for delivering new highway infrastructure for land north of Stafford including access points, new road links, Do Minimum and Do Something options. Although development to the north of Stafford is deliverable in highway terms it will require new infrastructure. ND stated that clarification will be sought from Atkins consultants this Friday 19 October 2012 as traffic flows were predicted to be lower than anticipated by the scale of development envisaged. It was noted that Do Something 1 option would lead to severance of communities whilst Do Something 2 & 3 options would improve community cohesion but lead to new road links. Other options changed to number of new junctions required along Beaconside. ND stated that a draft report would be produced by December 2012 setting out the detailed evidence based work, options assessment and preferred solution, although it was emphasised that this would have to be agreed by Staffordshire County Council members before sign off. ND invited the developers to provide feedback by Friday 2 November 2012 on their preferred transport solution and any other options to be tested before the draft report is finalised.

- IM asked for confirmation that access arrangement for HP13 were included in the modelling, together with a new access for Redhill employment site north of Redhill Villa. ND confirmed this was the case. IM stated that some filtering of traffic through the Akzo Nobel sites may not be appropriate, although bus gates and other connections were being considered. Public transport initiatives need to be included as part of a fully designed transport scheme. A common understanding needs to be established with the transport modelling numbers.

- ST raised concern about landownerships in order to deliver the transport options identified. A number of alternative options need to be considered including with and without signal controls. TM expressed Councillors' concerns about increased number of signal controls along Beaconside. ST stated that other uses of land north of Stafford would also have implications such as new primary school provision, a potential new secondary school, extra care schemes etc... TM stated that further engagement is needed with Staffordshire County Council Education to establish the precise school provision for this area, at primary and secondary level. IM queried the position of the Highways Agency and it was confirmed that a report was being finalised setting out that there were no major concerns about the impact of development on M6 Jcts 13 & 14. AY to check current position.

- CM stated that public consultation and engagement events would take place over weekends 23 & 24 November as well as 30 November & 1 December 2012 at Stafford town centre and a local school to share draft vision and design layouts with the public through exhibition style events. Information would include opportunities and constraints as well as transport access options for the area.

The public would be encouraged to provide comments and feedback for further consideration to guide the development, to be delivered through the Pegasus consultation team. TM emphasised the importance of briefing Stafford Borough Councillors in advance of the events.

- AY stated that it was important to make progress due to the Submission stage and it was agreed that the next meeting should take place before Christmas. Due to the transport study being progressed in the next few weeks it was agreed that ND and JJ would meet with the developers' transport specialists week commencing 5 November 2012 to finalise options in advance of the public consultation and engagement event at the end of November 2012. This work would include an interim report setting out the Do Minimum position and a selective Options approach.

- Date of Next Meeting – 14.00 on Tuesday 18 December 2012 (TBC) at Stafford Borough Council's offices.

Note prepared by Alex Yendole
Date last revised: 14/08/2013
Forward Planning Section, Stafford Borough Council

STAFFORD BOROUGH NEW LOCAL PLAN

LAND NORTH OF STAFFORD – PROJECT STEERING GROUP MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 15th JANUARY 2013

In Attendance:

Chris May (CM)	-	Pegasus Planning Group
Mark Dauncey (MD)	-	Pegasus Planning Group
Fraser Sandwith (FS)	-	Jones Lang LaSalle
Naomi Perry (NP)	-	Stafford Borough Council
Iain Miller (IM)	-	Director, Cameron Rose Associates
Jon Jarvis (JJ)	-	Staffordshire County Council
Nick Dawson (ND)	-	Staffordshire County Council
Richard McCulloch (RM)	-	DTA
Phil Atkins (PA)	-	Stafford Borough Council
Alex Yendole (AY)	-	Stafford Borough Council

Apologies

Ted Manders (TM)	-	Stafford Borough Council

- AY provided an update on the Plan for Stafford Borough informing the meeting that the statutory consultation had begun on the Publication (Pre-submission) with representations to be submitted before 12 noon on Thursday 28 February 2013. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment update has now been completed along with an Employment Land Review which has been published on the Council's website. The Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment is also being updated, to be published in February 2013.

- CM queried how modifications would occur to the Plan for Stafford Borough through the Examination process. AY set out the approach to changes, with major modifications such as alterations to the 'red line' or developable area of the Strategic Development Location being considered through the Examination. Following a meeting with PINS in November 2012, Stafford Borough Council (SBC) had been advised to get the Plan submitted for the Examination as soon as possible. CM asked whether SBC are open to agreeing modifications and AY responded saying that SBC will be asking the Inspector to make modifications, although the Plan is considered to meet the tests of soundness in its current form. Any areas of disagreement identified in the statement of common ground can be addressed through the Examination process, subject to representations received. CM stated that the site boundary could be an area of disagreement outstanding.

- MD provided an update on the public consultation event being organised by the developers and currently taking place including an initial summary of the key issues and comments received. The issues raised related to the need for infrastructure, including transport, rather than objections to housing development

per se. MD stated that following completion of the events comments will be summarised and presented in a formalised statement. This will then be provided to SBC either as part of a planning application and / or to support representations on the Plan for Stafford Borough – Publication. In terms of the number of people visiting community exhibitions so far this was approximately 180 including SBC ward members. AY stated that SBC will be submitting a response to the master plan subject to public consultation. CM stated that this wasn't expected but comments would still be welcomed. In response to AY asking about timescales MD stated that there would not be a strict timetable for responses so long as it was received within a reasonable timeframe. AY stated that it would be a coordinated response on behalf of the Council and SBC members. PA agreed to provide detailed comments from Development Management. ND also stated that a response from Staffordshire County Council (SCC) may also be provided.

Action **AY to submit a Council response to the current public consultation, including a detailed response from Development Management. ND to consider providing a response from SCC**

Transport

- The SCC Transport Overview presentation has previously been finalised and circulated to the group. ND summarised the current position with the model having been re-calibrated, the assessment based on 3,100 new houses and three distinct options tested and considered. The report demonstrates that the perimeter road is the best solution for the area with a development of this size delivering significant transport solutions for the locality.

- IM stated that the results between the options did not show significant differences in transport solutions which might be expected. JJ confirmed that the perimeter road is still the best solution. IM enquired whether COBRA details had been included and JJ confirmed that these were not tested as part of the options. Nevertheless the perimeter road option would still be the best solution. CM summarised the developers concerns relating to this option which included cost, ownership issues, Stafford Common land issues and concluded that other options would be pursued. ND stated that all options would require third party land agreements to be delivered. CM stated that the perimeter road option would have deliverability issues for the Plan. Following a discussion it was concluded that the perimeter road would not cross Stafford Common and in any event ND stated the specific road location is only indicative at this time. RM and IM enquired where traffic movements were coming from / going to in terms of the model. JJ and ND confirmed that traffic movements were generated in combination from housing growth locations, journeys to town and growth based on existing traffic distribution.

  Action: JJ to provide traffic movement data to RM and IM.

- ND confirmed that 3rd party land may be an issue along the length of Beaconside if other solutions were pursued. CM stated that there was other land in the consortium's ownership so this isn't a significant issue along Beaconside.

- CM asked about the impact of the Ministry of Defence housing site along Beaconside. It was concluded that this was not a comparable site in terms of traffic issues due to significantly different journey to work patterns.

- RM enquired why the traffic modelling showed increased movements east to west direction across Stafford town. JJ stated that further information would be available through the traffic data to be provided.

- The issue of community severance by the Beaconside road needs to be addressed in both the design of the master plan and transport solutions. Severance is an issue raised by local communities as well as multiple traffic signals on Beaconside frustrating residents and leading to traffic diverting through Stafford town centre. Although there are engineering solutions, AY emphasised that the Council's aspiration was for a sustainable vibrant community, well integrated to the town and this needs to be acknowledged by the consortium through any master plan and future planning application. A development of this size should not deliver the cheapest solutions available.

- CM stated that a transport assessment had been provided to SCC some time ago and no response had been received to date. SCC acknowledged that a report had been received but only provided do minimum solutions rather than reasonable alternative transport options. ND stated that SCC had been pro-active in presenting traffic data, running a model and will now be producing a report which offers a solution to development growth in this area by the end of January 2013.

  Action: ND & JJ to produce a draft report for end of January 2013 setting out transport solutions for land north of Stafford.

- IM confirmed that once relevant traffic data had been received, a response to the SCC report would be provided and this will contribute to a representation on the Plan for Stafford Borough – Publication. The objective of the Project Group was agreed to demonstrate transport issues and show that all traffic solutions have been considered in an amended Statement of Common Ground for Submission.

- FS enquired as to whether the solution to development to the west is in the public domain. AY said the report has been signed off and will be available as part of the evidence for the Examination.

  Action: AY to progress with an amended Statement of Common Ground following the Plan for Stafford Borough – Publication deadline.

Flooding and Drainage

- MD confirmed that work with the Environment Agency (EA) was on-going. A flood storage area has been identified in the draft master plan although discussions with EA were indicating a larger area may be required.

Green Infrastructure / Open Space

- NP gave an update the work relating to Cannock Chase SAC. The Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) reports will be published soon. The Council will be meeting with Natural England soon to discuss SANGS guidance and requirements for large developments. The Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Partnership is meeting shortly to discuss a strategic approach to SANGS.

Action: CM to arrange a meeting with Natural England to progress SANGs
NP to report Partnership outcomes to the next meeting.

Next steps

- The issue of inviting statutory consultees to the next meeting was discussed and it was agreed that this be arranged by AY. The developers agreed that there had been limited contact with statutory consultees to date and there are key areas requiring detailed discussions and solutions to progress the project. AY stated it will be useful to have all groups present as there may be solutions to issues which have multiple benefits. EA, Natural England, SBC Leisure and SCC education to be invited to the next meeting.

Action: AY to co-ordinate statutory consultees attendance at next meeting.

- CM confirmed that the consortium was progressing with submitting a planning application, but not necessarily before the Examination. CM stated that feedback on the public consultation event will inform the process and be provided to SBC as soon as possible. AY asked about further details being provided to the community in terms of transport options and alternative options for delivery as part of a feedback process. CM stated that there will not be a feedback event as the developers consider planning to be part of a continuous process. Where possible, there will be efforts to demonstrate how comments have been addressed.

- AY asked if there the developers had prepared any viability assessments or had any concerns about deliverability. FS confirmed that the developers were not yet in a position to assess viability because this depends on the costings of the 'big ticket' infrastructure items. Nevertheless there was no indication at this time that the site is unviable at the moment.

- Date of Next Meeting – March 2013.

Note prepared by Naomi Perry
Date last revised: 14/08/2013
Forward Planning Section, Stafford Borough Council

PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

LAND NORTH OF STAFFORD MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 5 MARCH 2013

In Attendance:

Fraser Sandwith (FS)	-	Jones Lang LaSalle
Chris May (CM)	-	Pegasus Planning Group
Jon Jarvis (JJ)	-	Staffordshire County Council
Nick Dawson (ND)	-	Staffordshire County Council
Mark Dauncey (MD)	-	Pegasus Planning Group
Richard McCulloch (RM)	-	DTA
Jon Hickton (JH)	-	Maximus Strategic
Lucy Smith (LS)	-	Environment Agency
John Dingley (JD)	-	Environment Agency
Anthony Muller (AM)	-	Natural England
Val Evans (VE)	-	Stafford Borough Council - Planning
Alex Yendole (AY)	-	Stafford Borough Council - Planning
Phil Atkins (PA)	-	Stafford Borough Council - Planning
Roger Leverett (RL)	-	Stafford Borough Council - Leisure

- AY welcomed everyone to the meeting and a round of introductions took place. AY provided an update on the Plan for Stafford Borough – Publication with the statutory period of seeking representations on soundness and legal compliance having closed at 12 noon on 28th February 2013. The Council is currently processing the representations submitted including a number of representations received from local groups, developers and Environment Agency with regard to the land North of Stafford. Key issues raised included queries on viability, deliverability, transport pressures, new services and facilities, scale of new development, design and the number of houses. AY stated that the Council was aiming to submit the Plan for independent Examination in May / June 2013 with the Examination anticipated in September / October 2013.

- MD reported that the developer's public consultation events had taken place during January and February 2013 with over 800 people attending on 15th /16th February with over 800 people. A report of the comments received is currently being produced although MD stated that there were no major objections raised. The main issues raised were concerning transport, design and access to services but generally there was a positive reaction to the new developments. In line with good practice through the Statement of Community Involvement the report and linked information will be shared to provide feedback. MD stated that since the public consultation events the proposed scheme had been changed to reflect the initial alignment of the HS2 route.

- FS stated that a comprehensive consultation exercise had taken place with all responses being considered to develop the master plan and address specific issues through site delivery. The objective is to complete this work by May / June 2013 to correspond with the Submission of the new Local Plan.

- AY stated that it is important to discuss deliverability of the Strategic Development Locations around Stafford in the context of viability and infrastructure requirements. A joint meeting / summit is being planned for April / May 2013 to achieve common consensus on viability evidence and delivery.

- PA provided initial development management comments based on the latest plans presented by the developers for the public consultation events. PA welcomed the variety of street patterns and built form but emphasised that existing features such as trees, ponds and hedgerows should be retained and incorporated into the overall scheme. It was noted that significant landscaping and open space provided a buffer between the built development and adjoining open countryside. PA asked if prominent views into and out of the site had been considered along with the essential constraints. Furthermore it is important that sustainable modes of transport such as foot and cycle ways are incorporated into the scheme. PA mentioned the potential impact of the proposed HS2 route on the site as well as the requirement to meet Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs) provision to mitigate the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation. It was agreed that a further discussion would be welcomed. FS stated that comments from PA would be welcomed on Akzo Nobel's land. AY informed the meeting that the area of land being promoted by the developer / landowner representatives was greater than the allocation shown in Plan for Stafford Borough. Furthermore a representation had been received from a Mr Lockley seeking his land to be included within the new Local Plan. AY stated that any amendments to the site boundary would be considered through the Examination process.

Transport

- RM introduced key messages from a transport report prepared by the developers and provided to Staffordshire County Council (SCC) on 1 March 2013 in the context of a number of solutions being identified by SCC. A number of deliverable access strategies were being assessed to correspond with delivery of new housing north of Stafford, to be reflected, in detail, through subsequent master plans to be produced. AY asked what recommendations were being presented by the transport report. RM replied that the report puts forward access strategies but no recommendations on the strategic road infrastructure for the area. RM stated that the new community would be incorporated into transport networks of a radial nature for Stafford. It was emphasised that further work would be needed to identify compatibility with public transport, walking to bus stops etc... ND stated that SCC were progressing with a report for land north of Stafford to assess

strategic transport infrastructure requirements in the context of an audit of available transport issues. This report is scheduled to be completed by April 2013. FS stated that transport evidence prepared by Cameron Rose had clarified that new development is deliverable north of Stafford, including the 1st phase of 400 new homes without prejudicing wider transport solutions. ND suggested a further meeting would be useful when the transport evidence is available.

Education

- AY stated that SCC Education has recently provided evidence and information on education requirements at primary and secondary school provision to developer representatives. As a result no-one was attending this meeting from SCC Education but the Borough Council will continue to work closely with the County. Currently a plan wide study is being prepared concerning future education requirements, scheduled to be completed by May 2013 including key requirements for Strategic Development Locations. AY to provide feedback when the report is completed.

Flooding

- LS stated the positive discussions had taken place with the developers on flooding issues and site drainage, with a number of solutions modelled and final recommendations with the final report now being sought from Environment Agency Regional Office. Calibration between the previous and new model has been completed. Solutions will focus on attenuation, to be finalised, together with existing flooding areas. A study of flood risk management for the whole of Stafford town was being prepared and will be consulted upon regarding general principles to accommodate extra flood area to accommodate new development, with plenty of opportunity for attenuation. FS stated that Flood Risk modelling should be shared but the developers had confidence that flood attenuation can be accommodated. FS queried whether new wetland areas could be incorporated into SANGS requirement. RL asked how flood attenuation would impact on Astonfields Local Nature Reserve and if reduction of water flows downstream would impact on reed beds. LS confirmed that impacts on Astonfields would be assessed once the general study was completed. AY asked for timescales and LS confirmed that the reports would be completed by April 2013 setting out initial scoping and gains assessed. FS stated the developers would share information and evidence on flood risk work. RL asked for an update on the Sustainable Drainage System Approval Board to be taken over by Staffordshire County Council in 2014.

Green Infrastructure / Open Space

- AM stated that a holistic approach was required to deliver new Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs) as mitigation for the Cannock Chase SAC. RL welcomed the general approach to new open space as part of the development but emphasised that play areas should be

incorporated into wider neighbourhood facilities on-site. Formal sports pitches should be delivered in one location on-site and aligned with the new primary school through new artificial pitches and 3G multi-pitch provision. Housing mix should be linked to open space standards, which had previously been sent to the developers. There was not further update on the relocation of Stafford Rangers. RL stated that the two development sites should be linked together for joint sport's provision rather than increasing internal trips. FS asked about the open space requirement of 34m" per person verses the latest quantity of open space required. The Plan for Stafford Borough includes the standards as an appendix.

- AM introduced the general principles of SANGS and explained that the new areas to be identified would have to provide multi functions and take into account existing site designations. It is important to understand the open space / recreation pressures on existing pieces of land with a holistic approach required. AM provided an update on the Footprint Ecology evidence-based reports published demonstrating the typical characteristics required for SANGs, information on visitors travelling from further afield verses local residents and the zone of influence set at 75% population. The zone of influence for new development was identified at 15 kilometres and needed to be reflected through site specific mitigation measures. Further recommendations will be considered for application regarding the Cannock Chase SAC as new development comes forward. The Cannock Chase SAC Partnership need to sign up and agree interim arrangements.

- FS asked whether SANGS provision could be made off site and confirmed that the developers were considering contributes from elsewhere. What scale of demand for recreation needs to be offset by the people relationship – new residents of land and usability of site. AM stated that SANGs provision should be made as close to the new development as possible to provide the alternative for local residents. Provision could be incorporated into the design of the new proposal of this scale with 3 -5 kilometre walks. RL asked if Sport England had been introduced to the scheme, AY stated this had not occurred to date. It was emphasised that SANGs provision was different to new open space requirements. Furthermore the extensive areas of open space bisected by the proposed HS2 route would have an impact on the quality and usability of SANGs / green infrastructure in this location.

Next steps

- AY encouraged further work to progress the strategy including the developers to provide a timetable for further master planning work, viability evidence and completing transport studies. AM stated that further discussion would be required on SANGs delivery with AM to assess linkages with the evidence base. AY asked if there had been any engagement with HS2 from the developers. MD stated that the HS2 route may change following consultation in Summer 2013 and at this stage it is difficult to quantify noise impacts and land take

implications. AY informed the meeting that the local authority was having a meeting with HS2 Ltd and would provide feedback with regards to construction details in due course.

Date of next meeting to be arranged – May 2013

PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

LAND NORTH OF STAFFORD MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 20 JUNE 2013

In Attendance:

Ted Manders (TM)	-	Stafford Borough Council - Planning
Fraser Sandwith (FS)	-	Jones Lang LaSalle
Kieran McLaughlin	-	Jones Lang LaSalle
Alexandra Alarcon	-	Jones Lang LaSalle
Chris May (CM)	-	Pegasus Planning Group
Jon Jarvis (JJ)	-	Staffordshire County Council
Nick Dawson (ND)	-	Staffordshire County Council
Mark Dauncey (MD)	-	Pegasus Planning Group
Richard McCulloch (RM)	-	DTA
Jon Hickton (JH)	-	Maximus Strategic
Alex Yendole (AY)	-	Stafford Borough Council - Planning
Phil Atkins (PA)	-	Stafford Borough Council - Planning

- TM welcomed everyone to the meeting and a round of introductions took place. AY provided an update on the Plan for Stafford Borough – Publication. In April & May 2013 a further consultation took place to address strategic locations not previously considered by the Sustainability Appraisal process. Less than 50 representations were received to this consultation exercise, which closed on 31st May 2013.All representations are available to view on the Council's web-site, including an alternative strategic allocation at Clarke's Farm, Stafford, which challenges land north of Stafford. AY stated that the Council was aiming to submit the Plan for independent Examination in July 2013 with the Examination anticipated in October 2013.

Transport

- JH stated that the red line area within the Plan for Stafford Borough – Publication is different than the area under control of the developers. TM confirmed that this issue would be considered as part of the Examination process regarding viability and deliverability.

- ND briefly introduced the Staffordshire County Council report regarding the assessment of future transport infrastructure for land north of Stafford, with a preferred option identified as an extended perimeter road from A34 to B5066 Sandon Road. RM stated that the report did not present any fundamental constraints to developing the two sites north of Stafford, with new road infrastructure to be accommodated together with sustainable transport solutions. It was stated that a significant number of trips would be contained within the sites to access services and facilities, rather than requiring movements to other parts of Stafford. RM stated that there were no significant differences between the longer and shorter perimeter road options, although

integration of the two developer sites should be considered. ND stated that the transport infrastructure requirement was necessary to ensure the scheme was integrated effectively into the wider Stafford road network. TM emphasised that the transport report needed to be agreed at this stage of the process rather than details being addressed at the planning application stage. The master plan work needs to incorporate the new road layout to demonstrate delivery and viability. There was concern that the developers should be working collaboratively to deliver the land north of Stafford and there would be linked trips to other locations across Stafford particularly due to education requirements and connectivity.

- RM stated that 90% of people will use local facilities, therefore taking pressure of traffic movements off the Beaconside road. Sustainable communities will access facilities by walking and cycling rather than the car, with the road network constructed as the development is built out.

- JH stated that the developers are not able to offer the longer perimeter road as an option at this stage because the land is not fully controlled. Part of the route crosses Mr Lockley's landholding and there is no agreement in place. Furthermore Mr Lockley is seeking to exchange some of his land south of Beaconside next to Stafford Common for another parcel of Common Land north of Beaconside. This is leading to complications in completing a deal on the land. JH stated that there are on-going negotiations, and agreement is being sought urgently. Therefore two separate scenarios are being considered for delivering the new road, based on the process of securing agreement. TM stated that the Plan for Stafford Borough's Examination will be taking place shortly and these issues need to be addressed to demonstrate viability and deliverability. ND stated that Staffordshire County Council preferred the longer perimeter road with bus integration, demonstrated by modelling to address traffic pressures on Beaconside and increased capacity. ND confirmed that some access to frontages could be made from the new perimeter road, which would be approximately 6.5 – 7.3 metres in width, provided bus services could be accommodated.

- CM stated that neither the short or long perimeter road was accepted across the Maximus landholding, with dualling of Beaconside being their preference. However, the short perimeter road across Akzo Nobel's land from A34 to Beaconside, as shown in the Stafford Borough Local Plan 2001, to link with Common Road / Marston Lane junction, was (subject to confirmation from Akzo Nobel) acceptable. CM asked for confirmation that the road network could integrate with the new development proposal rather than being a definitive perimeter road similar to the Stafford Western Access Route. This was accepted by ND. The function of the new road infrastructure is to mitigate the development's impact on Beaconside, primarily, although there may be some through traffic to provide capacity on Beaconside. JJ stated that there would be local transport impacts between the shorter and longer perimeter road but not significant differences. However TM stated the Stafford Borough Members supported the longer perimeter road and

this should be explored as a priority. A shorter route may have to be accepted if the land is not made available. It was confirmed that Stafford Borough Council would publish the Staffordshire County Council report as soon as possible.

- CM stated that Taylor Wimpey should be engaged in a phasing approach and delivery of transport infrastructure to address capacity at Redhill and along Beaconside opposite the Parkside area. FS noted that the County Council was currently carrying out work on the A34 to access the employment site via a new signalised junction. Despite the works, he noted that the County Council' transport report was suggesting that there might be potential to deliver a roundabout for access to the housing area east of A34 in the future to replace new signals.

- FS reiterated the difficulties of land ownership to deliver the longer perimeter road but confirmed that Akzo Nobel's land would take access from Beaconside and the A34. It was accepted that this approach should be reflected in the Staffordshire County Council report regarding junction improvements (Figure 7.6). It is important to ensure sufficient capacity is provided to reduce pressure on existing road junctions. FS confirmed that the road infrastructure would not be a showstopper for delivering land north of Stafford.

- AY stated that the Council had recently engaged Levvel consultants to prepare viability evidence for the Strategic Development Locations at Stafford for the Examination, with the work to be completed by mid July 2013. Therefore it was encouraged that meetings should take place in the next couple of weeks to discuss viability assumptions, establish infrastructure costs and identify any differences in approach. CM confirmed that viability consultants had been engaged and would progress with this work to consider key infrastructure, affordable housing, education and roads. JH raised concern about the cost of new road infrastructure not being known due to Mr Lockley's land and the amounts being sought. ND stated that Staffordshire County Council had not costed the options set out in the transport report, nor the dualling of Beaconside approach. FS stated that until an outline application was being processed with a Section 106 agreement the detailed infrastructure costs would not be known. CM confirmed that further negotiations would be needed on some infrastructure costs and flexibility to be applied. AY emphasised that the policy in the new Local Plan had to demonstrate deliverability to the Examination so therefore this work is vital. It was agreed that some high level viability assumptions on costs could be established to support the work being progressed by Levvel. EC Harris (developer's viability consultants) would be able to provide alternative scenarios.

Education

- TM stated that Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council had commissioned an education report, which will provide

information about the level of education provision required and the location of new facilities across Stafford town, including for the Strategic Development Locations. This report will be shared as soon as it is available in July. MD stated that Sir Graham Balfour secondary school could be extended to provide more education capacity. TM emphasised that a new secondary school on land north of Stafford may be needed later in the Plan period, costing £20 million excluding land. JH stated that a new secondary school would have a fundamental impact on delivery of the scheme, noting that there is adequate provision in the existing system. CM confirmed that new primary schools would be developed as part of the scheme together with appropriate secondary school financial contributions. However any change to this approach would have significant impacts on viability.

Flooding

- AY updated the meeting following a discussion with the Environment Agency. Evidence prepared by the developers was welcomed in terms of flooding and drainage issues within the land north of Stafford. The Environment Agency are currently securing funding to produce a report, based on modelling impacts for Marston Brook and Sandyford Brook. It is anticipated that this work will be completed in Autumn 2013 and will be presented to a future meeting.

Green Infrastructure / Open Space

- AY updated the meeting following a discussion with Stafford Borough Council's Leisure Department. Detailed open space requirements, based on 3,100 new homes north of Stafford, will be prepared in the next few weeks, taking account of the master plans produced in December 2012. This work will correspond to an update of the Open Space, Sport and Recreation strategy which is currently being finalised and will be made available in July 2013. It was noted that the evidence base and strategy report has specific requirements for Strategic Development Locations. FS stated that costs needed to be established to support the viability work.

- MD stated that discussions were on-going with Natural England about the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs) requirements. It was noted that Footprint Ecology had produced a mitigation report earlier this year but specific costs and off-site provision were still to be confirmed. CM stated that land north east of the proposed HS2 line was not necessarily to be used for green space provision but rather links to Stafford Common and existing green infrastructure. JH stated that public consultation will be taking place in July 2013 on the HS2 preferred route.

Next steps

- AY stated that following the viability work, a Statement of Common Ground would need to be revisited, in August 2013, prior to the

Examination. CM agreed to provide evidence for any matters raised by the Inspector concerning land north of Stafford to support the Council.

- TM asked about the 5 year housing land supply position and housing delivery before 2018 on land north of Stafford. A delivery approach was sought. JH stated that housing delivery would be sought as soon as possible, subject to the market and willing house builders. In essence the market will phase the development depending on willing buyers and therefore a phasing approach would be difficult to justify in the new Local Plan. JH agreed to provide AY with updates in terms of discussions with Mr Lockley.

- Date of next meeting to be arranged – September 2013