

# **THE PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH**

## **LAND WEST OF STAFFORD**

### **STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT LOCATION**

#### **MEETING NOTES 2011 – 2013**

Meetings Held:

- 14 September 2011
- 3 October 2011
- 8 November 2011
- 14 November 2011
- 16 March 2012
- 22 June 2012
- 16 August 2012
- 22 August 2012
- 20 September 2012
- 29 October 2012
- 10 January 2013
- 26 February 2013
- 21 March 2013
- 11 April 2013
- 6 June 2013



**STAFFORD BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**  
**ATLAS (BURLEYFIELDS) ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY MEETING**

**DATE OF MEETING: 14 SEPTEMBER 2011**

*In Attendance:*

Ian Thompson (IT)	- Chief Executive, Stafford Borough Council (chair)
Adrian Clack (AC)	- Strategic Land Regional Director, Taylor Wimpey
Richard Hickman (RH)	- Planning Manager, St Modwen
Sarah Milward (SM)	- Senior Strategic Planning Manager, Taylor Wimpey
Russell Poole (RP)	- Estate Manager, Lord Stafford
Ben Stacey (BS)	- Regional Planning Manager, Bellway Homes
Richard Stevenson (RS)	- Regional Director, Bellway Homes
	Iain Griffin – MLA representing Saint Gobain
Stephen Hill (SH)	- Advisory Team for Large Applications Service (ATLAS)
Julian Pye (JP)	- Advisory Team for Large Applications Service (ATLAS)
Robert Gatensbury (RG)	- Economic Regeneration Manager, Stafford Borough Council
Alex Yendole (AY)	- Principal Planning Officer, Stafford Borough Council

- Following a brief round of introductions IT introduced the purpose of the meeting in order to establish progress to date and the position for future collaborative working between the Developer's consortium and Stafford Borough Council on land west of Stafford (Burleyfields).
- JP provided a brief overview of ATLAS and its role within this project including progress to date on work with the Council. ATLAS offers to support the timely delivery of significant new development areas by invitation for interested parties, does not charge a fee and has extensive experience from other projects as well as specialist support. The emphasis is on partnership working and delivery.
- AY provided an update on the Plan for Stafford Borough (Local Development Framework Core Strategy) and the current consultation exercise taking place on the 'preferred options' stage during September and October 2011 with the deadline for responses being Friday 21 October 2011. The Plan for Stafford Borough identifies site boundaries for Strategic Development Locations including land west of Stafford as well as detailed policies and reflects changes in the Government's approach through the Draft National Planning Policy Framework.
- AC raised the issue that the site boundaries for land west of Stafford did not fully comply with landownership's and queried whether the areas identified were for new housing development or included other uses. A query was also raised concerning the Council's approach for the Burleyfields area in terms of preparing an Area Action Plan or identify as a strategic site allocation. AY stated that there was an opportunity to respond to the current consultation concerning the site boundaries identified and emphasised that the areas identified would include a mix of uses to provide for a future sustainable community as part of the Plan for Stafford Borough rather than being included in a future Area Action Plan.

- AC stated that representatives had recently met to assess the evidence base for land west of Stafford (Burleyfields) and identify any gaps to be filled. Colin Campbell at Savills had been engaged to co-ordinate this evidenced based work with a range of other consultants involved including transport, drainage, ecology as well as Barton Willmore working on the master planning exercise. It was anticipated that work on the evidence base and master planning would be completed by the end of October 2011 including an indicative approach with a vision and key objectives. AC confirmed that no specific collaboration or agreement had been reached on the delivery of infrastructure for the area. IT emphasised that the current housing development by Redrow Homes needed to be incorporated into the overall master planning approach at Burleyfields.
- 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 west of Stafford (Burleyfields) and asked for reactions / amendments from those present. Furthermore the potential for a two-day community engagement event was briefly introduced as part of a pre-application consultation process, with Stafford Borough Council acting as the lead organisation with developer organisations providing staff and funding resources together with ATLAS supporting facilitation. It was acknowledged that local Ward Members and the Parish Council needed to be involved in the process to deliver quality outcomes and robust collaboration.
- 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. AY agreed to circulate the interim report electronically to enable a more detailed discussion and feedback at the next meeting together with a draft Project Management approach.
- AC asked about the New Homes Bonus being used to support new infrastructure at Burleyfields. IT responded that the New Homes Bonus would be used to support Council resources as other Government grants and the overall funding settlement had been cut. However the Council was making progress with a new Community Infrastructure Levy for the area to support new infrastructure.
- 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 Savills and Staffordshire County Council together with topic based discussions with leisure representatives and the Environment Agency when appropriate.
- 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 AC.
- ATLAS to share initial project engagement plan with all parties for information.

- Consortium to consider timing of future master planning work in respect of the commitment to working collaboratively and the requirement to positively engage with the local community.
- Date of Next Meeting – Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2011 at Stafford Borough Council's offices to seek consensus on the draft vision and key objectives, an update on the evidenced based work, project management approach and progressing the master plan.

Note prepared by Alex Yendole

Date last revised: 14/08/2013

Forward Planning Section, Stafford Borough Council



## Land West of Stafford - Burleyfields

Designing a new sustainable neighbourhood for Burleyfields -  
**Collaborative discussion: Project vision, objectives and project management**

**Meeting Note: 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2011, Civic Offices, Stafford**

### List of Attendees

Colin Campbell (CC)	-	
James DeHavilland (JDH)	-	Savills consultants on behalf of the Developer Consortium
Richard Hickman (RH) -		Barton Willmore (BW) on behalf of the Developer Consortium
Sarah Milward (SM)	-	Planning Manager, St Modwen
Russell Poole (RP)	-	Senior Strategic Planning Manager, Taylor Wimpey
Ben Stacey (BS)	-	Estate Manager, Lord Stafford
Richard Stevenson (RS)	-	Regional Planning Manager, Bellway Homes
Nick Dawson (ND)	-	Regional Director, Bellway Homes
Stephen Hill (SH) -		Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Transport
Julian Pye (JP)	-	Advisory Team for Large Applications Service (ATLAS)
Ted Manders (TM)	-	Advisory Team for Large Applications Service (ATLAS)
John Holmes (JH)	-	Head of Planning & Regeneration, Stafford Borough Council
Alex Yendole (AY) -		Development Control Manager, Stafford Borough Council
		Principal Planning Officer, Stafford Borough Council

## Key issues

<b>Shared Vision / Objectives</b>				<b>ACTIONS</b>
	<b>Consortium</b>	<b>SBC</b>	<b>SCC</b>	
	Expressed general support but raised some concerns set out below:			Consortium to suggest wording for vision/objectives for discussion
<b>Infrastructure: Stafford Western Access Improvement (WAI)</b>	It will have town wide benefits and clarity is required in respect of its direct need / benefit to the proposed scheme along with timing and funding (see below). Also, what form will it need to take and how will it function within the development scheme and integrate with the wider town area	A key requirement for development to the west of Stafford is delivery of part of the WAI from Martin Drive to Doxey Road railway bridge. An integrated approach is essential with links to existing communities	Confirmed that phase 1 of WAI is considered relevant to scheme (from site to Doxey Road) and that total funding would be required (although unclear as to whether there was any additional money to support future bids).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Share all existing technical work</li> <li>▪ Clarify likely costs (£3m)?</li> <li>▪ Agree timing of provision</li> <li>▪ Agree design of route / street etc... and interaction with the rest of the proposed development</li> <li>▪ Agree how to communicate proposals to community etc</li> </ul>
<b>Education / Community</b>	Primary/nursery: Need to determine actual requirement, and location, plus flexibility / co location etc  Secondary/sixth form: need to justify scale of contributions sought and consider implications for viability as part of overall package	The existing school at Doxey will be retained and a new school provided at Burleyfields	525-place primary (including nursery) likely to be required –allow 2.5 ha. Plus contribution toward secondary and sixth form	SCC / SBC - Determine on-site requirements and provide further justification of calculations. Identify potential phasing and likely contribution required. Consider contribution in light of overall package and viability issues
<b>Open Space</b>	Need to determine amount and type along with strategic location. Key issue relates to compensatory measures for Cannock Chase SAC			Advise further on open space audit / shortfall and geographic / physical requirements  SBC to confirm approach toward SAC mitigation
<b>Car Parking</b>				SBC / SCC to consider required approach and future



				flexibility verses quality of place required.
<b>Neighbourhood Centre</b>	Likely that community hub should include all the necessary facilities in one location, potentially on a new High Street approach	Essential to integrate with existing communities		Consortium: to map existing community uses and set out delivery of future facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BW / ATLAS to consider examples of how a 'local neighbourhood centre' might be provided</li> <li>▪ SBC / SCC consider range of services they would consider relevant to a neighbourhood centre (including potential for local employment)</li> </ul>
<b>Density v place</b>	Too much emphasis being placed upon numerical density rather than a place led, design led approach. Suggest level of development referred to as "around 2,200" to reflect design-led approach	Will consider a range of densities in different locations across the site area. Acknowledgment that an up to figure of 2200 houses would be helpful.	Acknowledgment that an up to figure of 2200 houses would be helpful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BW/ to scope out initial suggestions for approach to master planning</li> </ul>
<b>Physical Constraints</b>	Need to identify / map all key constraints, including latest Environment Agency (EA) data			Update current plan bases – Consortium to speak with EA
<b>Site Area</b>	need certainty/clarity over allocation	No objection to inclusion of additional land to overall site area	No objection to inclusion of additional land to overall site area	Agree revised site area (i.e. red line) through consultation response to Draft Publication
<b>Employment</b>	Determine types of employment required	Reflect work done to date re: employment strategy; establish if additional evidence required. Flexible regarding what constitutes employment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inclusion of employment sites, currently adjacent to red line, would benefit wider consideration of master planning.</li> <li>▪ Seek views of local community on form and location of employment</li> </ul>

Energy, waste & water	<p>Will need to understand constraints across the area, but solutions/responses to issues, such as drainage and energy, are likely to vary across the area. Key is whether solutions/responses for parts of the area have a detrimental impact elsewhere within Burleyfields or across a wider area.</p> <p>Site-wide energy infrastructure is likely to be prohibitively costly</p>	<p>Take account of SBC Renewable Energy Study.</p> <p>Agree that key issue is reducing carbon, rather than means to achieve</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Confirm County Council contact</li> <li>▪ Consortium to appoint energy consultant for high level strategy.</li> </ul>
Master planning	<p>SPD likely to add delay. Development Team approach offers opportunity to work collaboratively and agree spatial framework.</p> <p>Consortium considered that it might not be necessary to consider the submission of a single outline planning application with supporting masterplan. I.e. a strategic spatial framework might provide sufficient level of certainty and then individual applications with supporting master plans could be submitted for consideration.</p>	<p>Concerned about future control of certainty of the process (i.e. strategic framework / planning applications &amp; delivery mechanisms). Quality of outcomes along with agreement of relevant and necessary planning obligations by the consortium.</p> <p>Agreed SPD not necessary</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need to consider further detail of BW's Cascades proposal;</li> <li>▪ Consider future control and delivery mechanisms.</li> <li>▪ Collaborative session re: initial concepts</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>
Other	<p>Requirement to engage members in the process</p> <p>Need to clarify the type of community engagement event required</p>	<p>Wish to involve the community in the process of formulating initial concepts for the place</p>		<p>Consider methods of engagement e.g. members sitting on Board and working groups; briefing papers etc Consortium to give initial consideration to potential approaches to this</p>
Viability	<p>Overall approach of development plan (eg affordable housing) and approach to the site needs to take into account viability.</p>	<p>Recognise need for viability. Affordable housing being assessed as part of work on CIL</p>		<p>Complete work on affordable housing viability and CIL</p> <p>Assess costs of WAI</p>

<b>Key Milestones</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>Information</b>
Core Strategy Examination	Summer 2012	Strategic Framework Plan (agreed)
Brief key stakeholders on process	Autumn 2011	
Community Engagement Event	Early 2011/12	Need to agree format and scope
Planning applications(s)	tba	Re: site wide concepts
Reserved matters applications	tba	Supporting detailed Master plan(s)

**Next Steps**

Refer to actions set out above;

1. Agree all baseline evidence (e.g. constraints etc..)
2. Consider representations to Core Strategy consultation
3. Agree refined vision and objectives
4. Formulate / refine project plan and programme, including responsibilities, tasks and timescales
5. Agree strategy for community engagement and master planning process (including date of event)



## Burleyfields, Stafford

Designing a new sustainable neighbourhood for Burleyfields -

**Collaborative discussion: Stafford BC (Alex Yendole), Savills (Colin Campbell), ATLAS (Darren Bell, Julian Pye)**

8<sup>th</sup> November 2011, Civic Offices, Stafford

### Meeting Note:

Key actions:

Issue	Action	Comment
<b>Strategic Site allocation in CS</b>	Agree/confirm the level of detail and supporting evidence required to support the allocation (for Burleyfields) as part of the emerging Core Strategy (as opposed to additional detail/evidence that would be required to support a future outline planning application).	Share examples of other CS Strategic Site examples that have been through examination. ATLAS to provide examples of useful practice/decisions from their experience.
<b>Review of supporting evidence to date</b>	Share Savills review of available evidence in order to agree where there are gaps, uncertainties etc and discuss together an appropriate strategy to resolve.  Infrastructure work to be shared/discussed with consortium once available (mid Dec).	CC to discuss with clients whether initial report can be released to SBC, ATLAS
<b>Transport/movement</b>	Share work carried out to date on proposed W/A, including any drawings, costings etc. AV to contact Nick Dawson	This would be very useful ahead of the meeting on the 14/11/11
<b>Community Engagement</b>	Confirm date for initial stakeholder event (December 2011). Need to manage expectations of community groups and scope the approach and content of the session (half day session would probably suffice).	ATLAS offer to facilitate the session. All to share available dates up to 20 <sup>th</sup> December. ATLAS to share examples of approaches from other project(s)
<b>Project Plan</b>	Need to consider arrangements to include appropriate members in the decision making/consideration process. This might need to be two tier ie critical decisions/information	Wider strategy for member training could be considered –

	<p>and more general informing/updating on issues. AY/CC to amend project structure accordingly. AY?TM to discuss with lead members.</p> <p>Delete Strategic Programme Group from structure.</p> <p>Consider early inception of Transport Group (to be led by Nick Dawson, SCC)</p> <p>Project Steering Group – needs to include key representatives of all promoters and landowner and a senior officer from Staffs County Council – AY to discuss with TM/SCC. Also, consider whether Kier should be invited to join.</p>	<p>ATLAS able to provide/facilitate.</p> <p>ATLAS would be able to re-format/define project plan and structure etc.</p>
<b>Meeting schedule</b>	<p>Diary monthly meetings of the Project Steering Group (which can be cancelled by exception). AY/CC to suggest dates.</p> <p>AY/CC to set out agenda for session 14<sup>th</sup> November 2011 (Steering group discussion)</p>	<p>ATLAS able to help with inception of working groups.</p> <p>ATLAS offer to facilitate discussion on project planning/initial programme.</p>
<b>Water Supply</b>	<p>Needs to be discussed in more detail re supply issue (as part of working group)?</p>	
<b>Green Infrastructure</b>	<p>SANGS and SAC issues need further consideration – Working group?</p>	<p>ATLAS to look into any useful evidence from elsewhere eg Thames Basin Heath.</p>
<b>Other</b>	<p>AY to investigate Growing Places Fund and LEP re: any future opportunities for Burleyfields/town wide growth (infrastructure)</p>	

## Burleyfields, Stafford

Designing a new sustainable neighbourhood for Burleyfields -  
Steering Group Meeting  
14<sup>th</sup> November 2011, Civic Offices, Stafford

### Meeting Note:

Key actions:

Issue	Action	Responsibility
<b>Vision</b>	Alex Yendole (AY) to refine shared project vision in light of comments made by the Consortium and circulate to all stakeholders (Steering Group)	AY
<b>Development Team Approach</b>	Principle of proposed decision making a structure and project management agreed. The proposed project structure needs to include formal engagement of members, both in terms of informing and decision making but also wider understanding of dealing with large scale proposals. ATLAS to refine proposed decision making structure and circulate and provide examples of approaches to member training form other relevant projects	ATLAS
<b>Critical issues to be considered/resolved</b>	Colin Campbell (CC) to share report on the behalf of the consortium setting out an analysis of current evidence base and identification of potential gaps/issues. SBC to consider report as a basis for joint consideration of working groups and agree with Consortium (iterative basis).	CC/AY
<b>Strategic Open Space</b>	AY to share with consortium (and ATLAS) relevant information regarding Natural England Concept Statements	AY
<b>Community Engagement</b>	Need to agree date for initial workshop (half day session) with community reps and members – AY to confirm this week. ATLAS agreed to facilitate session and will prepare a briefing note/proposal that can be circulated to all delegates in due course. ATLAS to provide plans and related materials for session (or part thereof)	AY ATLAS ATLAS
	Consider further the approach to a full community engagement exercise in the new year; ATLAS and CC to consider examples of relevant approaches.	ATLAS, CC





## STAFFORD BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

### LAND WEST OF STAFFORD – PROJECT STEERING GROUP MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 16 MARCH 2012

*In Attendance:*

Ted Manders (TM)	- Head of Planning & Regeneration, Stafford Borough Council
Colin Campbell (CC)	- Director, Savills consultants for Developer Consortium
Annabel Chell (AC)	- Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Transport
Julian Pye (JP)	- Advisory Team for Large Applications Service (ATLAS)
Darren Bell (DB)	- Advisory Team for Large Applications Service (ATLAS)
Mark Alford (MA)	- Principal Planner Development Control, Stafford Borough
Alex Yendole (AY)	- Planning Policy Manager, Stafford Borough Council

- TM introduced the purpose of the meeting in order to establish progress to date and the position for future collaborative working on land west 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 Draft Publication 'preferred options' stage during September and October 2011. Cabinet considered representations to the latest consultation on 8 March 2012. The next key stage of consultation will take place following consideration of the new National Planning Policy Framework and revocation of the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy.
- AY confirmed that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was currently being finalised and will be discussed with key stakeholders in the next few months. In addition viability work is being prepared to deliver a draft charging schedule for the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- CC provided a High Court judgement concerning the Greater Norwich Plan and emphasised the importance of considering reasonable alternative sites through the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment process before reaching the pre-submission stage. A failure in the Norwich case was not to consider alternative high level housing proportions nor alternatives development strategies. CC explained that growth at Stafford should consider alternative approaches to development quantities and the implications of the Stafford Western Access Improvement scheme on future development. DB asked whether infrastructure costs had been considered for land west of Stafford and CC confirmed that preliminary work was being carried out.
- JP explained the benefits of effective project management with a clear decision-making structure including a strategic board, project steering group and task groups with established responsibilities to deliver the project through the Local Development Framework process and planning application stage to delivery. Terms of reference need to be prepared and chairs identified for task groups in order to deliver certainty and share information. ATLAS prepared to support through negotiation and facilitation regarding technical issues and give

confidence. It was agreed that Wendy Woodward (Stafford Borough District Commissioner) should represent Staffordshire County Council on the Project Steering Group in the future, with other specialists attending when necessary. In addition MA should be the Development Management lead for Stafford Borough. The following attendees would also be required for a meeting during May 2012:

- Stafford Borough Council (Ted Manders, Alex Yendole)
  - Advisory Team for Large Applications (Julian Pye, Darren Bell)
  - Savills on behalf of Developer Consortium (Colin Campbell)
  - 1 representative from Taylor Wimpey, Bellway, St Modwen and Lord Stafford's Estate
- 
- CC explained the financial implications of the Master Planning process and the developer consortium needing clarity on the three issues of transport modelling, Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace and flooding. All parties agree that implementation of the draft project plan can be progressed with two initial working groups being formed, namely; Transport and Movement and Environment, both reporting to the Steering group. It was proposed that the Steering Group should aim to meet again in April / May 2012. AY agreed to update the draft project plan and share with all parties (ATLAS to assist)
  - AC stated that Staffordshire County Council – Transport section will be able to share the latest information through a new report on land west of Stafford, including highway modelling, during May 2012. On-going dialogue is taking place with Phil Wooliscroft regarding what level of development is deliverable with and without the road, with a figure of up to 1,000 new houses cited. TM explained that there was a political and community aspect to delivering development, to be provided after new road infrastructure had been provided. A balance is needed as well as consideration of landownership and legal agreements. AC confirmed that the County Council would require the phase 1 link to Doxey Road constructed after 400 new homes had been built. AC also emphasised that other factors needed to be considered, such as location of housing, other services and facilities. It was agreed to share work and evidence bases through a new Transport sub-group in order to provide for partnership working, establish basic principles and infrastructure delivery.
  - The Transport sub-group's terms of reference will include sharing and discussing the latest evidence base & modelling, issues of road infrastructure delivery timescales through capacity and phased approach, using Plans to discuss the design approach, hierarchy of movement, public transport entry points and how this would impact on the overall development's design including the community hub. The following attendees would be required to meet during May 2012:
    - Staffordshire County Council Transport (Nick Dawson, John Commins, Annabel Chell, John Jarvis)
    - Stafford Borough Council (Alex Yendole)
    - Advisory Team for Large Applications (John Sandyford, Julian Pye)
    - Croft Transport Planning (Phil Wooliscroft)

In addition the Highways Agency should be contacted for an update by AY.

- The Environment sub-group will need to focus on the Special Area of Conservation (SAC), flooding and open space provision issues linked to development viability. CC explained that further work is required in these areas as a crucial strand for the Development Plan. Concern that other developments in neighbouring authorities had not provided mitigation measures – CC to investigate and provide details. A multi-functional approach is needed. AY explained the work done to date on the SAC issues with further studies needed to assess existing open space provision at Stafford town, its quality & quantity in order to establish the additional requirements for new development. Delivery could be a mixture of on-site solutions and off-site elements. DB requested clarification of the evidence produced so far and the broad requirements. CC raised inconsistencies between the Environment Agency and Halcrow flood mapping, with a reluctance to share evidence. JP importance to build confidence.
- The Environment sub-group's terms of reference will include sharing and discussing the latest SAC evidence base & flood modelling, discuss the key environmental issues and establish future joint working, consider deliverability in the context of development viability timescales through capacity and phased approach, discuss location of open space provision / the green way and how this would impact on the overall development's design including the community hub. It may be useful to also have discussion with adjoining authorities to establish their current approaches to SANGS / SAC. The following attendees would be required to meet during late April 2012:
  - Environment Agency (Jim Kitchen, Jane Field)
  - Natural England (Antony Muller)
  - Sow & Penk Internal Drainage Board (TM to provide contact)
  - Staffordshire County Council (Ian Wykes)
  - Cannock Chase AONB Partnership (Ruth Hytch)
  - Stafford Borough Council (Alex Yendole, Naomi Perry, Bill Waller)
  - Advisory Team for Large Applications (Julian Pye + 1 specialist)
  - EDP (CC to provide named contact)
  - Halcrow (Caroline Shaw)
  - Savills on behalf of Developer Consortium (Colin Campbell)
- All acknowledged the importance of establishing an on-going strategy for community engagement. TM stated that the Council is keen to re-engage with local communities and politicians to avoid a loss of momentum and potential for a separate neighbourhood plan coming forward. CC explained that an initial brief for the Community Engagement event, prepared by Barton Willmore, would be available for discussion in the next 2 weeks. JP stated that the Council must be clear about the outcomes required from the event, the timescale & invites. An approach needs to be established leading to a Strategic Framework document for guiding future planning applications. TM suggested this should be discussed at the next Project Steering Group meeting. In addition a further meeting should be held with the community representatives in April 2012 to provide an update and discuss the forthcoming Community Engagement event.
- Date of Next Meeting – May 2012 (TBC) at Stafford Borough Council's offices.



## PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

### LAND WEST OF STAFFORD (Burleyfields) – TRANSPORT GROUP

#### ACTION NOTE OF MEETING – FRIDAY 22 JUNE 2012

##### Attendees:

Alex Yendole (chair)	Stafford Borough Council
Colin Campbell	Savills on behalf of Developer Consortium
Nick Dawson	Staffordshire County Council – Transport
Annabel Chell	Staffordshire County Council - Transport
Phil Wooliscroft	Croft on behalf of Developer Consortium
Richard Hickman	St Modwen's
Iain Griffin	MLA
Julian Pye	ATLAS
John Sandford	ATLAS
Mark Alford	Stafford Borough Council – Development Control

##### Introduction: Plan for Stafford Borough Update – programme & evidence

AY gave a presentation and progress update on the new Local Plan (The Plan for Stafford Borough) and next steps. This includes a specific policy and housing provision for the land west of Stafford (Burleyfields). A draft vision has been produced for the site – this should be seen as an evolving vision so comments can be made on the vision throughout the process of key stakeholder and future community engagement.

##### Project structure

- Stafford Borough Council (SBC) have been given a clear steer from Members that a strategic framework (masterplan) must be produced for the land west of Stafford and its associated sites
- Any discussions 'in confidence' also acceptable as part of the Working Group
- The purpose of the Transport Group is to assist with finding the new Local Plan and the identification of land west of Stafford deliverable, as well as assist with the planning application in the future. Work prepared should be used for both the strategic framework and the planning application. There is no need to duplicate
- Further information is required concerning site solutions on transport matters, to be facilitated by the Transport Group
- Remit of the Transport Group was set out and agreed by attendees

##### Key Issues

- ND gave a presentation and outlined the work carried out to date by Staffordshire County Council (SCC) and their strategy for infrastructure improvements to accommodate future growth for Stafford town.
- ND confirmed that SCC work to date identified that the existing network has capacity to accommodate an additional 400 new homes on the western side of Stafford before additional transport infrastructure is required. To go beyond

400 new homes, the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the Stafford Western Access Improvement (SWAI) scheme will be required. Transport modelling by SCC had shown that 100 additional dwellings would put pressure on Station Road & Newport Road whilst 400 additional dwellings would also create adverse impacts on Chell Road around Stafford town centre. In light of this evidence no alternative higher level scenarios have been tested to date (e.g. the impact of 600 or 800 homes). However SCC remain confident that 400 is the appropriate figure. Anything else in excess of this figure would be unacceptable to the local community and its representatives.

- ND confirmed that SCC had considered and discounted alternative strategies for connecting Burleyfields to the wider network in the early phases. SCC accepted that there could be potential to influence the current analysis / evidence by applying a meaningful travel plan (i.e. one 'with teeth').
- It was identified that there could be a window of opportunity, in 2017, to work with Network Rail's plans in respect of improvements to the Doxey rail bridge (although no discussion had taken place with Network Rail to date). SCC also confirmed that the overall Burleyfields development should contribute to improvements of the rail bridge in order to mitigate the impacts of the development.
- SBC acknowledged that initial thoughts on approach to any future planning obligations / CIL requirements should be considered.
- SCC agreed that the existing environment along Martin Drive to the Newport Road island could be changed and improved as part of the proposed development (including the opportunity to achieve appropriate frontage development).
- ND confirmed that SCC are able to make their transport model available for use by consortium, through liaison with Atkins consultants.
- AC confirmed that previous business case had resolved concerns expressed by the Environment Agency regarding flooding (and related impact on the Site of Special Scientific Interest at Doxey Marshes)

### Actions

Action / Task	Responsibility	Timescale
Share latest evidence / modelling (following any necessary SCC sign off)	SCC and Consortium	By Mid - End July 2012
SBC / SCC to provide initial thoughts on strategy for future contributions	SBC (with SCC)	By August 2012
Share previous business case information	SCC (AC/ND)	By 29/6/12
Consider future chairing role of this working group	All	By August 12
Arrange next meeting of Working Group	SBC (AY) & Consortium (CC)	To be held August 12

- Date of Next Meeting – August 2012 (TBC) at Stafford Borough Council offices





## PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

### LAND WEST OF STAFFORD (Burleyfields) – ENVIRONMENT GROUP

#### ACTION NOTE OF MEETING – FRIDAY 22 JUNE 2012

##### Attendees:

Alex Yendole (chair)	Stafford Borough Council
Colin Campbell	Savills on behalf of Developer Consortium
Ali Glaisher	Staffordshire County Council – Environment
Caroline Shaw	Halcrow on behalf of Developer Consortium
Mike Barker	EDP on behalf of Developer Consortium
Richard Hickman	St Modwen's
Iain Griffin	
Jane Field	Environment Agency
Anja Torikka	Environment Agency
John Beckett	Environment Agency
Amanda Smith	English Heritage
Julian Pye	ATLAS
Darren Bell	ATLAS
Naomi Perry	Stafford Borough Council – Planning Policy
Penny McKnight	Stafford Borough Council – Conservation
Mark Alford	Stafford Borough Council – Development Control
Roger Leverett	Stafford Borough Council – Leisure

##### Introduction: Plan for Stafford Borough Update – programme & evidence

AY gave a presentation and progress update on the new Local Plan (The Plan for Stafford Borough) and next steps. This includes a specific policy and housing provision for the land west of Stafford (Burleyfields) although the numbers may be subject to change due to emerging evidence based studies and boundaries may be amended to ensure effective delivery of new infrastructure.

A draft vision has been produced for the site – this should be seen as an evolving vision so comments can be made on the vision throughout the process of key stakeholder and future community engagement.

##### Project structure

- Stafford Borough Council have been given a clear steer from Members that a strategic framework (masterplan) must be produced for the land west of Stafford and its associated sites
- Membership of the Environment Group can vary – relevant individuals should attend meetings with specialist knowledge of subject areas and feedback to colleagues in order to establish specific evidence or send representatives
- Any discussions 'in confidence' also acceptable as part of the Working Group
- The purpose of the Environment Group is to assist with finding the new Local Plan and the identification of land west of Stafford deliverable, as well as assist with the planning application in the future. Work prepared should be used for both the strategic framework and the planning application. There is no need to duplicate

- There are 3 key 'environmental' issues that need to be discussed and a position established prior to involving the wider community:
  1. Flooding & Drainage
  2. Impact on the setting of Stafford Castle
  3. Habitat Regulations Assessment
- Further information is required concerning site solutions on these matters, to be facilitated by the Environment Group
- RH made the group aware that part of the site (Castleworks) is currently subject to a planning appeal, following a refusal of planning permission
- Remit of the Environment Group was set out and agreed by attendees
- Regarding a formal Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening and scoping exercise this will need to be completed for the planning application stage. The Council to advise on a full EIA in due course.
- **ACTION: AY to provide all attendees with current information on the draft vision and objectives (requested by Amanda Smith – English Heritage)**

### Flooding & Drainage

- John Beckett is the lead officer from the Environment Agency (EA) on this matter. Issues relating to the modelling of the Doxey Brook, Doxey Drain and the availability of current flood maps from EA were discussed.
- Usual standards will apply in terms of drainage solutions and Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS).
- Regarding SUDS – EA advised that a solution should consider one large balancing pond being preferable to several smaller ponds and no underwater storage. All agreed that a design based solution for water management, as part of overall master plan, would be preferable.
- Any transfer of water will need permission for cross catchment authorities, including the Sow & Penk Internal Drainage Board as appropriate.
- JB asked about work / solutions done for the Castleworks site? This may set standards for the whole site and Halcrow stated detailed information is available.
- **ACTION: JB to meet with Halcrow at EA office to assess available data, consider potential solutions and agree the extent of any revised flood mapping by Friday 6 July 2012. AY & other EA representatives to be involved in discussions with Halcrow - Mike Adams and Bethany \*\*\*\*\* (EA).**
- A discussion took place regarding open space and de-culverting areas of water space. Issues of future management / maintenance including handing over the land for this purpose were discussed, with the prime purpose being water storage (EA preference for opening culverts and providing water features within public open space).
- Integrating SUDS and opens space was supported – taking account that habitat and recreation requirements cannot be compromised by the need for drainage – i.e clear defined areas. Permanent wet water areas preferable.
- JB recommended that the SUDS scheme go through the SUDS approval Board and to contact Matt Bulzacchelli at Staffordshire County Council.

- Stafford Western Access Improvement (SWAI) scheme subject to options appraisal due to functional flood plain – sequential test will need to be followed, including testing of access points and / or prove design will not increase risk of flooding.
- **ACTION: AG to discuss with Matt Bulzacchelli future project involvement**
- **ACTION: Stafford Borough Council / Developer Consortium, in liaison with EA, to contact Internal Drainage Board**
- **ACTION: Staffordshire County Council to provide supporting information from the SWAI business case submission**

### Historic Environment

- Issues concerning the impact on the setting of a heritage asset have changed recently with new guidance published.
- CC asked for the evidence report prepared in 1991 for Local Plan Allocations & Archaeological Sites.
- Archaeological sites to be considered for inclusion within wider green infrastructure / open space provision.
- **ACTION: AS to forward a copy of the guidance to MB.**
- **ACTION: PM to provide a copy of the 1991 report to CC & MB.**
- **ACTION: MB to consider the 1991 report in light of new guidance, liaise with AS and PM to look at solutions such as lower density housing, location of open space etc...**

### Open space and Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANGS)

- AG gave an update on the work being carried out to support the Habitat Regulations Assessments for each authority. This may be available by the end of July 2012 subject to the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) partnership. Natural England will be attending the next meeting of the Environment Group, ensuring an opportunity to discuss development implications of the work.
- Key issues for the site are the desire for 1 larger site (recreation and informal / habitat) rather than fragmented sites
- Location of the space is very important – avoid open space provision on the edge or back of development that people will not access for formal or informal recreation
- Must also consider impact on Doxey Marshes SSSI – will the development encourage more people to visit this area?
- Issues surrounding open space / recreation standards were discussed. This depends on a number of factors and a draft scheme may need to be presented first before comment / community involvement establish solutions.
- Issues with open space and the need to keep dogs on lead may conflict with replicating reasons why people visit Cannock Chase
- SANGS should be considered additionally to open space requirements
- Ecological surveys will be needed for the site and could guide layout / design of open space.
- **ACTION: Staffordshire County Council / Stafford Borough Council to share latest Visitor Impact Survey information with project stakeholders (when agreed by SAC Partnership)**

- **ACTION:** RL (Stafford Borough Council) to clarify overall open space standards and confirm the amount of formal and informal open space required (by policy) in addition to any provision of SANGS (e.g. the figure of 34m<sup>2</sup> per person was discussed but needs greater clarification).

**Note:** this could be considered in respect of overall opportunities of strategic site(s) and not just application of a standard policy requirement.

- **ACTION:** ALL to confirm that 'red line' for land west of Stafford will include all incidental spaces / land that will be subject to future environmental, physical and economic change as a direct result of proposed development – draft revised red line to be shared with project stakeholders for discussion
  - **ACTION:** AY to clarify position regarding the existing Rugby Club
  - **ACTION:** ALL to consider approach to next working group session – ATLAS offer to facilitate a session in which open space / Green Infrastructure is mapped / tested in light of current vision / objectives. Need to reach consensus on appropriate concept(s) which could help inform future Strategic Framework / master plan.
- Date of Next Meeting – August 2012 (TBC) at Stafford Borough Council offices

## PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

### LAND WEST OF STAFFORD (Burleyfields) – ENVIRONMENT GROUP

#### ACTION NOTE OF MEETING – THURSDAY 16 AUGUST 2012

##### Attendees:

Alex Yendole (chair) - AY	Stafford Borough Council
Colin Campbell - CC	Savills on behalf of Developer Consortium
Adrian Clack - AC	Taylor Wimpey
Fergus Thomas - FT	Bellway Homes
Richard Hickman - RH	St Modwens
Mike Barker - MB	EDP on behalf of Developer Consortium
Ali Glaisher - AG	Staffordshire County Council – Environment
Matt Bulzacchelli - MaB	Staffordshire County Council – Flood Risk
Antony Muller - AM	Natural England
John Beckett - JB	Environment Agency
Becky Clarke - BC	Environment Agency
Amanda Smith - AS	English Heritage
Julian Pye - JP	ATLAS
Paul Evans - PE	ATLAS
Naomi Perry - NP	Stafford Borough Council – Planning Policy
Penny McKnight - PMK	Stafford Borough Council – Conservation
Mark Alford - MA	Stafford Borough Council – Development Control

##### Apologies

Roger Leverett	Stafford Borough Council - Leisure
Iain Griffin	MLA

##### Minutes & Matters Arising of 22<sup>nd</sup> June meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2012 were agreed as a correct record, with the following issues of clarification and matters arising raised.

CC stated that on Page 3 relating to Open Space and Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANGS) the 7<sup>th</sup> bullet point to provide clarity on what level of informal and formal open space is considered additional to SANGS.

A discussion took place concerning the red line used to identify the Strategic Development Location, to be subject to change as a result of sub group meetings. It was agreed that all uses should be included within the red-line such as housing, employment, on-site green infrastructure, services & facilities, school and new roads. AS raised concern of public perception that red line only showed new housing areas.

**ACTION: MA to provide CC with list of Section 106 requirements**  
**ACTION: Detailed feedback from landowner representatives to amend red line boundary by Friday 7 September 2012.**

Rugby Club – CC reported that Heads of Terms are now being agreed regarding the Stafford Rugby Club move but there were no further detail on where to or when.

**ACTION: CC to provide an update at the next meeting.**

## Plan for Stafford Borough Update

AY provided an update on the Plan for Stafford Borough. The Strategic Policy Choices consultation closed on 11 July 2012 and AY thanked those who had made responses. Members of Stafford Borough Council will be considering the responses alongside the Publication version of the new Plan for Stafford Borough during September & October 2012. The Publication document is due to be considered at Full Council on 27 November 2012 leading to a period of receiving representations on soundness and legal compliance during December 2012 & January 2013. Following this formal statutory stage all representations and proposed changes to the document will be sent to the Secretary of State as a Submission in Spring 2013 for the independent Examination in the Summer 2013.

AY provided an update on the evidence base for the new Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) Stage 2 Report has now been finalised and is on the website at <http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/live/welcome.asp?id=3612>. AY to circulate the link. All attendees were asked to consider the IDP contents, with specific reference to land west of Stafford. AY stated that the IDP is a live document and will be updated as and when new information becomes available. CC asked about the approval status of this document and AY confirmed that the IDP is part of the evidence base and had not been formally approved by Members. However elements of the IDP will be included in the Publication document. AY also confirmed that the Strategic Housing Market Area update was currently taking place and will be finalised in September, with new data incorporated into the Publication document.

CC asked for clarification of dates for finalising the Publication document and its policy concerning land west of Stafford before it is considered by Members of Stafford Borough Council. AY explained that the final date for amendments being incorporated would be 14 September 2012 leading to the Cabinet meeting on 4 October 2012. At this stage the Publication document is only subject to Member-led changes through the political process. AS raised concern about whether the Plan provides sufficient detailed evidence to overcome an outstanding objection from English Heritage and the need for further concept work and master planning. AS stated that English Heritage currently do not have the evidence to withdraw the previous objection. However whilst such work may not be finalised in time for inclusion in the Publication document, it should be available as part of the process in order to allow the sub group to make decisions.

**ACTION: AY agreed to circulate the current version of the land west of Stafford policy and relevant section to the Environment Group.**

## Flooding & Drainage

JB gave an update. Environment Agency (EA) only recently received a request from Halcrow regarding mapping of Flood Zone 3, following an instruction to start the work. Halcrow and EA to meet shortly for discussions, with the latest work not necessarily changing the area within Flood Zone 3 but will provide further details on the depth of flooding and its frequency. AC sought clarification about location of new developments. JB stated that evidence needs to be provided, with EA seeking new development outside of Flood Zone 3 areas unless sufficient mitigation measures included. JB stated that the main issue is de-culverting the Doxey Drain with associated green infrastructure to enable access and maintenance. If there is any development or access in Flood Zone 3 the EA would wish to see sequential test or compensation areas provided.



BC provided details on recent restructuring within the EA. Funding is now available from DEFRA, through EA to reinstate watercourses as part of meeting Water Framework Directive requirements. Developers could prepare a proposal and progress a bid with the EA to deliver infrastructure. Up to 50% match funding could be available for qualifying regeneration and economic development projects beyond the current Compulsory Spending Round (CSR). JP stated that this could contribute to the Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) including multi-functional open space. Tipton Brook in Sandwell was given as a good example of reinstatement with multiple benefits. As part of the former UCM site, the Redrow new housing area culvert has not been deculverted. MaB stated that deculverting of the Doxey Brook on site would assist with flood risk beyond the Burleyfields site. Currently SUDS are co-ordinated by EA although there is a process to create a SUDS Approval Board administered by Staffordshire County Council (SCC).

It is important to inform Sow and Penk Internal Drainage Board (IDB) due to their role in approving water discharge so need to be involved in the process for Doxey Drain in due course.

It was confirmed that SCC Highways do not have issues regarding flood risk of roads in the land west of Stafford (Burleyfields) area, addressed in the environmental work as part of the Western Access Improvement scheme

- ACTION: Halcrow to meet with EA to establish latest flood mapping data**
- ACTION: Developer consortium to provide feedback on progress with a WFD bid regarding de-culverting of Doxey Brook**
- ACTION: AY to contact Sow & Penk IDB.**

### **Historic Environment**

MB provided an update, stating that a sub group meeting took place on 13 August 2012 concerning the existing evidence base and further updating work required to include the setting of Stafford Castle, the historic environment record and recent English Heritage guidance. The scope and methodology for this work needs to be agreed by 24 August 2012 and the work completed by 14 September 2012. AG providing comments from SCC Archaeologist (Steve Dean) and it was agreed to include Steve Dean in future sub-group meetings. The work will guide the extent of development, master planning layout, location of Green Infrastructure and assist with English Heritage outstanding representation on the sensitivity of the Strategic Development Location in principle and in terms of detailed design. AG stated that other matters needed to be included such as ecological information and landscape. The issue regarding what work needs to be done when was discussed.

AS stated that the evidence needed to be provided in order for English Heritage to properly consider the proposals, with no commitment given that an objection would not be lodged at the Examination. CC stated that the master planning exercise would form part of the planning application and that development could occur without significant adverse impacts on Stafford Castle. AC stated that a concept statement would inform the strategic framework process. The concept statement shows how different parts of the plan requirements are to be dealt with and the masterplanning will assist with the planning application. It was noted that Lichfield District Council have Concept Statements as part of their new Local Plan – Publication giving good examples of the process / level of detail.

**ACTION: MB Scope and methodology of Historic Environment evidence to be prepared, with a draft report produced and consideration of key findings by the sub group by 14 September 2012. Report back to next meeting of the Environment Group.**

### **Green Infrastructure / Open Space**

AY explained that Stafford Borough Council's Leisure Department had requested a direct meeting with representatives of the developer consortium to discuss detailed open space standards and requirements for land west of Stafford.

**ACTION: CC to arrange a meeting with Leisure Department and provide feedback at the next Environment Group meeting.**

MaB stated that open space requirements should consider SUDS including future maintenance and management approach. It was confirmed that SCC was not considering adopting areas but an approach needed to be established.

AM gave an update on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) work, currently in a transitional phase and still on-going with next reports finalised in September leading to an implementation plan. Originally the 'zone of influence' was 19km, but this has been reduced to 15km. The amount of SANGS or open space provision is likely to be reduced from 16 ha to 8 ha per 1,000 population. The scale of development at Burleyfields will have merits for on-site & off-site provision, it is important to assess accepting that not all mitigation will be available on site and so s106 can be used for the difference. The features SANGS should include are set out in the Visitor Impact Strategy Report from 2009 available online at <http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/live/Documents/Forward%20Planning/Habitat%20Regulations%20Assessment/FE-VIMS.pdf>

PE and JP gave a brief presentation and overview, including case studies, of Green Infrastructure (GI) types to be considered at land west of Stafford. There will be synergies with SANGS, open space, SUDS and green infrastructure. GI should also consider ecological connectivity as key principles, links to and from Stafford Castle, edge of settlement areas, the future management of GI, local characteristics such as wetland, reeds, as well as allotments rather than orchards.

JP facilitated a discussion using maps of land west of Stafford, with the following discussed:

- Public rights of way – need clarity from SCC regarding footpaths routes
- Golf course extent and implications for protecting setting of Stafford Castle
- Duddas Wood / Millennium Green at Derrington – possible extension / links to this area as part of SANGS provision
- Extent of Lord Stafford's land ownership to deliver off-site green infrastructure
- Circular routes taking into consideration Stafford Castle as focal point
- Doxey marshes extension / linkages taking into account capacity of the SSSI
- Green way through the land west of Stafford
- Scheduled ancient monument west of motorway
- Motorway buffer

Date of Next Meeting – September 2012 (TBC) at Stafford Borough Council offices



## PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

### LAND WEST OF STAFFORD (Burleyfields) – TRANSPORT GROUP

#### ACTION NOTE OF MEETING – WEDNESDAY 22 AUGUST 2012

##### Attendees:

Alex Yendole (chair) - AY	Stafford Borough Council
Colin Campbell – CC	Savills on behalf of Developer Consortium
Nick Dawson - ND	Staffordshire County Council – Transport
Annabel Chell - AnC	Staffordshire County Council - Transport
Adrian Clack - AC	Taylor Wimpey
Sarah Milward - SM	Taylor Wimpey
Pascal French - PF	Taylor Wimpey – student placement
Phil Wooliscroft – PW	Croft on behalf of Developer Consortium
Richard Hickman - RH	St Modwen's
Iain Griffin – IG	MLA
Darren Bell - DB	ATLAS
Jon Sandford - JS	ATLAS
Ted Manders - TM	Stafford Borough Council
Mark Alford - MA	Stafford Borough Council – Development Control

##### Welcome & Introduction

AY welcomed attendees to the meeting for the transport group concerning land west of Stafford and re-iterated the purpose of the meeting to progress collaborative working and sharing the evidence base in a productive manner.

##### Minutes & Matters Arising of 22<sup>nd</sup> June meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2012 were agreed as a correct record, with the following issues of clarification and matters arising.

CC stated that clarification is required concerning what the development consortium should be delivering through the land west of Stafford – Burleyfields area, relating to Section C of the Stafford Western Access Improvement scheme and sustainable transport measures to 2031. This was not reflected in the Staffordshire County Council report or the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan. It was agreed this would be discussed at this meeting.

##### Plan for Stafford Borough Update

AY provided an update on the Plan for Stafford Borough. The Strategic Policy Choices consultation closed on 11 July 2012 and AY thanked those who had made responses. Members of Stafford Borough Council will be considering the responses alongside the Publication version of the new Plan for Stafford Borough during September & October 2012. The Publication document is due to be considered at Council on 27 November 2012 leading to a period of receiving representations on soundness and legal compliance during December 2012 & January 2013. Following this formal statutory stage all representations and proposed changes to the document will be sent to the Secretary of State as a Submission in Spring 2013 for the independent Examination in the Summer 2013.

AY provided an update on the evidence base for the new Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) Stage 2 Report has now been finalised and is on the website at <http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/live/welcome.asp?id=3612>. AY to circulate the link. All attendees were asked to consider the IDP contents, with specific reference to land west of Stafford. AY stated that the IDP is a dynamic evidence base and will be added to as and when new information becomes available.

CC asked for clarification of dates for finalising the Publication document and its policy concerning land west of Stafford before it is considered by Members of Stafford Borough Council. AY explained that the final date for amendments being incorporated would be between 10 - 14 September 2012 leading to the Cabinet meeting on 4 October 2012. At this stage the Publication document is only subject to Member-led changes through the political process. DB asked for clarification of the timetable for a Strategic Framework and the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment work to support the Plan for Stafford Borough. AY confirmed that the SA / SEA work had been prepared to support the new Local Plan.

**ACTION: AY agreed to circulate the current version of the land west of Stafford policy and relevant section to the Transport Group.  
CC agreed to provide amended policy wording suggestions by Monday 3 September 2012 for consideration.**

#### **Review & Discussion of Evidence Shared to Date**

PW introduced a series of issues raised by the developer consortium seeking clarification on elements of the Staffordshire County Council document entitled 'The Plan for Stafford Borough: Transport Evidence to Support a Western Direction of Growth' circulated following the last meeting. Issues included clarification of Do Minimum / Do Something scenarios to 2016 and 2031 as well as the delivery of Section C, the sustainable transport measures, key assumptions on trip / accident rates and the wider Stafford Western Access Improvement Scheme. Further clarification was sought on alternative options considered, in light of the transport envelope and sustainable transport measures, for up to 600 housing units with implications on Newport Road and Doxey Road.

ND agreed to amend the Staffordshire County Council document to provide further clarification for a number of the issues raised by circulating additional text for consideration. PW asked for an extra table to be included concerning Do Nothing scenario and 400 units. ND stated that the trip rates were consistent with the planning process, with standard assumptions / National Statistics applied. ND stated that, for the Castleworks site delivering 100 units, an assumption was made that when the remainder of the Castleworks site was delivered the access over the narrow railway bridge from Castle Street would be converted to a walking / cycling link and vehicular access provided onto Martin Drive.

CC stated that the purpose of the SCC document was to satisfy the Inspector at the Plan for Stafford Borough independent Examination that land west of Stafford is deliverable, with 400 units coming forward before the new road access being provided. A discussion took place about increasing the number of units above 400, subject to changes in trip rates, sustainable transport measures and further evidence. ND stated that alternative options could be considered through a detailed planning application stage, provided further evidence was available. PW agreed that the developer consortium would consider appointing Atkins consultants to use the SCC modelling facilities to test other scenarios in due course. ND stated that SCC transport planners would not accept more than 500 units from a single access point

and therefore a secondary access point would be required onto Doxey Road, based on SCC Design Guidance, safety and capacity issues. PW acknowledged that the evidence prepared by the developer consortium to deliver 1,000 units was no longer being considered as part of the proposals.

ND stated that the overage position needed to be taken into account and asked about the equalisation agreement between members of the developer consortium. AC confirmed that this would be given consideration as part of the Agreements. AC confirmed that there was no equalisation agreement currently in place, but an agreement had been established with Network Rail to provide a footbridge attached to the Doxey Road railbridge. AC stated that an agreement was nearing completion with the Giles Family concerning land south of Doxey Road and north of Lord Stafford's land interests.

CC raised concern about inconsistencies between the Stafford Borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), collaborative working discussions, and the SCC document relating to the transport infrastructure associated with land west of Stafford. CC stated that the developer consortium considered delivery of Section C and sustainable transport measures was sufficient, together with a secondary means of access onto Doxey Road. CC stated that the IDP linked phased delivery of land west of Stafford with the completion of other elements of the Stafford Western Access Improvement scheme out of the developer consortium's control. This could lead to uncertainty through the Examination process about delivery and soundness. AY stated that the IDP was prepared in July 2012 and further evidence and meetings would mean it's contents would have to reflect on more up-to-date information. This was agreed and a Statement of Common Ground / Position Statement should be prepared for the independent Examination to reflect the most up-to-date situation. It was agreed that the evidence prepared for land west of Stafford would be made publicly available in order to demonstrate soundness and new evidence produced.

JS introduced transport work progressed with other similar Sustainable Urban Extensions across the country including at York and Northallerton. Master planning, the approach of Manual for Streets, internal links and wider hierarchy impacts were all important issues to consider as part of progressing the project.

**ACTION:**

- ND to prepare amended text to the SCC document and circulate for agreement with PW**
- PW to establish further work programme with Atkins for alternative scenarios to support the land west of Stafford at Examination**
- PW to progress work on sustainable transport measures to be incorporated into the transport evidence base**
- CC to prepare a Statement of Common Ground / Position Statement to provide an up-to-date position on transport infrastructure for agreement**

### Any Other Business

CC stated that MA had provided a list of Section 106 agreement requirements for land west of Stafford. CC confirmed that viability work would be progressed by the Developer Consortium, taking into account the range of infrastructure requirements, during September & October 2012 based on information from Natural England on Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANGs). There is a legal requirement to provide SANGs based on the Habitat Regulations Assessment. AY confirmed that the IDP had been based on affordable housing viability assessment evidence, to be

circulated relating to a notional strategic site for 500 new homes. AnC asked for further master planning work to establish the access points onto Doxey Road with further community engagement.

A discussion took place on further master planning work to provide greater clarity concerning land west of Stafford, including transport access points. CC raised concern about a Concept Diagram being included within the Plan for Stafford Borough – Publication, leading to objections from statutory agencies and local residents, as well as the lack of stakeholder engagement. TM stated that Stafford Borough Council was required to provide further clarity to local communities on the nature of strategic development locations including the variety of uses. At a previous consultation on the Draft Publication document, local communities had asked for further detail about the nature of the development, layout and design issues through a master planning exercise. CC acknowledged that a community engagement exercise should be carried out during Autumn 2012, having received evidence in September 2012 on SANGs, Stafford Castle setting, delivery of transport infrastructure and flood mapping.

**ACTION: CC to co-ordinate a response and provide amendments to the Concept Diagram for consideration within the Publication document.  
CC to provide a Community Engagement proposal and timescale**

#### **Date of Next Meeting**

- September / October 2012 (TBC) at Stafford Borough Council offices. It was agreed that the Transport & Environment Groups to meet on the same day.
- It was noted that the next Project Steering Group meeting is scheduled for 20 September 2012.

## PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH – PUBLICATION

### DRAFT STAFFORD POLICY 3 – LAND WEST OF STAFFORD

Within the area West of Stafford identified on the Proposals Map a sustainable, well designed mixed use development will be delivered by 2031. Any application for development on a part or the whole of this area must be preceded by, and consistent with, a comprehensive Master Plan for the site including building Design Statements which have been submitted and agreed by the Council. Development must deliver the following key requirements:

#### Housing

- i. Delivery of approximately 2,200 new homes with 30% being affordable housing in a mix of housing types, tenures, sizes and styles and a greater proportion will be 2 and 3 bedrooled properties;
- ii. Provision to meet the needs of an ageing population through new extra care and specialist housing provision close to Stafford town centre;

#### Design

- iii. The development takes place on a 'neighbourhood' approach with the provision of a mix of uses including local retail facilities, public open space, social and physical infrastructure, a primary school, and a community building including provision for a library service and health facilities;
- iv. New small-scale employment areas providing a total of 5 hectares of new readily available land incorporated into existing and new housing development areas;
- v. The development should be based on maximising opportunities to use sustainable construction methods;
- vi. Proposals relate to the whole Strategic Development Location or if less do not in any way prejudice implementation of the whole development;

#### Environment

- vii. A comprehensive drainage and flood management scheme is essential to implement development at the West of Stafford Strategic Development Location including off-site measures to alleviate flooding and surface water management on Doxey Brook and tributaries to the River Sow;
- viii. The development should maximise on-site renewable or low carbon energy solutions including associated infrastructure;
- ix. Measures to conserve and enhance historic environment assets including the setting of Stafford Castle and sight lines to St Mary's Church in Stafford town centre;
- x. Protect nature conservation interests including Doxey Brook & Burleyfields BAS (Biodiversity Alert Site) and Doxey Marshes SSSI
- xi. Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation including Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace, existing hedgerows and tree lines to be retained and enhanced to support the provision of a network of green infrastructure including wetlands and water corridors, play areas, green corridors allowing wildlife movement and access to open space;

## Transport

- xii. An access, transport and travel plan strategy for the Strategic Development Location that maximises travel and accessibility by non-car transport modes via safe, attractive and conveniently designed street, pedestrian and cycling connections within the development and to Stafford town centre, nearby existing and new employment areas. The strategy shall identify access points to the site and between the site and the existing settlement. It shall also identify construction access arrangements that do not disrupt existing residents and improvements to transport capacity along the A518 Newport Road and its roundabout;
- xiii. Support delivery of the Western Access Improvement Scheme and associated transport improvements specifically providing phase 1 from Martin Drive to Doxey Road;
- xiv. There will be an interconnected network of streets serving the development producing discernible and distinctive neighbourhoods and places integrated and linked to existing areas, taking into account the existing Rights of Way network.

## Infrastructure

- xv. Link from Martin Drive spine road to Doxey Road with upgrade to railway bridge required for the development west of Stafford as part of the Stafford Western Access Road together with new or enhanced bus routes as well as cycling & walking links to existing routes to the town centre and other key destinations
- xvi. Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGS) required through on-site / off-site provision / management at Cannock Chase
- xvii. Planned electricity reinforcement works and connection to the grid
- xviii. Reinforcement required for potable water through a new main from the local trunk main or from the outlet main at Butterhill Direct Supply Reservoir
- xix. Sewage capacity improvements required to meet additional housing development
- xx. New primary school provision required with expansion of existing secondary school
- xxi. Creation of a new destination park for children's play areas and multi-use games areas in association with SANGs requirement on-site
- xxii. Telecommunications provided through Stafford exchange enabled with Superfast Fibre Access Broadband
- xxiii. Primary health care provision delivered by increased capacity through master planning

**Developer contributions will be required to provide the strategic infrastructure needed to achieve a comprehensive sustainable development at this Strategic Development Location.**

## Context

- 7.29 Development to the west of Stafford is located south west of Stafford town centre across the main West Coast mainline beyond the main residential areas to the west of the town and the M6 motorway. The key housing areas are to be



located north of the A518 Newport Road, Stafford Castle and the golf course. The area will have implications for the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation which will require mitigation measures to address the recreational impacts of the new development.

### **Proposed Development**

- 7.30 The land west of Stafford will comprise of various housing sites on previous industrial areas and greenfield land delivering a total of approximately 2,200 new homes. A primary school and GP surgery are within 20-30 minutes walking distance of the area although the King Edwards secondary school is further away. English Heritage has recently published 'The setting of heritage assets: English Heritage guidance' (2011) and 'Seeing the history in the view: a method for assessing heritage significance within views' (2011). These will need to be used to guide development on the site in terms of the setting of Stafford Castle together with the Stafford Historic Environment Character Assessment (April 2009).

### **Development Requirements and Implementation**

- 7.31 Infrastructure requirements are listed in the Policy, and further details are provided in Appendix \*\*. Of these requirements the following have been identified as critical to the delivery of the Strategic Development Location.
- Link from Martin Drive spine road to Doxey Road with upgrade to railway bridge required for the development west of Stafford as part of the Stafford Western Access Road together with new or enhanced bus routes as well as cycling & walking links to existing routes to the town centre and other key destinations. This infrastructure is required to provide access routes to the main development areas.
  - Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGS) required through on-site / off-site provision / management at Cannock Chase to provide recreational areas for communities to use rather than using the Chase.
  - Planned electricity reinforcement works and connection to the grid in order to meet the needs of the new communities
  - Reinforcement required for potable water through a new main from the local trunk main or from the outlet main at Butterhill Direct Supply Reservoir in order to meet the water resource needs of the new communities
  - Sewage capacity improvements required to meet additional housing development in order to meet the water resource needs of the new communities
- 7.32 Based on current information from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and working in partnership with developers for the land west of Stafford it has been established that the scale of development is capable of delivering the infrastructure requirements listed.

Infrastructure Category	Requirements	Phasing	Capital Cost	Funding
<p>Transport (CRITICAL)</p>	<p>Western Access Road to be completed in five sections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Spine Road</li> <li>2. The link from Martin Drive spine road to Doxey Road (adjacent to the railway line).</li> <li>3. A limited upgrade to the railway bridge link.</li> <li>4. The link from the bridge to the junction of Doxey Road and Pans Drive.</li> <li>5. Link from the Doxey Road / Pans Drive junction to A34.</li> </ol> <p>400 homes (significantly higher than 5 year allocation) can be developed prior to completion of section 2 from Doxey Road to Martin Drive.</p> <p>Network Rail has identified 2017 as a window of opportunity for upgrade to railway bridge as it would correspond to planned works on West Coast Mainline.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 2011-16</li> <li>2. 2016+</li> <li>3. 2017</li> <li>4. 2016+</li> <li>5. 2016+</li> </ol>	<p>S1 (TBC) S2: £2m S3 &amp; S4: £4.65m  S5: £13m</p>	<p>Section 1 will be developer funded.</p> <p>Remaining sections delivered through a mix of s106/s278, CIL and SCC funds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SDL Developer</li> <li>2. SDL Developer</li> <li>3. SCC/Pooled developer contributions</li> <li>4. Third Party Developer contributions</li> <li>5. Unknown / SCC.</li> </ol> <p>All costs quoted exclude environmental mitigation/utility diversions. Cost for S2 excludes cost of bridging railway sidings.</p>



Infrastructure Category	Requirements	Phasing	Capital Cost	Funding
Nature Conservation and Biodiversity (CRITICAL)	Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace to be provide through (a) on-site open space provision, (b) management of Cannock Chase, or (c) contributions towards 'Suitable Alternative Natural Green space' (SANGS) elsewhere.	2011-2016	TBC	Developer contributions and/or in-kind provision.
Electricity (CRITICAL)	Planned reinforcement works scheduled for completion during 2012, will provide sufficient capacity to accommodate all planned development  Connection to grid (including for Ladfordfields Employment Site)	2011-2015	£5m	Developers will be required to pay for connections.
Gas	None	N/A	N/A	N/A
Potable Water (CRITICAL)	Reinforcement required. Potentially a new main from the local trunk main near Beaconside/A34 junction to the new developments to allow it to be supplied from Stafford East Control Group, or a new main from the outlet main from Butterhill Direct Supply Reservoir . Subject to ongoing feasibility work by Severn Trent Water.	Unknown		(Severn Trent (AMP5) for off site works. ) Developer funds on site mains

Infrastructure Category	Requirements	Phasing	Capital Cost	Funding
Sewage (CRITICAL)	Reinforcement works, to be confirmed by further hydraulic modelling	Lead time of 3 years	£570,000 (tbc)	Severn Trent (AMP6)
Flood Alleviation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Education	Initial phase of development accommodated through extension to existing schools.  New Primary School (2-3 FE) to be included in masterplan  Expansion of existing secondary school subject to availability of Authority owned land.	2011-2015  2016+  2016+	Up to £8m  £7m	Developer contributions  DfE Capital Programme and developer contributions (including land in-kind)  DfE Capital Programme (under review) / developer contributions.
Primary Healthcare	Type of provision to be determined through masterplanning process. None envisaged during first 5 years of plan.	2016+	£8m	GP consortia. Possible provision of land / accommodation in masterplan.
Telecommunications	Stafford exchange is enabled with Superfast Fibre Access Broadband. No cost implication for developer over standard telecommunications infrastructure.		N/A	Developer
Open Space	Creation of a new destination park – will need to be planned in association with requirements for SANGs. Children's play areas and multi-use	2011+	Unknown	Developer contributions.

Infrastructure Category	Requirements	Phasing	Capital Cost	Funding
	games areas in accordance with local standards of provision.			





**DRAFT NOTE OF MEETING**

**Burleyfields, Stafford: Project Steering Group**

**1.30pm 20<sup>th</sup> September 2012, Stafford Borough Council's (SBC's) Offices, Stafford**

*Present:*

- Ted Manders (TM) SBC*
- Alex Yendole (AY) SBC*
- Mark Alford (MA)SBC*
- Russell Poole (RP) Lord Stafford's Estate*
- Iain Griffin (IG) MLA*
- Colin Campbell (CC) Savills*
- Richard Hickman (RH) (St Modwen)*
- Fergus Thomas (FT) Bellway*
- Adrian Clack (AC) Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd*
- Julian Pye (JP) ATLAS*
- Darren Bell (DB) ATLAS*

*Apologies:*

	<b>Actions</b>
<p><b>1. Local Plan update</b></p> <p><b>Programme</b> AY summarised the latest position regarding the draft Core Strategy. Recent work has involved reviewing the response to the June/July consultation on the strategic policy choices and review of RSS context &amp; NPPF. Draft Core Strategy has now been made available online and will be considered at an all member scrutiny committee on 26<sup>th</sup> September ('Special meeting of the Community Services Scrutiny Committee'). Further refinements will then be possible prior to consideration of the pre-submission document at Full Council on 27<sup>th</sup> November. A six week consultation will then take place (taking into account the Xmas period) and any comments received forwarded to PINS with the submission document. Examination is expected in Summer 2013.</p> <p>It was anticipated that PINS would meet with the Council in November.</p> <p>Prior to the November Council meeting, there would be a two week lead in time therefore the document would need to be finalised by mid-November at the latest.</p> <p>CC highlighted two key areas of concern being emphasised by Inspectors: Meeting objectively assessed needs and demonstrating deliverability (especially in light of paragraph 174 of NPPF regarding the cumulative impact of the plan</p>	

on viability).

JP suggested there was logic to continuing to work collaboratively to narrow differences. It was agreed that this was appropriate and that the Consortium was needed to demonstrate deliverability and provide a framework to show how it can happen. TM added that it had reached a point where there was a greater risk in not publishing the draft plan. RH confirmed that, notwithstanding current appeal, he is willing to continue to work collaboratively on the wider site.

### ***Viability***

With reference to viability, it was agreed that there is a distinction between testing the viability of the site (led by the Consortium) and testing the whole plan (primarily a SBC responsibility). It was also acknowledged further work can be done to supplement the evidence base prior to examination.

In terms of undertaking site specific work, CC was grateful to MA for his initial response but highlighted a few outstanding queries, including the basis for County education request (i.e. pupil generation calculations) and clarity over Stafford Western Access Improvements. Issues will need to be discussed on a continued and iterative basis.

### ***Policy Wording and Concept Plan***

AY tabled the latest policy wording and concept plan. A discussion over the concept plan confirmed that there would be scope for some further changes. For example, it was suggested that the area highlighted red for development could be 'toned down' and also the legend changed to the effect of 'potential development area including requisite public open space to be determined by master planning'. It was also agreed that additional notation could be helpful eg. the southern boundary of the site and relationship to the golf club and Stafford Castle.

It was also agreed that there was the need for consistency across all the SDLs therefore the Consortium would not provide their own version of the plan but instead could suggest some revisions. RH stated, that in the light of the current appeal, he could not accept a plan showing an access arrow into the site. It was also pointed out that there is some landownership outside of the Consortium's control shown within the red line on the Concept Plan.

JP suggested that the best way to develop a shared concept plan would be to continue to work through the green infrastructure principles and develop a framework for access and connectivity then articulate the main agreed principles on a diagram. Notwithstanding the concept plan in the Local Plan, it was agreed this work would help form

*Consortium to review latest wording and concept plan and suggest any minor revisions as considered necessary.*

<p>the basis of a spatial framework that could then be discussed/tested with the local community. He also suggested that it would be very useful if SBC and its partners could agree a clear 'route map' and confirm the status of any future outcome of community engagement (see below).</p>	
<p><b>2. Project planning</b></p>	
<p>It was agreed that a timeline showing key milestones would be useful for all parties (assuming consideration of current project milestones, policy evolution through to the submission of an outline planning application). ATLAS agreed to provide a first draft of the key milestones.</p>	<p><i>ATLAS to provide first draft of project timeline for consideration.</i></p>
<p><b>3. Working Groups update</b></p>	
<p><b><i>Environment working group</i></b></p> <p>AY said that a key meeting was taking place on Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> September regarding the Footprint ecology report on Cannock Chase SAC mitigation. It was agreed that the Consortium could follow up on this, in AY's absence, by contacting either Ali Glaister of Staff County Council or Naomi Perry of SBC</p> <p>A discussion regarding alternative approaches to the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) ensued. It was agreed a balance would need to be struck between on site and other forms of mitigation. RP confirmed that Lord Stafford may be in a position to offer other land (beyond the red line) to contribute to SANG and it was agreed that it would be beneficial for RP to attend the next Environment working group.</p> <p>ATLAS extended the offer to facilitate a workshop, at the next working group, seeking to agree some key green infrastructure concepts and principles for the site. It was agreed this would be a useful exercise and ATLAS would prepare and circulate an outline proposal. In order to make the most of this, ATLAS suggested at least 3 hours was needed. However it was also agreed that emerging and latest work on the Castle setting and on SANGS should feed into this process.</p> <p>CC confirmed that clarification on updated flood risk areas and modelling was expected soon. He also confirmed that a brief for an historic environment report examining the setting of the castle had been prepared and circulated – currently awaiting response from English Heritage.</p> <p><b><i>Transport Working Group</i></b></p> <p>It was acknowledged that there were positive actions agreed from the last Working Group and actions need to be followed up. It was acknowledged that ATLAS circulated a note regarding approach to sustainable transport measures. It was also agreed that at the next working</p>	<p><i>CC to follow up on progress on Footprint Ecology report.</i></p> <p><i>ATLAS to prepare outline proposal for exploring green infrastructure principles at next environment working group.</i></p> <p><i>All to give regard to agreed Transport Working groups.</i></p> <p><i>ATLAS to contact County/Phil Wooliscroft to discuss progress</i></p>



<p>group it would be helpful to jointly map the existing and potential access points/movement framework.</p> <p>Next working groups to be scheduled for <b>29<sup>th</sup> October 2012.</b></p>	<p><i>and potential 'mapping' session at next working group.</i></p> <p><i>CC to circulate meeting request for environment and transport working groups on 29<sup>th</sup> October.</i></p>
<p><b>4. Community Engagement – next steps</b></p>	
<p>TM asked that it is important to make progress with this and it needs to be programmed properly. He said the onus is on the Consortium to set up and run this event.</p> <p>CC will revisit draft proposal and aim to circulate revised version for discussion in next two weeks. It was agreed this could be discussed following next working group meetings</p> <p>JP suggested that proper consideration be given to the anticipated outcomes and the status and weight to be attached to any outcomes.</p>	<p><i>CC to circulate draft proposal for community engagement.</i></p>

DRAFT



## PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

### LAND WEST OF STAFFORD (Burleyfields) – ENVIRONMENT GROUP

#### ACTION NOTE OF MEETING – Monday 29<sup>th</sup> October 2012

##### Attendees:

Colin Campbell	Savills on behalf of Developer Consortium
Mike Barker	EDP on behalf of Developer Consortium
John Beckett	Environment Agency
Amanda Smith	English Heritage
Julian Pye	ATLAS
Paul Evans	ATLAS
Darren Bell	ATLAS
Naomi Perry	Stafford Borough Council – Planning Policy
Penny McKnight	Stafford Borough Council – Conservation
Ted Manders	Stafford Borough Council – Planning
Adam Hill	Stafford Borough Council – Leisure
Adrian Clack	Taylor Wimpey
Fergus Thomas	Bellway Homes
Richard Stevenson	Bellway Homes
Antony Muller	Natural England
Roger Leverett	Stafford Borough Council - Leisure
Iain Griffin	MLA
Russell Poole	Lord Staffords estate
Mike Barker	EDP
Rebecca Gregory	EDP

##### **Apologies**

Alex Yendole (SBC), Richard Hickman (St Modwen), Ali Glaisher (SCC)

##### **Minutes of 22<sup>nd</sup> June meeting**

Minutes from August meeting were agreed and actions to be discussed as part of agenda items.

##### **Plan for Stafford Borough Update**

*The Plan for Stafford Borough – Publication* will be taken to full Council on 27<sup>th</sup> November. Following this SBC will seek representations on soundness, legal compliance and duty to cooperate. There is still opportunity for members of the steering group to make amendments to the document before Council considers it. Any amendments should be provided to AY **no later than Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November.**

The document is available online at:

<http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/document/id/94FDF2AA-57C4-49E3-867C-7AEF044C8EF3>

##### **Flooding**

JB gave an update – the work has been progressed by Halcrow and EA with a license fee agreed in order to update the model. There are some differences in the

flood plain from the previous model with some areas taken out of the floodplain and some areas now in flood zone 2 rather than 3. All information is in place to progress with masterplanning and viability. This work will be done in the run up to community engagement. TM questioned why it was not being commissioned now, but it was explained that the further modelling work only related to a small area near to the M6 motorway. So didn't affect progression of the masterplan or viability assessment.

### **Historic Environment**

The methodology for the work considering the setting of the castle has been amended by EDP and agreed with SBC and EH with the completion of the work expected mid November. AS has requested a draft of the report before it is finalised. The work so far indicates that the setting is more linked to sensitivity rather than visual aspect and character, and this will need to feed into masterplanning, site layout, design of properties, density and characteristic of the edge of the development. The outcome of the meeting can also be fed into the assessment (and vice versa, the findings of the study used to help inform emerging concepts).

**Action: EDP/Promoters to provide a draft of the report to AS and PM when completed**

### **Green Infrastructure/Open space etc**

There is now general consensus on the overall principles of green infrastructure, but further refinement of the agreed list of principles might be useful as the project evolves. It is useful, however; to continue to test the principles. The existing position/baseline of the site was outlined and discussed. In particular, the location, character and function of the following:

- Millennium Way/Greenway
- Access – Rights of Way and bridleways
- Overhead lines
- Extended boundary of golf course
- Woodland around Castle
- Western Access Improvements
- Existing sport uses
- Duddas Wood and Millennium Green at Derrington
- Standing water

JB asked whether existing ponds would be topped up and it was considered that these could form part of any future SUDS scheme (and be included as part of a multi functional network of green infrastructure).

The issue of red line was discussed, in particular that it was agreed by all parties that it should be amended to include all areas affected and or contributing to positive environmental, social and economic change (eg up to the motorway; incidental open space at Castlefields; land alongside Kingsway/Martin Drive etc). It will also be important to continue to consider additional 'blue land' in the control of the Lord Stafford (and possibly others) which might provide a positive contribution to future framework for development.

The map provided in the meeting did not show amended flood areas. Amendments to flood boundaries could lead to higher densities/potential for additional development in the northern part of the site. It was agreed that once the promoters have resolved the

necessary licence for access to the latest modelling (with EA) that this information can be shared with the project team (and also help inform emerging thinking of concepts/initial framework).

JB identified the culverted watercourse on the map and would like to see this opened up as much as possible. A separate culvert near the cricket pitch was discussed. This is outside the site boundary, however the multi benefits of addressing this was discussed by Matt Bulzacchelli in a previous meeting.

The location of and reasons for the Biodiversity Alert site was discussed. The special nature of the site was not clear, however; there was general consensus that it should not prove to be a significant obstacle to achieving the vision for this new part of Stafford.

**Action: NP to investigate this and provide any further information with copy of the minutes.**

Character of existing footpath/footway routes were discussed, in particular:

- Views to the castle are different from different points on the existing walk ways.
- Over the years there has been significant tree growth around the castle, mainly from self setting trees rather than planned management.
- SBC manage the castle with the aim being to protect ancient woodland and for the castle to act as a gateway to Stafford through management of monoculture tree growth. The number of regular users of the castle and surrounding area is not currently monitored. However, it was acknowledged that the majority for the current trees now surrounding the Castle are relatively modern additions to the landscape and that the introduction of an agreed management scheme might provide opportunities to improve the overall setting and context of this important asset.
- Strong footpath in parts but quite open with poor signage in others with some areas being more formal than others
- Local users wish to protect existing routes
- Issue of frontage onto greenway discussed, and potential issues with adjacent uses such as fly tipping etc
- General consensus was that the route character changes from the easterly side, which is more urban, to the west, which is more rural in character. This should be reflected in the masterplanning along with high density towards the northerly/eastern side, with less dense development to the south nearer to the castle
- Opportunities for increasing visitors at Duddas Wood/Millennium Green at Derrington through signing. This could also assist with Habitat Regulation Assessment of the site, and there is opportunity to increase the size of these areas onto Lord Stafford's land. Any application and decision will need to demonstrate that the requirements of the Habitat Regulations Assessment have been addressed.
- The provision of a continuous walking route, along which there could be a number of milestones/destinations (eg Greenway, Duddas Wood, Millenium Green, Golf Course, Castle etc) should be explored further and this, inter alia, could offer significant contributions to SANGS in this part of the town.
- SANGS and the latest (emerging) criteria discussed in context of the spatial plans. There is no longer a specific threshold target for the SUE in respect of

designation of land for SANGS. It is hoped that the final (revised) report might be available towards the end of November.

**Action: NP/AM to update the group on date for publication**

AM asked how much is known about the natural system of the site and geology etc at the moment. This would have an impact on how the site is developed and designed.

Consideration of formal open space/community/services hub was discussed:

- Central hub rather than pocket parks. Some village green style provision would be acceptable as pockets without formal play
- Don't want formal play to be seen as 'leftover land' – it needs to be located so it is successful
- Flexibility regarding the play area at Martin Drive, which could be relocated to incorporate larger area on the central hub
- Flexibility regarding the multi use of formal space – for education, community use etc
- Central location could have viability issues but options could be looked at as part of the masterplanning/community involvement.
- SBC do adopt some open space but not SUDS. In principal there is no issue with using management companies once open space is established. There is also the option for community groups or parish council to take on management but this has not yet been discussed any further.
- Off set distance from motorway could be used for allotments
- Overall across the scheme an informal feel would be encouraged including summer meadows/wildflower areas etc.
- The opportunity for Doxey Marshes to act as an opportunity to address habitat Regulation Assessment requirements should be raised with the Wildlife Trust who manage the site in a zoned approach. The Isobel trail is the only way onto the marshes and there is opportunity to improve this (access to it could lead directly from The Greenway in the eastern part of the site).

**Action: The promoter team agreed to take away the outcomes of both discussion of the Environment and Transport Working Groups and develop initial scenarios/options to be presented to and considered by the Project steering group at end of November/Mid December, taking into account other emerging evidence as referenced above (eg the setting of the Castle, baseline data and flooding work, SANGS report).**

**Associated Action: RP to provide layout of golf course as this will assist with masterplanning and design of footpaths (and copy to project partners).**

**Date of next meeting: Early/Mid December**

## PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

### LAND WEST OF STAFFORD (Burleyfields) – TRANSPORT GROUP

#### ACTION NOTE OF MEETING – Monday 29 October 2012

##### Attendees:

Colin Campbell	Savills on behalf of Developer Consortium
Mike Barker	EDP on behalf of Developer Consortium
Julian Pye	ATLAS
Darren Bell	ATLAS
Naomi Perry	Stafford Borough Council – Planning Policy
Ted Manders	Stafford Borough Council – Planning
Adrian Clack	Taylor Wimpey
Fergus Thomas	Bellway Homes
Richard Stevenson	Bellway Homes
Iain Griffin	MLA
Russell Poole	Lord Staffords estate
Mike Barker	EDP
Rebecca Gregory	EDP
Nick Dawson	Staffordshire County Council – Transport
Annabel Chell	Staffordshire County Council – Transport

##### Apologies

Phil Wooliscroft	Croft on behalf of Developer Consortium
Richard Hickman	St Modwen's

##### Minutes

The minutes of the previous August meeting were agreed with many of the actions covered in the agenda.

JP and MB provided a summary of the earlier discussion of the Environmental Working Group – highlighting the key information recorded on the overlays and plans.

- Existing setting of the Castle and related work
- Access routes – roads and walkways
- Desire lines for access based on existing paths
- Recreation/community hub
- Proposed Greenway

Options were discussed for road and multi modal access into the site and illustrations provided on the map including discussion on cycle way improvements due to take place through existing built up area in terms of signage etc.

Kingsway is considered 'over-engineered' for the existing purpose and the required strategy for WAI infrastructure and, whilst SCC would not promote residential frontage directly onto a revised highway environment, there are options to change

the width and character (environment) of the road. It is still considered a 'distributor' road and this should not change.

It was also agreed between parties that the environment of the existing Martin Drive and its relationship with both existing development at Castlefields and future development within the site could be improved in principle (this also needs to be considered in light of discussions for the provision of the Greenway and any additional pedestrian routes at the eastern end of the site).

Access points from Doxey into the site (SUE) were considered. Options for 2 or 3 access points were discussed, with the conclusion that 2 access points was the desirable option. Due to bus access, some roads would need to be wider than others (ie display different design characteristics). The option of having a wider road on the southern part of the site to cater for buses was discussed, along with having a different width road to the northern part. Doxey is relatively well served by buses and so it is not necessary that the whole site should be served by the same bus route as long as there are other forms of access between the two parts of the site. However, an improvement of existing bus services might be the most appropriate starting point for consideration of this issue. It was acknowledged that continuous routes running past highest levels of population, on primary routes would be required and thus would be more commercially viable. This part of the discussion also included the potential location of a new local centre (and two or three options were recorded, all close to the Greenway).

Access from The Drive considered unlikely for cars due to ownership and issue of directing traffic through existing residential areas. The Greenway would need to be crossed at grade. SCC own the Greenway and would not give permission to crossing it until the first phase of the Western Access Improvement scheme is completed. In addition, it would be expected that parts of the greenway would become lit. Furthermore, some parts of it would benefit from natural surveillance from new development.

Driving behaviours were discussed, and SCC expressed a view that, due to Doxey being traffic calmed at present, the southern part of the site should be consistent in terms of traffic calming measures so it does become an alternative route.

AC explained that 2 access points would allow the potential of the site being built out from both the easterly and westerly directions which in turn could assist with releasing maximum value from the land; overall viability and delivery of required infrastructure.

Possibility of extending current street 'ends' at Castlefields was discussed and SCC consider there is no reason why these couldn't continue onto new access routes.

The work that SCC has carried out is nearly completed taking into account comments provided by Phil Wooliscroft.

**Action: SCC to complete the report and provide to the steering group as soon as possible**

**Action: Promoters and SCC to provide comments on the Publication document as soon as possible, at latest by Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November, in order for changes to be incorporated before the document is agreed by full Council. The document will then go out for formal representations early December.**

**Action: Various development scenarios and options to be considered by the Promoter team and presented for discussion to the steering group end of November/mid December, taking on board the discussion regarding access routes and transport issues (and other matters discussed as part of the Environmental Working group).**





## PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

### LAND WEST OF STAFFORD – PROJECT STEERING GROUP MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 10 JANUARY 2013

*In Attendance:*

Ted Manders (TM)	Head of Planning & Regeneration, Stafford Borough Council
Colin Campbell (CC)	Director, Savills consultants for Developer Consortium
Russell Poole (RP)	Estate Manager, Lord Stafford's Estate
Richard Hickman (RH)	St Modwen Estates
Ian Romano (IR)	St Modwen Estates
Adrian Clack (AC)	Taylor Wimpey
Sarah Milward (SM)	Taylor Wimpey
Fergus Thomas (FT)	Bellway
Julian Pye (JP)	Advisory Team for Large Applications Service (ATLAS)
Darren Bell (DB)	Advisory Team for Large Applications Service (ATLAS)
Alex Yendole (AY)	Planning Policy Manager, Stafford Borough Council

Apologies

Iain Griffin – MLA representing Saint Gobain  
Wendy Woodward – Staffordshire County Council  
Mark Alford, Stafford Borough Council

- TM introduced the purpose of the meeting in order to establish progress to date and the position for future collaborative working on land west of Stafford.
- CC provided an update regarding the Statement of Common Ground, explaining that the consortium had made progress and was close to agreeing final revisions. RH stated that St Modwen were not in a position to sign the Statement of Common Ground due to site disposal associated with the land recently consented planning permission following the Appeal decision for 80 new houses and approximately 2 hectares of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGS) which is within Flood Zone 2. RH stated that a private management agreement would be established with new residents to maintain the SANG rather than seek transfer of the land to Stafford Borough Council. AY explained that the Statement of Common Ground was required by April 2013 to support the Plan for Stafford Borough – Submission.

**ACTION:** RH to prepare a form of words to input into the Statement of Common Ground explaining St Modwen's position and reason for not signing up.  
CC to agree wording for Statement of Common Ground and submit to AY by Friday 1 February 2013

- RH asked for St Modwen's land to be excluded from the Burleyfields comprehensive development area due to the recent consent and its imminent disposal to a housebuilder for delivery. Part of St Modwen's land is required to deliver the Stafford Western Access Improvement scheme. TM stated that

Stafford Borough Council would not be making further changes to the Plan for Stafford Borough this side of the public Examination. IR stated that it was not St Modwen's intention to land-bank the site. It was estimated that approximately 30-40 houses could come forward as additional development on St Modwen's land in addition to the SANGS provision and consented scheme.

- AY introduced a proforma seeking an estimated completion rate each year for the land west of Stafford. CC stated that an update is required from Staffordshire County Council in terms of the cost breakdown for the Stafford Western Access Improvement Scheme to establish the delivery approach based on a business case. TM stated that there was a significant cost difference between the Burleyfields consortium delivering the new road and the County Council taking the scheme forward.

**ACTION: CC to complete the housing completion table and return to AY.  
ND to re-circulate the cost breakdown for the Burleyfields link road**

- AY introduced the Indicative Programme and Task Plan previously circulated by ATLAS. There was broad agreement with the list of tasks identified under the Policy, Master Planning and Delivery headings together with the milestones. To date the following tasks have been completed:

POLICY	Refine Policy Wording and Concept Plan Prepare Full Council report Pre-submission consultation – deadline 28 February 2013
--------	--

- It was agreed that significant progress had been made on the Green Infrastructure Framework Plan and the Connections Framework Plan which will be finalised through the Master Planning / Strategic Framework Plan currently being co-ordinated by Barton Willmore consultants in the next few weeks, subject to future community engagement and options appraisal. TM stated that SCC Education were currently progressing with future education modelling work to establish the primary and secondary education requirements. This should be completed by the end of January 2013. A minimum 2 form entry primary school as part of the land west of Stafford was welcomed together with other social infrastructure. CC stated that the phasing of infrastructure needed to be clarified in terms of delivery of new development at Burleyfields. CC confirmed that no planning application would be progressed on land west of Stafford until the end of 2014, although there would be housing delivered within the first 5 years of the Plan period starting at 2011.

**ACTION: TM / AY to circulate SCC education modelling evidence, when available, anticipated for February 2013.**

- FT confirmed that Bellway acting with St Gobain were keen to progress with a planning application for their land holdings during 2013 but not to conflict with the Local Plan independent Examination process, to deliver 170 new houses.

- JP stated that Network Rail had been approached regarding future work in 2016 / 2017 on the Doxey Road rail bridge and are seeking a meeting to co-ordinate infrastructure delivery. Further investigations are required for the requirement of the freight sidings.

**ACTION: JP to convene a meeting with Network Rail to progress co-ordination of infrastructure delivery.**

- CC asked for further information from Mark Alford in terms of the infrastructure requirements and Section 106 obligations for land west of Stafford including health, public open space as well as off-site infrastructure such as SANGS. Through TM / AY it was agreed that a full list of deliverables would be provided by CC as part of pre-application discussions to Mark Alford to support infrastructure delivery to clarify the type of place to be achieved.

**ACTION: TM / AY to provide further information to CC in terms of Section 106 obligations and infrastructure provision.**

**CC to provide a list of infrastructure deliverables for land west of Stafford including the phasing approach**

- A general discussion took place regarding viability testing for land west of Stafford to support new development delivery in the context of the new Local Plan, which will lead from the infrastructure phasing and costing work. CC stated that this work would need to be informed by the infrastructure requirements and viability of the Plan in its wider context. TM stated that it was in all parties interests to demonstrate that the new Local Plan is sound to deliver new development. JP agreed to consider the viability issues raised at other Local Plan examinations recently and establish whether further ATLAS expertise could assist with this matter. This should also be supported by the Project Managers.
- The next key stage of progressing the project is Community Engagement. CC confirmed that the consortium had prepared a proposal to deliver wider community engagement on the master planning approach and options. However feedback was needed on the historic environment study from English Heritage in the next few weeks, after EDP completes the work. Further clarification is also needed on SANGS from Antony Muller at Natural England. CC stated that the site development options tabled by Barton Willmore at the combined Environment & Transport meeting needed to be reviewed prior to final agreement at the next meeting, proposed for end of February, based on 2-3 scenarios. TM stated that the Burleyfields community representatives had not received any information for more than a year and that a meeting was now necessary to provide an update.

**ACTION: CC to provide the Community Engagement proposal to TM / AY. CC to clarify SANGS requirements with AM by early February 2013.**

**CC to circulate reviewed master plans and associated scenarios.**

- RP stated that Heads of Terms were close to finalisation with Stafford Rugby Club in order to move to a new site at Blackberry Lane by 2015 to correspond with the Rugby World Cup. This is being effectively driven by the new Chair.
- Date of Next Meeting –Tuesday 5 March 26 February 2013 (TBC) in the Craddock Room, Stafford Borough Council's at Staffordshire County Council's offices, Riverside1 Staffordshire Place, Tipping Street, STAFFORD. ST16 3AQ.

## PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

### LAND WEST OF STAFFORD (Burleyfields) – ENVIRONMENT GROUP

#### ACTION NOTE OF MEETING – THURSDAY 10 JANUARY 2013

##### Attendees:

Colin Campbell	Savills on behalf of Developer Consortium
Mike Barker	EDP on behalf of Developer Consortium
John Beckett	Environment Agency
Jane Field	Environment Agency
Stephen Dean	Staffordshire County Council – Archaeology
Amanda Smith	English Heritage
Ali Glaisher	Staffordshire County Council – Ecology
Fergus Thomas	Bellway Homes
Iain Griffin	MLA
Russell Poole	Lord Stafford's Estate
Julian Pye	ATLAS
Darren Bell	ATLAS
Naomi Perry	Stafford Borough Council – Planning Policy
Penny McKnight	Stafford Borough Council – Conservation
Richard Hickman	St Modwen
Ian Romano	St Modwen
Nick Dawson	Staffordshire County Council – Transport
Annabel Chell	Staffordshire County Council – Transport
Adrian Clack	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
Sarah Milward	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
Alex Yendole	Stafford Borough Council – Planning Policy
James de Havilland	Barton Willmore
Ash Gupta	Barton Willmore

##### **Apologies**

Antony Muller	Natural England,
Ted Manders	Stafford Borough Council – Planning
Roger Leverett	Stafford Borough Council – Leisure

##### **Minutes of 29th October meeting**

Minutes from the environment and transport group meetings, 29<sup>th</sup> October, were discussed with updates and amendments below:

- CC provided update on the flood modelling to be done on the northwest corner of the site, which will begin shortly. The aim is to establish developable land rather than determining access.
- AM – word changes required regarding sensitivity – page 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence 'This work will need to feed into the Local Plan evidence base, master planning'.

**Action:** MB confirmed that the work relating to the sensitivity of the setting of the castle has been delayed and will be provided week beginning 14<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

- CC enquired whether including the open space at Castlefields was agreed in the meeting. The red line has not been amended in light of this and it was agreed that this be considered through the masterplanning process as an opportunity.
- Regarding the Biodiversity Alert Site (BAS), AC enquired as to the current condition of this and reason for designation.

**Action: NP to attach map of this area to the minutes and report on the reason for designation.**

- Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) – the position of the SUDS approval board was discussed. Staffordshire County Council have not yet taken on the role of Approval Board, anticipated for April 2013, and the consortium will need to consider options regarding this – whether SUDS are agreed and maintained by the SUDS approval board or a private management company. SBC policy is still not to adopt SUDS.
- Transport – the issue of not developing land facing onto the Kingsway was discussed. The transport report has now been finalised by SCC and distributed with agreement for inclusion in the Council's evidence base.

**Action: Wording of the minutes to be amended to read doesn't rather than does in relation to traffic calming.**

### **Plan for Stafford Borough Update**

AY gave an update on The Plan for Stafford Borough. The timetable is as follows:

- Consultation begins 11<sup>th</sup> January until 12 noon on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2013.
- March and April 2013 – review representations and identify key issues
- Submit end of April / May 2013
- Examination late July or September 2013 – dependent on number and nature of responses received.
- An updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has been produced and is available online with an updated Gypsy Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) expected in the next few weeks.
- The document can be viewed online at <http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/publication> and evidence base at <http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/gathering-evidence>

AS enquired as to how the castle sensitivity work will fit into the plan with the response being it will form part of the evidence base when completed and signed off.

AY provided an update on affordable housing viability work and indicated that the Stafford housing market is improving, with affordable housing becoming more viable. An affordable housing summit is being arranged to take place in March 2013 with representatives, housing providers and consultants invited for roundtable discussions.

CC stated that whilst the affordable housing viability work has been done, a cumulative viability study into all areas / requirements hasn't been completed and this should be done for the Examination to meet requirements of NPPF and for soundness of the plan.



## Evidence Base

- The draft historic environment report is to be published imminently for consultation with EH, SBC and SCC. The aim is to finalise this report quickly and for issues to be carried forward into the plan and masterplan. The key themes in the report have been carried through the masterplanning work to date. SD enquired as to the geo-physical study and it was concluded in discussion that this work was never completed or carried out.

**Action: MB to circulate the report for comments and confirm that the geo-physical report was not commissioned.**

- Flooding – Last outstanding work relating to flood modelling for the northwest corner to be completed. JB responded that the modelling of the River Sow, in terms of the impact on Doxey Road, required work to demonstrate suitable access, with work demonstrating sustainable drainage also required. EA will not object on SUDS grounds so long as there is sufficient space for water.
- SANGS / HRA – AG gave an update on the work. The Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) reports will be published soon. AG will be meeting with AM 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. Outcomes of both will be passed on as soon as possible.
- Transport – No other outstanding work required. Modelling work for other strategic locations is progressing but none are at the same stage as Burleyfields. There are no cumulative impacts arising yet, providing that all sites incorporate the correct infrastructure.

## Progress of plan options

MB gave an introduction to the master planning maps, which is the basis for the development options. The mapping included consideration of surrounding land uses, golf course design, views, SUDS, existing Rights of Way (RoW).

JH introduced the basis for the options (Option 1, 2, 3 and 1B)

- **Option 1** – this was based on an internalised circular route running from the top and bottom of the local centre area. The option provides strong links to the Castle, a formal strong Green Infrastructure (GI) route with formal frontage to the south with lower densities. Existing features such as RoW routes and hedgerows are incorporated into GI network. The idea is for the scheme to sit within the landscape and is less formal on the southern edge. The option provides significant opportunities for large space planting and RoW improvements. GI also includes allotments, orchards, active uses. The red line area does not include the rugby club land. SUDS are considered part of GI. The school is closely related to the local centre.
- The BAS is covered by sports pitch provision and this obviously needs to consider a recent assessment of the site. The option would provide 2,100 dwellings for the whole Burleyfields area with an average of 37 dwellings per hectare, excluding the mixed-use area. Key discussion items focused on level of sports pitch provision, habitat provision and local centre position. AS asked whether profile sections had been produced as these would be useful. The

proposed western access road is shown with development frontage and JdH stated that the road could be made to work in this way.

- **Option 2** – the local centre focus is shown lower down (further south) within the site with the main access route being more linear. The school is adjacent to the centre but not as closely related as Option 1. The option still has a strong green link to the castle with a more formal green space approach. The option removes some hedgerows and manages the space from field character to townscape. The option shows more development to the north and fewer allotments. The northeast section as with the first option been kept as green land. However it could be considered for low density / soft edge development. The option presents similar densities but overall has more dwellings than in option 1. Key discussion items focused on the need to retain hedges not just for habitat purposes but also for a historic environment purpose and the GI/ecology principle of keeping the best features of the site. The western access route is shown with a green swathe off set. All options cater for 2 form entry education provision.

**Action: AY to check with SCC regarding education provision as further provision may be required.**

- **Option 3** – This option has the same development approach for the area north of the Green Way but includes an additional access opportunity onto Doxey Road. This option is a more regularised urban and formal arrangement with long boulevards but fewer formal linked views to Stafford Castle. The street pattern is orientated in a different way to Options 1 & 2 with increased housing densities. There is retail provision along a High Street type approach, with a higher density focus, and is the only option identifying small-scale employment areas in this locality. There is also formalised green space.
- **Option 1B** – This option is the same approach as Option 1 except for development included north of the Biodiversity Alert Site.

In general terms, overall densities of around 37 dph would be required in order to meet the policy requirement for numbers of new homes. However, it was acknowledged that this is a somewhat crude, blunt measure at this stage of the process and that within such a figure there would be opportunity for appropriate variance and range both above and below this figure.

The connectivity shown on all options was welcomed. It was noted that all options have extensions on the existing Martin Drive and Redgrave Drive roads in order to provide alternative routes into and out of the site. A general discussion took place about the merits of these routes and the impact on existing local residents together with access to new facilities in the Burleyfields area. CC stated that employment need for this particular part of Stafford had not been demonstrated. AG raised concern about the BAS with further evidence to justify ecological losses and the required approach. It was also raised that sport's provision needed to be finalised, with the proportion on and off site. CC to make contact with Roger Leverett to establish the identified priorities and types of open space provision. AG asked for Andy Goode from Staffordshire County Council to be invited to future meetings to provide an input into the landscape and design aspects.



JP suggested that other strategic locations / large scale developments could be visited by the project group in other areas to gather further information about the approach and qualitative outcomes for such developments.

CC stated that the master planning options should not be circulated to other parties until members of the developer consortium had had an opportunity to review and include changes. It was agreed that the revisions should identify constraints and profiles. CC agreed to gain further information from Natural England about SANGs requirements including off-site provision. AG added that the existing guidance sets out the qualitative expectations for SANGS.

**Action: ALL to provide bullet pointed comments to CC and AY concerning the master plan options by Friday 18<sup>th</sup> January 2013.**

**Action: Consortium team to circulate constraints plan.**

**Action: Consortium team to refine 2-3 options for further discussion at working group meeting to include potential blue land re: overall contribution to green infrastructure and SANGS.**

**Date of Next Meeting:** 10.00 a.m. Tuesday 5 March 2013 in the Craddock Room, Stafford Borough Council's offices, Riverside STAFFORD. ST16 3AQ



## Burleyfields, Stafford – Strategic Location for Development

### Transport & Movement – Western Access Improvements/Upgrade of Doxey Bridge

Meeting/discussion with Network Rail, 26<sup>th</sup> February 2013

### Agenda/basis for discussion and Key Issues / Actions Arising

---

#### Introductions (All)

Colin Campbell, Savills (CC)  
Nick Dawson, Staffs CC Transport Planning (ND)  
Russell Poole, Lord Stafford Estates (RP)  
Rob Turner Network Rail, Dev Surveyor, Network Rail (RT)  
Richard Draper, Network Rail, Asset Protection (RD)  
Alex Yendole, Planning Policy Manager Stafford BC (AY)  
Richard Stevenson, Bellway Homes (RS)  
Ian Romano, St Modwen (IR)  
Ian Griffin, MLA - St Gobain (IG)  
Adrian Clack, Taylor Wimpey (AC)  
Jon Sandford, ATLAS  
Julian Pye, ATLAS

#### Introduction to the project – context and background (SBC/SCC)

- Objective – collective understanding to the issue of crossing of WCML and provision of infrastructure.
- Background – Alex Yendole – outlined where policy making process is up to. EiP later in 2013. All about delivery – 2200 houses planned for the area.
- ND – ongoing dialogue with devpr consortium. SCC evidence base for the Council. Need for more than just sust trans strat reqd. Are more houses in area adding to dev pressure. More hard infra needed – 3 phases. Total scheme cost £37.4m
- CC – 4 land owner devpr interests. Cost / timing of W access is key issue. Consensus for signif dev than this infra is reasonable suggestion. Principle of infra is agreed.
- RT - Sidings – crossing of rail link to them – are they operational? 2017 potential window – ~~may not become operationally viable~~. Siding proposed to be decommissioned (redundant & railway infrastructure recovered) Dec 2015 as part of Network Rail's Stafford re-signalling project – siding land may become surplus to Network Rail's requirements following decommissioning and a freehold sale may be possible subject to railway and regulatory approvals inc. network change to be sold, as part of re-signalling programme. Formal internal consultation within NR required. Internal consultation / due diligence could occur at any time – ensure are no other operational reqmnts for the line. Understood that the siding is not mentioned in NR's route utilisation strategy (RUS) but to clarify. Need to get approval clarification from ORR to disposal under NR's Land Disposal Licence Condition as well. NR Business clearance 2 weeks; NR Tech clearance 4 weeks; So in 6 weeks overall could get internal NR approval for disposal unless objections raised.

Issue/Task	Responsible
1. Send letter to SBC setting out no objections/support for the proposed SDL at Burleyfields, including existing railway sidings	RT (NR)
2. Clarify Network Rail process (including timescales) in respect of potential land disposal for sidings and options (eg conditional sale etc)	RT (NR)
3. Carry out initial 'internal' valuation of land (Sidings)	RT (NR)
4. Identify/agree preferences for development appraisal process	RT (NR)
5. Identify likely design parameters for improvements to existing Doxey Bridge over West Coast mainline (share current information and examples from elsewhere if relevant)	RD (NR) ND (SCC)
6. Share previous business case for Western Access Infrastructure	ND (SCC)
7. Consider potential risks to structure (Doxey Bridge) and how this would be managed/weighting of risks	RD (+ others) (NR)
8. Establish whether there are current/future plans to improve Stafford Rail Station/associated infrastructure	RT (NR)
9. Identify any alternative strategies to land sale (sidings) - which could be considered to enable delivery of required infrastructure at appropriate time	ND(SCC) RT (NR) CC (Sav) et al

- Industry stakeholders also have to be consulted on the proposed disposal under Network Rail's Land Disposal Licence Condition – 56 day process. If no objections then, dependant on responses, NR apply to ORR seeking Specific Consent to the disposal – have 3 months to determine if sale is acceptable to the ORR. Alternatively NR can consider using General Consent grounds following industry consultation

The need for the 'improved' railway crossing (and wider transport/movement strategy) **(SCC/NR)**

- ND – existing bridge is strong enough – but 1.2m raising in level with footway and cycleway.
- ND – do the rail sidings crossing first, then main line (so not cut off the Doxy area).
- NR - can provide indications as possible possessions.
- Once is no rail use – other restrictions – enter into discussions for heads of terms for disposal. (Issue; NR share of cost savings?) Possible release of land to consortium. Different ways to structure a potential deal – depends on intended outcomes. NR to take stock after meeting and consider further.
- Anker Valley development in Tamworth Staffs similar situation.
- Need for potential heads of terms to be drafted up for agreement with NR.
- Issue – need to get best value to NR – NR need further information to inform valuation. i.e Number of keyholders, land ownership Plan, master plan, deal structure/option required?, appraisal etc
- Need to establish how much housing can be released with the western road/Doxey Rd upgrade and without it – ~~will affects NR position is.~~
- Lead in time for the design of the new bridge – go through Asset Protection team – difficult to put timescale depending on information required / provided.
- If siding bridge no longer required – then could cross at grade saving time and construction costs.

**The nature of the bridge crossing proposed – options, timescales, guiding parameters and potential funding including any existing commitments (from both NR and County perspective) (SCC/NR)**

- £4.65m for complete new bridge structure. Design of bridge yet to be determined – whole set of parameters to be determined. NR no plans to raise bridge – but if renew bridge have to renew parapets and so raise bridge.
- Risk assessment of incursion also relevant – vehicular incursion risk to the rail.
- Former SCC engineer – view was that the bridge needs to be replaced. Some operational advantage in lifting the bridge height – eg signal sighting on the line.

**Understanding the railway operating context.**

**Nature of the line to be crossed.**

- Siding as above, then WCML.
- **Adjacent existing (at grade- level) crossings that a new bridge may obviate the need for)**
- RT confirmed that no level crossings appear to be in the vicinity

- Running surface belongs to County – NR owns the structure – structural sound / increased risk of traffic crossing – loading and incursion. Query process of appraising increased risk/ process to be clarified – assess how real the risk increase is and its implications.
- If bridge replaced or works to it – cost and maint liability looked to be taken on by the Council.

**Understanding the benefits of the crossing for Network Rail – factors enabling Network Rail to take an holistic and wider benefit view; as opposed to a more narrowly commercial ransom strip view. (NR/All)**

- ND - SCC great priority on this as a project – but will be a limit on best value negotiations.
- Bridge adopted – reduced maint costs – NR consider as part of any shared value payment.

**Understanding Network Rails negotiating remit, statutory powers and obligations to its Board – in securing best value for the use of its assets and air rights. (NR)**

- Work required to work through the process?
- Due diligence – have a look at the appraisal.
- NR would not block the scheme per se.
- Are benchmark appraisal approached / examples that can be used as comparison.
- NR do both in house and outsource / consultant agent input to appraisal process.
- Query if NR can take holistic view of benefit of the development to NR – patronage on the network / improvement to the station etc.
- Net Rail – own the station – no plans to improve the station. Work ongoing at the moment – new roof.
- Stokes vs Cambridge case – cited as precedent case – 50% value to NR if single keyholder.

**Project management/process – NR's communication process – negotiation, design etc. (NR/All)**

- One point of contact – JP – action as conduit of key issues/information for all parties for now (SCC to share information with NR).
- Issue of how to include NR in the process – NR are open to assist.

**Agree actions/tasks (All)**

- Parallel valuation work - principle
- No objections in principle letter.
- Process for appraisal to be clarified –relevant information etc.
- NR to clarify parameters for design – examples – SCC structures person to liaise with NR.
- Risk structure process to be clarified.

- Clarify NR spend plans for the area / station.
- Idea of site meeting to enhance understanding of the rail issues.







## **Burleyfields Historic Environment Meeting, 21 March 2013**

**Attending:** *Alex Yendole (SBC), Mark Alford (SBC), Penny McKnight (SBC), Amanda Smith (English Heritage) Ian George (English Heritage) Stephen Dean (SCC), Gareth Owen (SCC), Darren Bell (HCA ATLAS).*

### **Introduction/purpose of the meeting**

1. It was agreed the purpose of the meeting was 1. to discuss any overarching issues regarding the setting of the castle and the implications for the allocation of land west of Burleyfields, and 2. Agree some key principles that could provide a steer in the preparation of the emerging concept masterplan options for the site.
2. It was acknowledged that this was not the correct forum to review the detailed technical queries associated with EDP's report Historic Environmental Assessment) but that a separate meeting would follow with EDP in attendance. However English Heritage (EH) and Staffordshire County Council (SCC) will prepare separate comments and queries on the report and aim to send out by 9 April .

### **General points**

3. EH explained that in their opinion an important part of the significance of the Castle lies in its strategic position in the landscape and its open, rural surroundings - this area representing the last rural land formerly associated with the medieval Castle. Central to this significance is the local topography which affords views to and from the castle, including long distance views. The network of formal and informal public footpaths also contribute to the public's appreciation of the Castle and its landscape context.. It was also clarified that the woodland management of the Castle grounds could change in the future and the existing planting has not been subject to recent management.
4. As an overarching point of principle it was agreed that some housing development could be accommodated at Burleyfields, including on land south of the railway, subject to appropriate mitigation being implemented. It was also agreed that the proximity of the Castle affords a good opportunity to achieve a distinctive and attractive development given its strong association with the town and overall image of the Borough.
5. In relation to the EH representation on the proposed allocation in the pre-submission Stafford Local Plan, it was agreed that this could be addressed once a concept plan (and supporting policy wording and strategic development principles) has been agreed showing how the site could be developed appropriately. At this stage,

however, the published Concept Plan shows potential housing development on all parts of the site. AY confirmed that it was the intention was to retain the Concept Plan but it could be revised as part of modifications once an alternative plan was prepared. It could also be possible to use a Statement of Common ground to set out the key design measures that would overcome EH's in principles objection.

### **Site specific principles**

6. In establishing site specific principles for consideration in the masterplanning it was agreed to review the mitigation measures suggested in the EDP report and other principles that had been earlier discussed in relation to green infrastructure. In no particular order the following key principles were agreed:
  - Create a broad north-south green corridor emanating from the castle and emphasising key view/s. The corridor should avoid being too formal or too narrow and relevant examples from elsewhere could help demonstrate how this should be designed.
  - Appreciate the landform and topography, in particular through a sensitive and careful approach to the prominent ridgeline running east west across the site.
  - Take a sensitive approach to development within a central swathe of land extending north from the castle to the former railway; and land close to the south eastern corner of the site (see attached indicative plan). This could include a number of design responses such as keeping the land open (e.g. far southeast corner), open space provision, lower density development, and greater permeability in the design .
  - Retain and enhance the public right of way network to maintain connections to the castle, town and adjacent settlements.
  - Retain hedgerows within the proposed development, but also consider extension of hedgerow lines where they have been broken and would make valuable contribution to the development form and or help to reinforce the local topography where this varies from the existing hedgerow network.
  - Locate the neighbourhood centre and other key public open spaces in potential view corridors of the castle, in order to enhance the experience of the heritage asset and reinforce civic associations.
  - Ensure the green spaces on the southern boundary are well related to routes or gaps on the proposed golf course extension to help ensure the landscaping of both sites is complementary.
7. It was agreed that the above principles should be tested through the emerging options and there would need to be a balance with other development and planning objectives including drainage, green infrastructure and development capacity.
8. Off-site measures identified in the EDP report were also discussed. It was agreed that management of the woodland belt could be improved. In this context there is the potential for a Heritage Partnership Agreement. The proposed improvement of the management of the processional route between Stafford and the castle may play a role and could be discussed but, is more closely associated with the Golf Course extension than Burleyfield.s

9. It was reiterated that a long range section through the site would be helpful in understanding the relationship of the site's topography with the castle and any proposed design options.

#### **Next Steps**

10. It was agreed that the key principles in this note be shared prior to a meeting with EDP. In addition, separate notes regarding the detail of EDP's report would be circulated. All parties welcomed an on-going dialogue and involvement in the emerging development concepts for the site.

DRAFT





## **Burleyfields Historic Environment Group Meeting, 11<sup>th</sup> April 2013**

**Attending:** *Alex Yendole (SBC), Colin Campbell (Savills); Andrew Crutchley (EDP); Penny McKnight (SBC), Amanda Smith (English Heritage) Ian George (EH); Neil Rimmington (EH); Alison Macdonald (EH); Julian Pye (HCA ATLAS).*

### **Introduction/purpose of the meeting**

1. It was agreed the purpose of the meeting was
  - i). to review and fully understand the outputs of the Historic Environment Group meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup> March;
  - ii). Seek consensus on the key principles,
  - iii). Discuss potential approaches, solutions and mitigation that could be considered as part of the preparation of the emerging concept masterplan options for the site, and;
  - iv). Agree future programme / next steps along with a timetable.

### **General points**

2. EH agreed that they would circulate their detailed observations on the EDP report – Historic Character Assessment – by week ending 19<sup>th</sup> April 2013. It was also acknowledged that their comments would not contain anything of principle that hadn't already been raised in context of the discussions to date.
3. It was also agreed that EH would be happy to carry out further work on a statement of common ground which would help inform the plan making process; build consensus and provide greater certainty in context of the emerging evidence base for Burleyfields and future delivery.
4. As an overarching point of principle it was agreed that the issue of topography is central to formulating an appropriate response to the sensitivity of the setting. It was acknowledged that historic setting / environment should also be considered in the round with other key issues / parameters such as green infrastructure, transport and movement and location of key infrastructure and facilities.
5. AY agreed that the formulation and agreement of a spatial concept plan (master plan concept) would be helpful in overcoming some of the current concerns about the draft policy and concept plan. It was also acknowledged that an agreed concept plan could be included as a core document for the future Examination in Public; be part of any recommended revisions / changes to the Inspector; be referred to in revised statements of common ground and be recognised as a more sophisticated and



informed method of explaining the policy – offering a more refined plan compared to the one in the draft Local Plan. It was also agreed that a concept master plan that had been tested with community representatives could also be endorsed by Cabinet (or appropriate representatives thereof).

### Site specific principles

6. The key principles as suggested were discussed in turn: There was no fundamental disagreement to these and additional comments are shown in italics immediately following the main text of each in turn.

- Create a north-south green corridor emanating from the castle and emphasising key view/s. The corridor should avoid being too formal or too narrow and relevant examples from elsewhere could help demonstrate how this should be designed. *Agreed that this should not be a formal avenue and that it would not have to reflect a single view of the castle from both within and beyond the site boundary. From within the site, vistas and glimpses of the castle / setting could be of equal importance. The north south route ought to relate to other factors such as green infrastructure (existing and proposed) and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) as well as transport and movement.*
- Appreciate the landform and topography, in particular through a sensitive and careful approach to the prominent ridgeline running east west across the site. *Agreed*
- Take a sensitive approach to development within a central swathe of land extending north from the castle to the former railway; and land close to the south eastern corner of the site (see attached indicative plan). This could include lower density, more open space and greater permeability (see attached indicative plan). *The issue of density should not be seen as just a discussion on the number of homes. Any variations of built form density should not respond by applying concentric circles of differing density from the edge of the site towards the centre. That is, the response should be more sensitive and also reflect other key factors, including hierarchy of streets / movement and broader pattern of land uses and the distribution of open space/green infrastructure. For example, the parcel of land in the south eastern corner will might require a particularly sensitive response and -built form response when combined with inter alia the point below. Alternatively-given the high quality of views from this area it may warrant an open space use.*
- Retain and enhance the public right of way network to maintain connections to the castle, town and adjacent settlements. *Agreed that the routes should make sense in any future development layout / pattern. This might require diversion where sensible and practicable. The historic significance of the southern footpath route (processional route) on the edge of the site was acknowledged in conjunction with the close and prominent views of the Castle from the associated south eastern corner of the site.*
- Retain hedgerows within the proposed development, but also consider extension of hedgerow lines where they have been broken and would make valuable contribution to the development form. *Retention where it is sensible to do so (and not just for its own sake) and reinforcement as a general characteristic within the site. Need to consider future maintenance and management as part of overall green infrastructure and the issue of public and private space.*

- Locate the neighbourhood centre and other key public open spaces in potential view corridors of the castle, in order to enhance the experience of the historic asset and to help realise the potential of the asset to enrich the design and distinctive offer of the area.  
*Agreed that this represents a key opportunity. Need to combine with movement framework and consider views.*
  - Ensure the green spaces on the southern boundary are well related to routes or gaps on the proposed golf course extension.  
*Agreed. Need to explore further the approved planting / landscaping scheme for the golf course extension (and consider whether it should and could be improved). Need to consider potential proximity of properties to edge of golf course and whether any further means of protection is required.*
7. It was agreed that the above principles should now be tested through the emerging concept options and there would need to be a balance with other development and planning objectives including drainage, green infrastructure and development capacity.
  8. There is also an opportunity to further consider off-site measures (identified in the EDP report). This might include improvements to woodland management and also build on the agreed green infrastructure principles, including contributing to the potential demand for circular walks and alternative destinations.
  9. It was reiterated that long range sections through the site would be helpful in understanding the relationship of the site's topography with the castle.

#### **Programme / Next Steps**

- a) EH to share their comments on the EDP report by w/end 19<sup>th</sup> April 2013
- b) Consortium team to meet to discuss emerging concepts / approach on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2013
- c) Agree dates for the next Environmental Working Group (mid to end May 2013); CC to advise
- d) Consortium team to circulate emerging master plan concepts at least 1 week ahead of the agreed date of the working group
- e) Agree two master plan concepts that could form the basis for community engagement
- f) Diary community engagement event (preferably towards the end of June)
- g) Present emerging options to appropriate elected members of SBC (SCC?)
- h) Carry out community engagement and report back on findings / outcomes
- i) SBC to endorse master plan concept (Summer 2013)





## PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

### LAND WEST OF STAFFORD – PROJECT STEERING GROUP MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 6 JUNE 2013

*In Attendance:*

Ted Manders (TM)	Head of Planning & Regeneration, Stafford Borough Council
Colin Campbell (CC)	Director, Savills consultants for Developer Consortium
Iain Griffin (IG)	MLA representing Saint Gobain
Ian Romano (IR)	St Modwen Estates
Adrian Clack (AC)	Taylor Wimpey
Julian Pye (JP)	Advisory Team for Large Applications Service (ATLAS)
Darren Bell (DB)	Advisory Team for Large Applications Service (ATLAS)
Alex Yendole (AY)	Planning Policy Manager, Stafford Borough Council

Apologies      Russell Poole (RP) – Estate Manager, Lord Stafford's Estate  
Richard Stevenson – Bellway  
Wendy Woodward – Staffordshire County Council

- TM introduced the purpose of the meeting in order to establish progress to date and the position for future collaborative working on land west of Stafford.
- CC provided an update regarding the master planning session reporting a good discussion with a number of detailed points resolved, based on a single concept plan but with explanation of the process such as relevant constraints together with the agreed green infrastructure and historic environment principles applied.. The issue of long distance and near distant views of Stafford Castle have been accommodated through a corridor approach of significant open green space. The issue of development in the south east corner of the area is to be resolved with English Heritage but no significant issues to prevent the strategic site being delivered. Nature conservation and sustainable drainage systems to be focused alongside the M6 motorway. CC asked for the latest open space report from Kit Campbell Associates to be provided when completed. Informal open space to contribute to the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace mitigation approach. Immediate next steps is for Barton Willmore to circulate a revised concept plan to all partners, through the Council, by Tuesday 11 June 2013 with responses by Monday 24 June 2013.

**ACTION:**      **AY agreed to circulate the open space report.**

- TM asked St Modwen to explain their current position with regards the consortium. IR stated that St Modwen were no longer contributing financially to the consortium, such as preparing the evidence base, as planning consent has been granted for 80 new dwellings on their land following the Castleworks appeal decision. IR asked for St Modwen's land to be excluded from the land west of Stafford red line boundary and TM stated that this would be considered through the Examination process later in the year. Nevertheless IR stated that St Modwen

wished to remain engaged with the process as an integrated party to delivering the overall scheme, including the residential element and a section of the Stafford Western Access Improvement scheme through land provision. Although there was no representative of Bellway present, it was considered unlikely that Bellway would be in a position to bring forward a planning application before the Examination, although preparatory work around education was being progressed.

- CC stated that 1,800 to 2,000 new homes would be delivered across the land west of Stafford, not including 80 new homes on St Modwen's land and some residential development as part of mixed use on St Gobain's employment land. CC asked about signing off the concept plan at a political level through Stafford Borough Council's processes, following a public consultation event in July 2013. TM explained that the concept plan would be part of the evidence base to support the new Local Plan through the Examination process, linked to a Statement of Common Ground between the Council and the consortium. Lead members from Stafford Borough Council would also be made aware of the latest position and note the concept plan as contributing to a subsequent planning application. However, the Council did not look to endorse such plans at the political level.
- CC stated that the concept plan would be finalised by the end of June 2013, leading to a public exhibition in July 2013 to consider the plans and key topics with the local community. It was considered that a single event would be more appropriate with invited key stakeholders in the morning and the general public engaged in the afternoon and evening. Ward Members from Tillington and Rowley will be specifically notified for the morning session with all Members notified of the afternoon event. The exhibition would take place in mid July 2013 before the summer holidays, with feedback provided to the community via a newsletter in August 2013 to enable completion by mid-September 2013. CC stated it was important for the public to understand the process / story of how the concept plan had been prepared. It was agreed that the consortium (Taylor Wimpey and Bellway) would lead on preparing and delivering the public exhibition, with support from officers of Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council. The public exhibition day is anticipated to take place at St Andrews' Parish Church in Doxey.

**ACTION: AY to provide a list of invitees including key community stakeholders, local Ward Members, residents associations, the Stafford Chamber of Commerce etc..**

- AY gave a brief update on viability. The Council is engaging Level to establish the position on assumptions, funds available for infrastructure provision and policy requirements. Economic viability consultants on behalf of the consortium will be contacted to identify any differences in approach and infrastructure delivery during June 2013 with position statements produced. JP stated that ATLAS viability specialists would also give support to this process.
- TM reported that a dedicated meeting will take place on Tuesday 11 June 2013 to discuss delivery of the Stafford Western Access Improvement scheme including the implications of Network Rail and other landowner interests. ATLAS' transport specialist could attend if the agenda suggested that this would add

value. JP asked for an agenda to the meeting together with a meeting note to be prepared as part of the evidence.

- JP raised the issue of Staffordshire County Council being engaged in the Project Steering Group through a senior officer to ensure consistency and achieve buy-in on key elements of the transport, social and educational infrastructure. It was suggested that Wendy Woodward – District Commissioning Lead for Stafford Borough should be involved. The purpose of engagement was to ensure viability and deliverability of infrastructure including key decisions on prioritisation. AY stated that a County Council commissioned consultancy report on education for Stafford Borough was being finalised and would be available imminently with reference to cluster activity and school capacity.

**ACTION: AY agreed to circulate the finalised Education report.**

- TM stated that the Stafford Western Access Improvement scheme was a key initiative for Staffordshire County Council, with funds being sought through the new Local Transport Body for Staffordshire to deliver sections between Doxey Road railway bridge and the A34 Foregate. Funds would be released by the Department for Transport to the Staffordshire Local Transport Body to deliver the scheme in 2015 – 2019 via a prescribed process if the Stafford Western Access Improvement scheme was agreed as the priority for Staffordshire. The Local Transport Body will make a decision in July 2013 to the Department for Transport. It was noted that re-constructing the Doxey Road railway bridge with an additional height over the West Coast mainline was being considered by Network Rail. The expensive option of extending the width of the bridge to include a walking / cycling link, although desirable was not absolutely essential due to alternative routes from the Burleyfields area into Stafford town centre.
- TM asked the developer consortium to provide a letter of support for the Stafford Western Access Improvement scheme demonstrating commitment and delivery in order to link with the Local Transport Body's approach for funds, signed by Taylor Wimpey, Bellway, Lord Stafford and St Modwen. Furthermore, the Statement of Common Ground should provide contractual agreements regarding the scheme.
- Date of Next Meeting – July 2013 subject to public consultation event.



## PLAN FOR STAFFORD BOROUGH

### LAND WEST OF STAFFORD (Burleyfields) – TOPIC GROUP

#### ACTION NOTE OF MEETING – THURSDAY 6 JUNE 2013

##### Attendees:

Colin Campbell (CC)	Savills on behalf of Developer Consortium
Andrew Crutchley (AC)	EDP on behalf of Developer Consortium
Stephen Dean (SD)	Staffordshire County Council – Archaeology
Amanda Smith (AS)	English Heritage
Ali Glaister (AG)	Staffordshire County Council – Ecology
Fergus Thomas (FT)	Bellway Homes
Iain Griffin (IG)	MLA
Julian Pye (JP)	ATLAS
Darren Bell (DB)	ATLAS
Penny McKnight (PM)	Stafford Borough Council – Conservation
Richard Stevenson (RS)	Bellway
Ian Romano (IR)	St Modwen
Nick Dawson (ND)	Staffordshire County Council – Transport
Adrian Clack (AC)	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
Alex Yendole (AY)	Stafford Borough Council – Planning Policy
James de Havilland (JdH)	Barton Willmore
Roger Leverett (RL)	Stafford Borough Council – Leisure
Mark Alford (MA)	Stafford Borough Council – Development Management

##### Apologies

Anthony Muller	Natural England,
Ted Manders	Stafford Borough Council – Planning
Russell Poole	Lord Stafford's Estate

##### Minutes of 10th January meeting

Minutes from the Environment and Transport topic group meeting, 10<sup>th</sup> January 2013, were discussed and agreed. Other general points made were as follows:

- CC confirmed further flood risk work had been undertaken and had informed the emerging concept plan.
- AY confirmed education study for the whole plan area was on-going, to be completed imminently.
- The next Special Area of Conservation (SAC) partnership meeting will take place 10<sup>th</sup> June 2013.
- Lichfield District will be the first Local Plan to be considered at Examination regarding Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) issues (Examination starting on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2013).
- Geophysical Survey now complete for relevant parts of the land west of Stafford.
- County Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) Approval Board now put back until April 2014.

## Plan for Stafford Borough Update

AY gave an update on The Plan for Stafford Borough. The timetable is as follows:

- Pre-submission consultation occurred January and February 2013. 575 representations were received.
- A further strategic site has been suggested at Clarke's Farm, Stafford. Therefore the Council consulted upon a Planning Strategy Statement and Sustainability Appraisal Addendum during April and May 2013. Less than 50 representations were received.
- Plan for Stafford Borough to be submitted in July 2013.
- Examination anticipated for October 2013.

SBC is undertaking a further plan wide viability assessment to be National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) compliant. This will include the strategic sites at West and North of Stafford. For the land east of Stafford, planning applications have been received including 30% affordable housing.

**Action: CC and AY to exchange contact details of viability consultants in order to discuss and agree, as far as possible, assumptions and approaches.**

CC requested clarity regarding Appendix 1 of the Plan, which implies the whole of the Western Access route would be required in its entirety to be delivered through the Burleyfields (land west of Stafford) development.

**Action: AY to review with SCC, to clarify the position and wording.**

## Concept Plan Review

JdH summarised the new or updated constraints information that had helped inform the concept plan, in particular drainage, the M6 noise and historic environment work. Including He summarised the the headline aspects of the plan:

- A single concept which focusses on the importance of multi-functional green infrastructure to capture the opportunities, key views and safeguard the setting of the Castle.
- Viewing the development as part of a single new neighbourhood with Doxey and neighbouring housing to the east; and a single new local centre to serve the neighbourhood.
- Generosity of open space and lower density overall resulting in a capacity of 1800-2000 dwellings excluding the St Modwen site, mixed use employment area (where there may be scope for further residential in the future) and the Redrow site. Net residential land is about 49 hectares (out of total site area of 102 hectares).
- Green infrastructure is framed by three north-south routes with differing widths and functions, intersecting with the existing green way running east-west.
- Density plans not prepared but plot ratios shown as better response to design. Ratios would vary from low, with predominance of detached houses and gardens

**Comment [A1]:** English Heritage disagrees with this statement which implies that a summary was given of the draft Historic Environment Assessment Report. There was no specific overview of the findings of the draft report, including the subsequent comments made on the report by EH and Staffs CC.

**Comment [A2]:** English Heritage considers that this was not explained in any level of detail at the meeting beyond highlighting the two proposed green infrastructure corridors north/south, which EH and SCC further commented during the discussions with regard to their proposed width, formality and the overall density and permeability of the surrounding development plots.



(especially at southern edge), to medium with mix of dwellings, gardens, to higher ratios at / adjoining the mixed use local centre with predominance of terraces.

The general approach was welcomed. The key comments / queries made were as follows:

- It would be possible to rationalise the sports pitches by introducing a 3G (artificial) pitch adjoining the primary school that could be used by the wider community. The implications of this would be that it would free up more land within the parks for more informal / natural green spaces and possibly some additional housing land by reconfiguring the site. Dual use of the facility would need to be agreed with the school and the facility would need to be lit.
- A single destination play area in a central location (possibly adjoining the playing field, but close to greenway / High Street axis) is preferred by SBC rather than dispersed play areas throughout the site. However, there would still be informal and natural areas for recreation.
- The inclusion of land in the north-west corner was queried.
- Queries whether land adjoining Martin Drive could be included in the red line. Currently it is under-used adopted open space adjoining the rear boundaries of residential properties. ND confirmed that SCC would have no objection to the overall improvement of the existing highway environment between Newport Road and Martin Drive.
- Concerns expressed about the possible inclusion of street trees on flooding and highway maintenance grounds, but others positive that trees could be included and streets designed to minimise these issues.
- Query about how the landscape on site relates to the Golf Course and request that the golf course consented scheme is shown on the plans (JdH explained how there would be a gradation from more natural and bushy planting to more formal and urban towards the new local centre).
- It was acknowledged that SUDS require a significant land take through drainage ponds and that these are constrained where they can be located due to topography (although less formal play provision to the west might assist in this strategy).
- The location of the allotments was questioned but JdH clarified that through careful design of parking etc... it could work and would be well located.

**Comment [A3]:** English Heritage disagrees with this statement and its inclusion in the notes. The list of comments/queries should be presented as an impartial record of the discussions held.

In terms of the setting of the Castle, and in relation to the principles agreed through previous meetings, the concept plan was broadly accepted in terms of the green spaces and opportunities for views emanating from the Castle. Further comments will be made by EH and SCC in due course. However, concerns were also expressed on three issues:

- The inclusion of housing on the south east corner of land in relation to the setting of the Castle. AC put forward that there could not be a negative impact on the setting because it does not currently have public access and that introducing some views would be net benefit. AS in response put forward that argued it is not just about views and that the contribution of the setting to the significance of a heritage asset and its experience is not dependent on public access to private land. However, it was agreed that some illustrations to demonstrate what might be a sensitive and acceptable layout arrangement would be beneficial.
- The width on the street next to the proposed local centre needs to be of sufficient width and informality to retain a view of the Castle (JdH confirmed this would be wide enough to ensure views).
- Uncertainty about how the development responds to topography of the site, especially in relation to the ridge line.

**Comment [A4]:** English Heritage disagrees with this statement and its inclusion. English Heritage did not agree to or accept the concept plan as tabled at the meeting. This statement should be deleted.

**Comment [A5]:** This statement requires clarification. Whilst further illustrations may be provided, this was not specifically agreed to by English Heritage at the meeting.

**Action:** Consortium to provide illustrative sketches to demonstrate how development could be arranged to take into account the Castle setting, and provide long-range cross sections to show relationship between rooflines and site topography.

**Action:** It was agreed that some further changes would be made and the plans would be circulated by Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> June 2013. Comments were then to be made within the next ten working days (by 24<sup>th</sup> June).

**Date of Next Meeting:** *to be confirmed*