

Matter	Code	Summary of Response	Representatives	Council Response
Matter 5- Stone Town				
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-2a	Highlights the recent consultation event carried out for proposed development on part of Westbridge Park. It raises concern over the definition of mixed use development and the lack of clarity on the amount of land at Westbridge Park included in this policy.	Jon Heal	The proposed modifications to the Plan clarifies what mixed use development is envisaged and a boundary adjustment shows the area of land identified for new development (A27). The Plan does not provide specific details about the scheme (size, layout etc.) as this is not appropriate detail for the Plan. Specific details to be prepared at the planning application stage.
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-3a	Several questions raised regarding the WYG retail evidence. It challenges the term “overtrading” and states that this is not the case at Stone, and there is no need for new convenience floorspace. There is no definition of mixed use development and the area of land for development is not clear. The designation of Westbridge Park as green infrastructure is highlighted, and a local residents’ petition is quoted. The Statement references the previous Local Plan’s Inspector’s report, and raises concerns about flooding and conservation issues.	Keep Westbridge Park Green	<p>The Council are confident in the WYG retail evidence and believe that it does show a need for further convenience retail floorspace in Stone. No alternative evidence has been provided to counter the WYG study.</p> <p>The policy wording has been altered (A27) to provide greater clarity of what is meant by mixed use development and defining the area to be developed. The green infrastructure (GI) boundary has been redrawn accurately (A27) to remove the areas that are not GI. The previous Inspector’s report was considering a different proposal and is not considered comparable with the current Plan.</p>

Matter	Code	Summary of Response	Representatives	Council Response
				<p>The flooding and conservation issues highlighted are recognised by the Council, and any proposed development would have to respond to these matters. However it is not considered that these matters pose an insurmountable constraint on development.</p>
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-4a	<p>The statement promotes Bowers land to be used for retail and green infrastructure. It raises issues with the continued use of the boundary of Stone and Spatial Principle 7. It states that the Sustainability Appraisal provides poor justification for the exclusion of Bowers land. It also argues that potential green infrastructure gains should be considered as part of the development of other parcels of land.</p>	Bowers/Bell	<p>The boundary for Stone is the same boundary adopted in the previous local plan. It has been retained as an interim measure to demonstrate delivery of the Strategic Development Location compared to other sites, and will be reviewed as part of the Sites DPD. Spatial Principle 7 set out criteria.</p> <p>The Bowers site has not been included in the plan as it is an out of town location (as identified in the WYG retail study). Following the sequential approach through NPPF this site is less suitable for retail development than those highlighted in the amended town centre boundary (A27).</p> <p>With regards to green infrastructure gains, Policy N4, and the protection, enhancement and expansion of green infrastructure is to be delivered through a range of mechanisms not just new development.</p>

Matter	Code	Summary of Response	Representatives	Council Response
				The Council disagrees that a clause favouring new development adjacent to green infrastructure should be added to incentivise the development of Bowers land.
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-5a	References the flood constraints report by Capita Symonds (J6), and questions whether the site would pass a sequential test (flood), particularly with regard to potential changes arising from climate change. The statement also refers to the Stone Conservation Area character appraisal and the aesthetics of the park, together with the PPG17 study.	RG Jones	The Council commissioned the flood constraints report and is aware of its contents. Proposals at Westbridge Park would have to comply with national policy and the sequential test. The Environment Agency has been consulted with regards to development on this site and do not have any objection in principle. The Council disagrees that development at this site would have a negative impact on either the area's character or its green infrastructure and recreational function. The area proposed for development is not green infrastructure, and can be developed in accordance with Conservation Area policies.
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-6a	Supports mixed use development at Westbridge Park, referring to a Facebook campaign set up by residents in favour of the development. The statement highlights that the area is previously developed land, and is an under used dilapidated area of the park. It states how Stone has to compete with Trentham Gardens for retail footfall and supports the WYG evidence. It also provides some update on vacant shops in Stone town centre.	R Evans	The Council notes this support.

Matter	Code	Summary of Response	Representatives	Council Response
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-7a	<p>This statement argues against post 2021 delivery, and against concentration of development to the West of Stone. It proposes a further Strategic Development Location (SDL) to the East (as a partial substitution or in addition). It claims there is no rational case for holding back development at Stone, and that it is counter to NPPF. It acknowledges that there is a potential need for delay due to assimilation of previous development West of Stone, but states that this is not the case in the East. It further argues that affordable housing should capitalise on market potential of this area, and that the East SDL was not properly assessed or considered throughout production of the Plan.</p>	<p>Paul Sharpe Associates for Fradley Estates Ltd.</p>	<p>The Council maintains that delivery post 2021 is necessary as set out in the Matters Paper M5-1a. The West SDL at Stone is considered most appropriate as it is a strategic site capable of delivering the new housing and infrastructure. It is supported by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (D57) and is more suitable than an Eastern SDL due to access difficulties across the railway line.</p> <p>Restraining development at Stone is not contrary to the NPPF as it is required to support Stafford as part of the sustainable settlement hierarchy and the housing distributions. The NPPF advocates a sustainable Plan led approach. Allowing unrestrained development at Stone would be counter to the development strategy of the Plan.</p> <p>It is not agreed that extra housing should be permitted to facilitate affordable housing provision. This would not be sustainable or deliverable. There are clear limits to the capability of the planning system alone to deliver fully identified affordable housing needs.</p>

Matter	Code	Summary of Response	Representatives	Council Response
				<p>The Council considers that land to the East of Stone was properly considered as part of the Plan preparation, with robust evidence of constraints. Furthermore this site is not considered to be strategic in nature being for 100 new houses compared to the 500 new houses as part of the west SDL.</p> <p>The eastern SDL proposed for Stone town was rejected as it is constrained by the West Coast mainline railway, has access issues and is located on prominent high landscape above the town.</p>
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-8a	Site owners of the Western SDL. Confirm that the site is the most suitable and deliverable option. A Statement of Common ground has been signed setting out areas of agreement but the developers contest the need for delivery post 2021. An outline application has been submitted to the Council for this site. Details of the application are provided.	Wardell Armstrong for Hallam Land	The Council notes the commitment to delivery of the site and believes that all policies commitments are appropriate and viable as proved by the recent application. However the Council remains committed to delivery after 2021 to support regeneration initiative in the North Staffordshire conurbation and to support the wider development strategy of the Plan.
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-9a	Housing provision is insufficient for the second settlement in the hierarchy. The West SDL at Stone should be increased above 500 units, and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) site 44 added as a residential opportunity.	Wardell Armstrong for David Wilson Homes	The amount of housing assigned to Stone is appropriate in line with the sustainable settlement hierarchy set out in the development strategy. The Council disagrees that the West SDL at Stone should be extended as there is sufficient land allocated to meet identified need.

Matter	Code	Summary of Response	Representatives	Council Response
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-10a	Supports the approach taken in the Plan to housing and delivery, in particular the restriction of development prior to 2021 to support delivery of regeneration projects in North Staffordshire, in accordance with the adopted Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy	City of Stoke on Trent	The Council notes this support.
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-11a	The policy contains an inappropriate level of detail, in naming Westbridge Park for new development. This site detail should be removed and identified in the forthcoming Sites Development Plan Document (DPD). A text alteration should reflect the static nature of the retail capacity studies, and an addition to criterion b with an approximate figure rather than an absolute.	Trent vision Trust	<p>The amendment proposed (A27) to the town centre boundary identifies sequentially preferable sites for new retail development. Westbridge Park is not the only potential location for convenience retail, but it is identified in the retail evidence as the most appropriate, hence why it has been referenced in the Plan.</p> <p>Criterion b has been updated with revised figures but is still a single figure in accordance with the retail evidence.</p>
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-12a	Housing: should have had a Green Belt review. Land between A34 and the Trent & Mersey Canal should be safeguarded for housing – more appropriate than the Strategic Development Locations (SDLs).	JVH Town Planning Consultants for MJ Barrett Group	A Green Belt review was not considered necessary for the new Local Plan as there were deliverable sites located outside of the Green Belt that could meet identified needs. Therefore it is not considered necessary to safeguard this land for future development.
Matter 5- Stone Town	M5-13a	An adjustment should be made to the distribution of growth with a greater level of provision at Stone, commensurate with its role and sustainability. Questions	Planning Prospects for Taylor Wimpey	The Council does not consider it necessary to allocate further land at Stone to meet housing provision. The site proposed would

Matter	Code	Summary of Response	Representatives	Council Response
		the choice of a West SDL at Stone on landscape grounds, promoting a site south of Eccleshall Road as preferable. The submission contains an analysis of landscape impacts for the 2 sites.		be small-scale rather than strategic so could be considered through the Sites DPD process of the requirement is necessary.
Matter 5- Stone	M5-14a	Support for the development of Westbridge Park, to include a new leisure centre.	Chris Tibbits	The Council notes this support.