

Response and Officer Response to Sustainability Appraisal Commentary Vol 2

| General comments | |
|---|--|
| Miss Jane Field, Environment Agency | <p>We have no significant comments to make concerning the Sustainability Appraisal Issues and Options. This document is clearly aware of PPS25 and the Rivers and Flood Plains associated within SBC area.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal Technical Appendices.</p> <p>Sustainable drainage systems are clearly mentioned in the documents but one main point of concern is that in promoting SuDS there should perhaps be policies to ensure the future maintenance of these systems. This is clearly a major issue for the Environment Agency.</p> |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | <p>Agreed. Additional decision making criteria added under Sustainability Appraisal 14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there clear opportunity for future maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems? |
| Summary of SA Commentary findings | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | <p>For 'selected rural settlements' I would like to see the comment on point 2 read "in keeping with the local character and the rural setting".</p> |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | <p>Agreed. 'and the rural setting' added to the recommendations for the plan objectives</p> |

| Next Steps | |
|---|---|
| Stuart Mellenchip | <p>Issue's Great Haywood/Little Haywood. Traffic increase Tixall Road, Stafford congestion ongoing problem not being resolved, Baswich Littleworth & Weston Road. Constraint in the Haywoods three railway bridges, canal and rivers restrict traffic flow. Surface water Flooding Great / Little Haywood current problem not been resolved. School Capacity class size. Lack of current recreation facilities for existing residents. Houses need to address aging population and younger generation mix not based upon profit to developer. Surgery at capacity. Policing at Capacity, Restricted public Transport. Houses need to be sited closer to place of work.</p> <p>Services Elec. Water borderline currently explanation may tip the balance. No reference made concerning visitors and boats all using local amenities. The bypass was built to take traffic out of the Haywoods the current proposals will turn the clock back fifty years. Many questions need to answered the last presentation was lacking in detail.</p> |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comments noted. No change proposed. These factors will continue to be taken into account during the Sustainability Appraisal and the LDF decision making process. |
| Paragraph 1.2 | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | These aims must be given equal weight in the LDF. Currently it seems that economic growth takes precedence at any cost. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comments noted. No change proposed. The Sustainability Appraisal sets out social, environment and economic objectives. |

| Paragraph 1.8 | |
|---|---|
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | I feel many members of the public whose literacy and/or computer skills are lacking have already been excluded from much of this consultation due to the methods used and the complex language demands of the documents. I think local wildlife/environment groups should have been formally consulted. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | <p>Comments noted. Amendments have been made to the Sustainability Appraisal process to improve understanding, including providing a non-technical summary and a leaflet explaining the Sustainability Appraisal Process, available at { HYPERLINK "http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/live/welcome.asp?id=4040" }</p> <p>All consultees are informed on the consultation of the Sustainability Appraisal including statutory agencies and local groups.</p> |
| Paragraph 1.9 | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | I fully agree with the aims of the SEA but hope that such reports are not carried out at general 'borough -wide' level, which would not allow for specific features of some localised habitats to be analysed. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | <p>When appraising detailed sites, the most up to date information regarding local habitats will be used. Future appraisals will have access to the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSSI, Trees with TPO's, woodland, County wide designated sites, Local Nature Reserves, Regionally Important Geological sites, National Nature Reserves, Ancient Woodland, European Sites, Staffordshire Ecological Nature Reserves, Habitat Survey Area, Biodiversity Action Plan and Protected Species information • In 2008, the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust completed an Ecological Desk Study of proposed areas outlined for housing and employment development around Stafford, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Stone, Eccleshall, Gnosall, Hixon, Great Haywood and Haughton. The study includes the identification of priority species and habitats which the Local Authorities have a duty to consider when determining planning applications. |
| Paragraph 2.3 | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | Again, I hope 'other agencies' are at a very local level, such as Staffordshire Wildlife Trust, your own LA21 team, Biodiversity Officer and so on. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | All consultees are informed on the consultation of the Sustainability Appraisal including statutory agencies and local groups. |
| Paragraph 2.6 | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | Would like to see the Borough consider parish plans, particularly for the 'rural settlements'. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Agreed. Relevant parish plans to be included in the list of other plans to be considered in the SA Technical Appendices. |
| Paragraph 2.11 | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | I would prefer to see Option 3, but with the focus of development including brownfield land before greenfield. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comments noted. No change proposed. The Sustainability Appraisal previously appraised broad strategy options, recommending option 3 and 4 as being the most sustainable. A variation of these was taken forward as part of ' Delivering The Plan for Stafford Borough – Issues and Options '. |
| Paragraph 3.3 | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | I am disappointed that constant economic growth and targets relating to competitiveness seem to be the key indicators of our society and therefore development. There are already vacant units and houses in Stafford and elsewhere in the Borough. The huge distribution centre at Prime Point has thousands of square feet of empty warehouse space and contributes light pollution 24 hours a day which can be seen for miles. The 'indicator and target' for objective 3 bears no relationship to the objective itself. For objective 4, who has completed a survey of the needs of rural communities, and are they |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>all the same? I would like to see the indicator for objective 9 refer also to business premises. For objective 12, what is 'minimum'? It should be none. Your waste strategy should stop wetlands being used for surface landfill. Objectives 16,18,19 and 20 are all very positive in Eccleshall. The proposals for development endanger these objectives.</p> |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | <p>Comments noted. No change proposed.</p> <p>Objectives 1-5 deal mainly with economic objectives. Indicators and targets have been selected on what has been monitored in the past and those listed in SA good practice guidance. Additional decision making questions have been included to draw out a more detailed appraisal.</p> <p>Some survey work relating to local rural needs, in particular housing has been carried out and this will be drawn on during the next appraisal stage.</p> <p>'Reduce to minimum' reflects the aims for no new development to impact on local biodiversity, either by being located in areas with no biodiversity value, or protecting and/or enhancing what is already there.</p> |
| Paragraph 4.2 | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | <p>Will the number of 'conflicts' for the developments in rural areas actually matter? "Additional services in rural areas would meet local needs" is an untested assertion. People in rural areas have chosen to live there because of proximity to the countryside. There is a risk that this development could suburbanise rural areas.</p> |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comments noted. No change proposed |
| Paragraph 4.3 | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | <p>Again, for the last point about rural settlements I would like to see mention of the rural character being maintained.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Agreed. ' and the rural setting ' added to the recommendations for the plan objectives |
| Key Question 2: Do you you agree with the appraisal of the plan objectives above? | |
| Mrs Christine Heelis | Eccleshall Parish Council considers that the Plan Objectives for rural settlements should be amended to read as follows:- 1. Provide for limited high quality new housing development in selected settlements that sustain, enhance and maintain the distinctive local character of rural settlements and is supported by new infrastructure provision, and 2. Deliver sensitive additional facilities in settlements selected for growth to provide an improved level of local services appropriate to the settlement and in keeping with the local character and rural setting. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comments noted. 1. Agreed that ' distinctive ' be included as this would allow the use of village design statements etc. 2. Agreed. ' and the rural setting ' added to the recommendations for the plan objectives |
| Paragraph 5.1 | |
| Mrs Alison Vaughan | I am really pleased to see that the land proposed for development at Derrington in the SHLAA Initial Findings is no longer under consideration. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comment noted. No change proposed |
| Paragraph 6.3 | |
| Evans, Stott & Boote Families, c/o First City Ltd | The Strategic Housing Locations referenced SF-4 and SF-3 are incorrectly recorded on the Plan at paragraph 8.9. and should be transposed. SF3 Part North of Tixall Road (423 dwellings) is not within an area of "highest sensitivity" in terms of landscape, flood or biodiversity issues. The reference to this location needs to |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>differentiate between the land north and south of Tixall Road. SF-4 and SF-10 are within the Flood Plain and should be ruled out for residential development. SF-8 is an area of high landscape quality and development on the scale suggested would be detrimental to the character and setting of the AONB</p> |
| <p>Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents</p> | <p>Comments noted. Mislabelling of Housing Locations Options to be addressed in future documents.</p> <p>Information used to assess areas sensitivity is taken from the Historic Landscape Characterisation Study. The purpose of the study is to show areas around the principal settlements within the Borough to highlight areas that may be sensitive to new development in terms of landscape character. This assessment summarises work undertaken alongside English Heritage during 2002/03.</p> <p>SF3, north of Tixall Road, is in the area of historic landscape sensitivity, of which the 'designation' covers both north and south of Tixall Road.</p> <p>More recent work on the Stafford Environment Character Assessment, completed in June 2009, has given this area of Stafford the highest value.</p> <p>Whilst SF4 and SF10 are not in the flood zone, there may be flood implications from developing in these areas. This will be addressed in subsequent Sustainability Appraisals, drawing on SFRA level 2 reports and water cycle studies, when available.</p> <p>The SA Commentary Vol 2 recognises impacts on Cannock Chase SAC. Agreed that reference be made to the impact on the AONB also.</p> <p>Information relating to the Appropriate Assessment of the Core Strategy will be used in subsequent Sustainability Appraisals.</p> |

| Paragraph 6.16 | |
|---|--|
| <p>Mrs Christine Heelis, Eccleshall Parish Council</p> | <p>Housing development in Eccleshall is not necessarily appropriate as many services e.g. the Doctors, are already at their limits. A small amount of phased development within the limits outlined in the Parish Council's response to the Issues and Options consultation document may be acceptable.</p> <p>Proximity to Raleigh Hall is not an advantage to the local community. The access to the Industrial Estate is by rural roads unsuitable for HGV's, with narrow, tight bends and no opportunities for overtaking. The Town Centre is grid locked daily and the local roads cannot accommodate an increase in lorries. Although there is significant employment at the site very few local people are employed there and the public transport to the site is poor. The location is not considered viable in terms of sustainability.</p> <p>In the recent 'Assessment of Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities Strategy' Eccleshall was identified as being sadly lacking in open space and recreational facilities. Eccleshall is in urgent need of multi-sport provision and teenage facilities as well as a bowling green and a floodlit artificial turf pitch.</p> |
| <p>Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents</p> | <p>Noted. No change proposed</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Commentary Vol 2 recognises the lack of open space and recreational facilities and states <i>It may be appropriate to provide additional open space and recreational facilities, especially in accessible locations</i>. This issue will continue to be considered, alongside all sustainability issues in subsequent appraisals.</p> <p>Likewise, issues of public transport at Raleigh Hall have been acknowledged in the Sustainability Appraisal Commentary Vol 2 in the recommendation</p> <p><i>Development at Raleigh Hall would be an extension to the existing industrial estate, which may provide employment for the rural areas of the Borough. Although there is a bus service to Raleigh hall, a more regular service / green travel plans could help reduce the need to travel by car.</i></p> <p>This issue will continue to be considered, alongside all sustainability issues in subsequent appraisals.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | <p>Eccleshall should not be considered to have such a wealth of services that large scale development is guaranteed. The small town serves a large rural hinterland as well as those who live within it.</p> <p>Raleigh Hall Industrial Estate employs few people living in Eccleshall, most of whom commute by car from Stafford or Stone. The estate is not within easy walking distance of the town and provides mostly low paid jobs. Reliance on the Estate as a source of jobs for Eccleshall would be misguided and its increase would lead to a rise in HGVs and other traffic through the town itself, as there is no other route. We already have 'open spaces'-these are called 'green fields' but they are currently under threat from development.</p> |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Noted. No change proposed. |
| BB Apps | <p>Eccleshall is not necessary appropriate as the most of the services and facilities are at there limits e.g. drainage, doctors, traffic.</p> <p>The proximity to Raleigh Hall is not an advantage, it's a distinct disadvantage, and all Industrial Estates should have dual carriageway access and have dual carriageway acces to the motorway. Raleigh Hall's access is over roads which are too narrow, bends too tight and there is no place for other vehicles to overtake. The access via Eccleshall town centre comes to a grid lock on occasions every day.</p> <p>It is not MAY BE appropriate, but MUST provide open space for children to ride their bikes, or play ball games within Eccleshall.</p> |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Noted. No change proposed. |
| Paragraph 6.17 | |
| Mrs Christine Heelis, Eccleshall Parish Council | Eccleshall Parish Council is unaware of any reason why EC2 should be considered to be an area of highest sensitivity in terms of the historic environment. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Noted. No change proposed. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Information used to assess areas sensitivity is taken from the Historic Landscape Characterisation Study. The purpose of the study is to show areas around the principal settlements within the Borough to highlight areas that may be sensitive to new development in terms of landscape character. This assessment summarises work undertaken alongside English Heritage during 2002/03.</p> <p>Land to the east of Eccleshall, covering EC-2 is shown as being as the area of highest sensitivity. Further information can be found at</p> <p>{ HYPERLINK "http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/live/welcome.asp?id=6270" }</p> |
| BB Apps | I have spoken to a number of people and no one knows why EC-2 is an area of highest sensitivity |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | <p>Comment noted. No change proposed.</p> <p>Information used to assess areas sensitivity is taken from the Historic Landscape Characterisation Study. The purpose of the study is to show areas around the principal settlements within the Borough to highlight areas that may be sensitive to new development in terms of landscape character. This assessment summarises work undertaken alongside English Heritage during 2002/03.</p> <p>Land to the east of Eccleshall, covering EC-2 is shown as being as the area of highest sensitivity. Further information can be found at</p> <p>{ HYPERLINK "http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/live/welcome.asp?id=6270" }</p> |
| Paragraph 6.18 | |
| BB Apps | Agreed |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comment noted. No change proposed. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Mrs Christine Heelis, Eccleshall Parish Council | Eccleshall Parish Council agrees with this statement. Development on land to the west of Eccleshall would impinge on the picturesque rural landscape leading to the SSSI at Copmere. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comment noted. No change proposed. |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | Agree. Land to the West provides a green corridor towards the SSI at Copmere. The whole Sow Valley leads from Doxey Marshes to Copmere and should be recognised as an important wildlife habitat. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comment noted. No change proposed. |
| Paragraph 6.19 | |
| BB Apps | A flood risk assessment and a full in-depth ground survey will be required in this area as it there may be up to 13 metres of peat under the surface |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comment noted. No change proposed. Any information regarding flood risk will be taken into account in subsequent appraisals. |
| Mrs Christine Heelis, Eccleshall Parish Council | A flood risk assessment and in-depth ground survey would be required for the area EC1 as there may be up to 13 metres of peat under the surface. Any additional housing on the outskirts of the town would require associated improvements to the infrastructure especially drainage, sewerage and storm water. The land to the south of Green Lane should not be developed without a complete new drainage system replacing the totally inadequate existing drains from this area of the town. The present drainage system is inadequate and during heavy rain premises in Stafford Street and Castle Street flood with storm water. Major work would be required to rectify this problem |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comment noted. No change proposed. Any information regarding flood risk will be taken into account in subsequent appraisals. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | Flooding is an issue for parts of Eccleshall. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | <p>Comment noted. No change proposed. The appraisal recognises local flooding issues, with the conclusion and recommendation</p> <p><i>No options lie within flood zone 3, although there may be flood, drainage and water quality issues to the north of the settlement, and so a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for EC1.</i></p> |
| Paragraph 6.38 | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | I feel strongly that this brownfield land should be used before you consider developing greenfield land in the 'rural settlements'. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | <p>Comment noted. No change proposed. The SA framework contains the following indicator and target</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of development on previously developed land • Target: In accordance with national and regional guidance |
| Paragraph 6.39 | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | I hope development on this brownfield land is given precedence over greenfield land. The two sites here and at Yarnfield could prevent a large number of homes being built on the edge of the rural settlements in the Borough. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comment noted. No change proposed. The SA framework contains the following indicator and target |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of development on previously developed land • Target: In accordance with national and regional guidance |
| Paragraph 6.41 | |
| B B Apps | As in reply to paragraph 6.16 all Industrial Estates should have access via a dual carriageway only. The extra traffic from heavy goods vehicles is totally unsuitable for the country lanes in this area. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Noted. No change proposed. |
| Mrs Christine Heelis, Eccleshall Parish Council | It would be difficult to justify further expansion at the current site as this is a rural location and further development would encroach onto existing farmland. Further development would have the effect of routing more heavy goods vehicles through the already congested town. There are very few local people employed at the site and the location is not viable in terms of sustainability. As development proposals are most unlikely to lead to any additional improvement to the local roads (as advised by Council Officers), industrial and commercial development should be concentrated in Stafford and Stone where there is good access to the M6 and public transport |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comments noted. No change proposed. |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | The bus service is minimal. The Estate is responsible for the huge numbers of HGVs that must pass through our small town. A biodiversity survey should be carried out before any decisions are made on the site. Too much significance has been attached to the Estate in this report in terms of its ability to supply jobs and employment. Its development would help the Borough reach very few of its targets related to employment, and would not provide an adequate mix of jobs to sustain the population. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comments noted. No change proposed. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Issues of public transport at Raleigh Hall have been acknowledged in the Sustainability Appraisal Commentary Vol 2 in the recommendation</p> <p><i>Development at Raleigh Hall would be an extension to the existing industrial estate, which may provide employment for the rural areas of the Borough. Although there is a bus service to Raleigh hall, a more regular service / green travel plans could help reduce the need to travel by car.</i></p> <p>The issue of biodiversity value has also been raised in the report stating that Raleigh Hall <i>contains some water and tree features, which may have biodiversity value.</i></p> <p>These issues will continue to be considered, alongside all sustainability issues in subsequent appraisals.</p> |
| <p>Key Question 3 Do you think the comments for each settlement are correct?</p> | |
| <p>Mrs Christine Heelis, Eccleshall Parish Council</p> | <p>Comments for Eccleshall are not correct for the reasons stated. Eccleshall is not appropriate for large scale housing development. The infrastructure and support services are inadequate. There are very few recreational or teenage facilities and expansion at Raleigh Hall would not be viable in terms of sustainability.</p> |
| <p>Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents</p> | <p>Comments noted. No change proposed</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Commentary Vol 2 recognises the lack of open space and recreational facilities and states <i>It may be appropriate to provide additional open space and recreational facilities, especially in accessible locations.</i></p> <p>Likewise, issues of public transport at Raleigh Hall have been acknowledged in the Sustainability Appraisal Commentary Vol 2 in the recommendation</p> <p><i>Development at Raleigh Hall would be an extension to the existing industrial estate, which may provide employment for the rural areas of the Borough. Although there is a bus service to Raleigh hall, a more regular service / green travel plans could help reduce the need to travel by car.</i></p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | These issues will continue to be considered, alongside the scale of development and all sustainability issues in subsequent appraisals. |
| Key Question 4 Do you think the development principles are correct? | |
| Mrs Christine Heelis, Eccleshall Parish Council | Eccleshall Parish Council agrees with the list of principles but questions whether they would be adhered to in the event of any development. The Borough Council should ensure that Section 106 agreements are secured from developers and used to the benefit of the area involved. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comments noted. No change proposed. The list of recommendations will be considered when producing the Core Strategy Preferred Options. The LDF will contain a planning obligations policy and this will be appraised in subsequent sustainability appraisal reports. |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | I would like to see the inclusion of clearer principles to do with protected species and habitats that are already vulnerable. For example, the Borough could insist on barn owl boxes/bat boxes being installed when rural buildings/barns are developed for residential/business use. The reinstatement of native hedgerows once development has taken place could be mandatory (see Prime Point as a poor example). These principles should include more detail about how they will actually be achieved. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comments noted. No change proposed. A Green Infrastructure Study is currently being produced, which will set out principles for development with regard to biodiversity, open space and green routes. It is anticipated that this will form an SPD and will be appraised and drawn on in subsequent sustainability appraisals when available. |
| Little Haywood and Great Haywood Options Appraisal | |
| Ms Amanda Margetson | I would like to register my concerns and complete disagreement in regard to the proposals of building houses in Little Haywood, the fact that the roads that lead from the proposed sites are on the whole only wide enough for one car, this to me, would seem to be the first obvious reason that the proposed building sites are inappropriate. Adding more houses, and then more cars to this area is madness.i agree with comments made on this forum that Little Haywood is surrounded by fields, canals, Shugborough all of which make it a wonderful area to live in. i hope the council take a good look at the areas before making any decisions, as adding all these extra houses would spoil the village. |
| Change made to Sustainability | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Appraisal documents | Comments noted. No change proposed to Sustainability Appraisal Framework |
| Eccleshall Options Appraisal | |
| Mrs Christine Heelis, Eccleshall Parish Council | <p>Eccleshall Parish Council strongly disagrees with the statements that Eccleshall has a good range of recreational facilities. This is not true and consultations conducted for the Parish Plan in 2004 and the recent review show that most of the respondents consider that youth facilities together with sports and recreation facilities are desperately needed in the town. Indeed the recent 'Assessment of Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities Strategy' identified Eccleshall as being sadly lacking in open space and recreational facilities. Eccleshall is in urgent need of multi-sport provision and teenage facilities as well as a bowling green and a floodlit artificial turf pitch. With limited public transport the young people are severely disadvantaged as they have to travel some distance to access facilities.</p> <p>In addition to the upgrading of Cherry Tree Lane Pumping Station and investigation into surface water drainage, any development would require additional resources, support services and enhanced bus services.</p> <p>The Parish Council does not agree with the assumption that development would have a positive effect on key sustainability objectives. Development would not necessarily ensure that local people would be able to purchase low cost, decent, affordable homes nor would additional housing improve opportunities for access to work, education, health and social services. Many services in the town are already full to capacity and pupils have to travel to secondary schools in Stone and Stafford, which means that they are excluded from homework classes and after school activities due to lack of public transport. There is limited local employment and many people currently commute to work. Large scale development would be detrimental to, and not support the needs of the local rural economy and the community</p> |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | <p>Comments noted. No change proposed</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Commentary Vol 2 recognises the lack of open space and recreational facilities and states <i>It may be appropriate to provide additional open space and recreational facilities, especially in accessible locations.</i></p> <p>It is recognised that at this initial appraisal stage it is difficult to appraise details of sites, in</p> |

terms of affordable housing etc. This has been addressed in the list of recommendations

- Specify materials to be used in the production of the development, with particular emphasis on waste re-use
- Specify waste arrangements for after completion
- Specify on-site and where appropriate off-site supply of renewable energy / low carbon contributions
- Green Infrastructure / biodiversity protection and enhancement to be in place before development begins
- Flood risk assessments to be produced for the relevant options highlighted
- Improvements in infrastructure where issues have been identified
- Mix of housing types and tenures for housing options
- Mix of employment uses where appropriate for employment options
- Design principles to ensure all development is in keeping with local character
- Transport assessment / green travel plans for those options identified to increase transport

As sites and policies become more refined, the appraisal will continue to use the SA Framework and address positive and negative site impacts.

| | |
|---|--|
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | <p>In the summary column, there are some inaccuracies. Eccleshall does not have 'a good range of recreational facilities'. You have already said that additional open spaces and recreational facilities may be necessary here. None of the sporting facilities is public/municipal. One school is primary, the other a special residential school two miles out of the town. Neither have sports facilities that can be used by the public. The library has two computers. There is no youth club. You have already stated in 6.16 that it may be necessary to provide additional recreational facilities in the town.</p> <p>I believe the statement in the summary column is misleading and should be taken out of the document, in order to prevent inaccurate conclusions about potential development in Eccleshall.</p> <p>You have stated that development in the rural settlements may have "negative impacts on natural resources, travel, soil, biodiversity, water resources and the historic and natural landscape." This statement should be included in the 'summary' box next to all the Eccleshall site options.</p> |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | <p>Comments noted. Agreed that the appraisal should take into account results of the PPG17: Open space, Sport and Recreation Assessment, which identifies deficiencies in Eccleshall's sport and recreation provision.</p> <p>The subsequent appraisal will be looking into the positive and negative effects of preferred development locations and policies. Any effects will continue to be reported in the same way and in the non technical summary.</p> |
| Yarnfield Housing Location Option | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | Due to the few 'conflicts' I think this option should be considered more preferable to the greenfield development in other rural areas. |
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comments noted. No change proposed. Recommendations from the Sustainability Appraisal Commentary Vol 2 will be taken into consideration when developing the overall development strategy and associated policies. |
| Tittensor Housing Location Option | |
| Mrs Lindsay von Elbing | This land should be considered before any greenfield option in the rural areas. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Change made to Sustainability Appraisal documents | Comments noted. No change proposed. Recommendations from the Sustainability Appraisal Commentary Vol 2 will be taken into consideration when developing the overall development strategy and associated policies. |
|---|---|

In addition to the above, the following have been incorporated into the Sustainability Appraisal Report, which went out for consultation during September and October 2011:

- Appraisal of Core Policies, Development Management Policies and location specific policies against the 20 Sustainability Appraisal Objectives in appendix 1
- Recommended wording changes to policies Guiding Principles, Spatial Strategy, Stafford Town, Stone Town, West and South of Stone, Areas outside Stafford and Stone, New development in the countryside, Planning Obligations, Replacement Dwellings, Extensions to the curtilage of dwellings, Development within and outside Recognised Industrial Estates, Primary and Secondary Retail Frontages, Vacant and Upper Floors, New retail & leisure development outside the defined town centres, Tourism
- SEA table showing what sections of the Report meet SEA requirements in section 1 (table 1)
- Table looking into cumulative impacts in appendix 2
- Quality Assurance information provided in paragraph 1.10
- Monitoring table in appendix 4
- Section looking at the alternatives that have previously been considered in Appendix 3
- More detailed baseline / spatial portrait section added in section 3 before sustainability issues identified
- Evidence base list included in Appendix 6