

## **Stafford Station Gateway Strategic Regeneration Framework Consultation Responses**

**Question: If you have any other comments on the vision, please set these out below**

I think it could be better. Too many houses, not enough green space. Stafford is desperately lacking in sports provisions i.e. 4g pitches, basketball courts, football pitches etc. Why can't a small sports complex be located on parts of the old rugby site. Secondly the lake is lovely and should be enhanced as part of the scheme. Would be excellent if this space could be connected to the trail and to the Victoria park. Scheme needs to be carbon neutral. More trees needed and energy efficient homes. Do we need that much retail. Some decent leisure facilities would be better i.e. A gym with pool, indoor sports hall. Outdoor gym etc. "

Area needs to be created into nature and flood mitigation areas and create better sustainable transport opportunities.

There is already not the infrastructure in the town to cope with the houses we have, never mind the ones being built! Shops are standing empty in the centre of town making Stafford look a complete mess. Building yet more house and more shops is a complete waste of time and money and will cause even more traffic chaos and issues for a town that isn't deemed 'large enough' to have a full time A&E and other services.

Please stop new builds and work to improve what we already have. The high street is like a ghost town - so many empty shops. Invest the money in improving the town centre rather than new projects that pull people away from the town centre.

Important infrastructure has been completely missed. Stafford is already struggling and bursting at the seams with not enough GP surgeries, dentists, schools, and the hospital needs development to support the additional population this development will bring in.

Now is your opportunity to have an 'integrated transport system' by putting the bus/tram( in the future?) close to the Railway Station instead of a 0.4 of a mile walk. Please cease this Opportunity !!!! Remember this is the County Town the Transport System should reflect this

Lack of inspiration; Lack of basic services; Hospital failing; Lack of doctors; Lack of school; Lack of support of amateur clubs and groups

Stafford is more than just a commuter town, and there's no need for more housing. The disused brown field adds to the scenery and makes Stafford station iconic.

I cannot comment as there are so many factual errors within the report on what exists on the ground. As it is I do not see how anybody can either. I would add what is the obsession yet again with cycle routes opposed to solely walking routes. I would rather that the existing wasteland that is Stafford Town Centre is addressed first .Along with the introduction of Community Facilities of all kinds to the Existing

Infrastructure which is sadly lacking due to a lack of vision of the existing powers that be. The Borough should also step up on all fronts accordingly.

The provision of additional housing is welcome and to be expected given the investment in infrastructure with the access road. The plan itself highlights that almost a quarter of retail space in Stafford stands vacant. The plans for Station Approach must be altered to reflect the fact that additional retail space is unnecessary. The resulting empty units created here, or elsewhere in the town as retailers move from one site to another (as they did with the opening of the Riverside complex) adds nothing to the character of the town and only amplifies a sense of failure and decline. Retailers and leisure must be encouraged to occupy existing stock. The Riverside complex has ample floor space and it only a short walk through Victoria Park away.

The provision of additional multi storey parking is welcome.

Traffic at the traffic lights at Newport Road and Station Road junction will become a significant bottleneck. There are regular peak time delays in all directions here which this plan must seek to alleviate.

If we are to have more housing then we need to improve the services we offer. The hospital only offers a limited service and seeing a doctor is very hard

Stafford is a shadow of its former glory and everything is being done to ensure it doesn't recover. Why are the developments taking place here when the town centre looks derelict? Why not get Stafford back on its feet rather than encourage people onto the outskirts so the town centre falls further into dereliction.

Need to see plans as this will increase traffic in my area

I believe it is imperative for this plan to proceed providing employment and a new open environmentally friendly area to live, socialize, study and work. A great opportunity for Stafford itself to become a more established town with hopefully a vibrant community feel for now and into the future.

Whilst accepting a potential need for new housing in the town I see no point whatsoever in creating new retail space outside the town centre whilst the actual town centre is full of empty rotting unused retail units making the town centre less and less attractive to visitors. Even new retail space in the town is standing empty (Staffordshire place, Kingsmead, attached to the new cinema. Stop bidding for funds for new white elephants and focus on regenerating the existing town centre and promoting small businesses.

I think we need to look at the town centre first with new shops, bars, restaurants, entertainment etc first than more houses. The town is dying every day more and what are all these new people supposed to do when there isn't anything. All we have is a cinema (odeon) and a few ok places to go. Other than that Stafford is becoming like Cannock and other places that have gone downhill.

Stafford has nothing to offer - the planners have shifted m&s from town centre - they could have revamped the old co op instead and just move across the road. More

houses are being built. No childrens A/E no 24hr A/E for the rest. Ambulances are taking longer and longer to get to patients. Instead of going into Stafford - they have to go to Stoke - Burton - Wolverhampton - Walsall. Who is looking after the people of Stafford. You need to walk from one end of Stafford to the other to see how dire everything is. 2nd hand shops banks a sweetie shop food outlets wh smiths card shops and thats about it - someone asked on fb the other day where in Stafford could she get a mother of the bride outfit - i directed to Stone - even a small place like Stone could supply an outfit.

What are you going to do to the town and are you Strengthen the water system and other system and environment.

What about Stafford market !!!

The council are blind and so are the developers, Stafford needs a fully functioning Hospital and the roads which are lined with pot holes all over the place need to be fixed with a matter of urgency, this is more of a priority than building more homes which will cause major clogging of Stafford Town Center

Stafford has no full time hospital cover, and the infrastructure is already overloaded, this development will futher over task the existing systems and cause major problems with traffic and other things

Seems to be a lack of consideration for schools and healthcare but otherwise it looks reasonable

I hope they incorporate the old loco sheds into the plan. Stafford was a railway town, and this building is something to treasure.

How about, as a council, you focus on strengthening the infrastructure. More GP surgeries, a fully functioning hospital with a 24 hour Accident & Emergency department AND maternity ward. There are TOO many new homes being built and no infrastructure to handle them. To say NOTHING about the town centre being dead. Empty shops (most likely earmarked to become some kind of homes/housing). Repair the roads and the countless potholes. Not sure if you burkes at the Council have noticed, but there isn't a town centre to extend to and visit! Maybe address and plan to increase regeneration there before selling off to Taylor Wimpey so you can make a quick buck and chuck a load more houses up without a thought to the services the residents will need. This plan isn't intended to improve the area for the people of Stafford, it's for you to line your pockets as normal.

We do not need another 900 houses built, think about the schools, work places, road maintenance etc we need some more entertainment or even something more for the children in our town.

Whilst the vision itself is ok, the infrastructure of Stafford can't support anymore property development. The roads are a nightmare, pot holes never repaired, traffic jams etc. Not enough doctors appointments available, the town centre is shocking, I'm aware there is development due there, but there are limited shops in the town since the new shopping area was created & parking in the town is very difficult.

Why the hell are you ripping out more trees and getting rid of green space I understand developing area's with existing buildings but there's been too much green areas lost to housing recently I really don't understand this development as is

There are other aspects of the Gateway concept that need to be considered, including the appearance of buildings on the pedestrian route from the station into the town. The former Kemley House and the Stafford Institute next door are a blight and should be demolished. Improving and widening this route would be hugely beneficial, with the much improved park on either side. The station itself is bleak and improvements to it are long overdue. This would make the vision gel together more and not so focused on one side of the railway.

I feel very strongly that there should be an element of "re-wilding" to show that as a town we are striving to improve the environment. I.e. a pond, native hedgerows etc as well as the residential and commercial development. Something similar to the Derrington Millennium Green.

I am aware that this is already well underway therefore the public's opinion on the matter is very much irrelevant on the project. My concerns are as such. The council has already invested in "building Stafford Town Centre" this was designed to encourage growth and provide a thriving asset to Stafford. However much of the building which has already been completed around the Town Centre for similar projects is left empty and unused, providing no use and in the long run becoming unsightly and impractical. It only makes sense to provide infrastructure when there is someone there to use it not for it to be left to decay. Secondly, by standards of locals and visitors to Stafford, the town centre itself is appalling. There has been such little investment to date to the centre resulting in empty shops which indeed are decaying and becoming unsightly. What use is it to encourage people to Stafford when they are greeted by empty shops and damaged buildings on the high street? I am aware there is a proposal for investment in the centre itself, but does that not become a moot point if you are encouraging the centre to be elsewhere? Thirdly, proposals of more building of housing seems somewhat madness. It appears that the council insists on building more property based on the prospect of success with the project, however previous projects have shown us that success is unlikely in the desired manner. There are plenty of properties (especially around the proposed area) which remain derelict. Not to mention new property which has already been built, in what is at the very least, in a very shoddy manner. Hundreds of housing properties have been built in Stafford within the last 5 years yet, more is required in a slowly dying town? Finally, whilst I agree that something needs to be done with the area surrounding the train station. I'm sure many things could benefit in Stafford with the money that will be thrown into this project. You can't keep building new everytime a brand new build project fails. We are even yet to see much movement on already proposed projects, not to mention the environment projects which seem to have taken a back bench for the sake of banging up cheap, poor quality housing. I encourage growth where growth is relevant, and has probably success at little cost to the environment. I do not like to see areas left to be derelict and become an eyesore or a risk, but that seems to be the case within Stafford town centre and keep building new isn't going to help that, plenty of current property has potential to be resurrected and transformed

for businesses. The general public seems to feel the same way. So whilst we know that our voices will not be heard on these matters, it is important for our views to still be made.

The scheme does nothing to address the needs of existing Stafford residents. Stafford doesn't need more retail as demonstrated by the derelict guildhall. Stafford doesn't need more offices. There are vacant units on the tech park, and within the high street and companies are moving to hybrid working so there is less need for offices. However what Stafford is desperately lacking is adequate sporting provision. In 2003 the council commissioned the playing pitch strategy which recommended that there more football and hockey pitches in Stafford. In 2019 the borough council again commissioned a report with almost identical findings. However it also noted that there has been a loss of football pitches. In 2022 Stafford has lost its hockey pitches at beaconside. The report in 2019 states that Stafford needed 2 hockey pitches with the loss of beaconside it now needs 3. Why aren't these being built on the former rugby club site. Why are we building more things that we don't need when the council have been told what is required yet continue to do nothing. Why do our council not implement the recommendations from their own report. We need a much better sporting provision.

Looks great, let's get started! The new development should link more effectively with the existing town centre. Where 'Palmbourne Industrial Estate' is labelled on the map there could be an improved connection (gateway) between the existing and new parts of the town."

In principle I love this idea, but have concerns on local road networks coping with what is a town already struggling to cope with the housing developments in the area. What facilities will be affordable to residents like myself who will be in their 70's then? Also the main Stafford town is in desperate need for regeneration and this cannot be overlooked.

The vision is a valid one and more housing on brownfield sites is to be welcomed. However, care must be taken not to draw shoppers and the retail offer away from the town centre.

To keep it simple, Stafford currently is a mess, overgrown and unkempt everywhere one looks and it's nothing to do with environment in the slightest it's plain neglect and this for the whole of Stafford should be addressed before any kind of growth plans are submitted. Stafford town centre is a filthy broken run down mess with the high street looking more like a battle war zone, broken paving, botched tarmac repairs, no functioning drainage and nothing to attract visitors, investors or the public at all, shouldn't this be the regeneration priority first and then maintaining the town centre long term instead of neglect as per usual? Staffords road network is a joke, no while line markings or inadequate markings on most roads, pot holes you can literally fall in, verges unkempt and overgrown, weeds, dirt and debris at the side of every road, side street or lane, shouldn't this be prioritised first? Stafford does not have a 24hr A&E or children's ward, no critical care or maternity ward with residents now forced to drive tens of miles to Stoke which can not cope with their local residents demands

without Stafford on top!? Shouldn't our hospital be regenerated, expanded, re-opened before you add hundreds more houses to the town?

The only reason this plan is on paper is because it's a cash generator, cash that's never invested in what we already have! You should not turn your backs on what Stafford already has and desperately needs regenerating, cleaning, maintaining and investing in! I can not support this plan as it is out of touch with what Stafford desperately needs right now and for decades to come. Fix the high street, paint the roads, weed the paths and kerbs, fix drainage, cut the overgrown trees and bushes back away from the roads, remove unkempt scruffy verges, cut the hedges back, plant wildflower meadows & trees in under-used fields, tidy Stafford up again and re-open the hospital first please.

The failure to build infrastructure for previous housing plans needs to be addressed first & these plans are for commuters to the city. The council needs to lift the ban of housing for Stafford people of affordable housing & build council housing for local people as a priority & stop making Stafford a housing estate for outsiders, destroying the culture of the town & the communities who live here. Living on a council estate we have seen SBC grand housing plans to turn our community into a ghetto by using them as a money saving scheme for open prisons under the pretext it will be good for our community were dangerous criminals from other areas are housed in preference to hard working Stafford families making our lives a misery.

The development does not connect Stafford. It just seems to connect a multi storey car park and hotel to the train station via an existing pedestrian bridge, which is not suitable for cyclists and does not create a welcoming invitation to Stafford

We live very close to the proposed development and in principle we support the proposals but have some very real concerns about the impact on our streets. We already have the occasional problem of rail travellers parking on our streets and also college students. The proposed development will certainly increase the possibility of cars parking in our streets to avoid car parking charges or the overspill from the new houses that will only have one parking space. We would like this concern to be taken into account. I personally would be happy to have our streets given residents parking status in the near future before the problem becomes worse for us.

I wondered if it was April Fools day. You want to build more shops in a town that has more shops empty than most towns in this country. We have a whole empty shopping centre and half a high street. You want to build more? Madness You want to build office in an era when empty office abound due to working from home? More madness. You tick the climate emergency box and then ignore both it and its consequences when paying a ridiculous amount for the equally ridiculous plans. Progress isn't all about how much money you pay the developer. Why can't the fields on the old rugby club be kept along with the green space around it for the benefit of local residents, wildlife and that climate that you ticked a box to protect? No profit in that I guess. The most dinosaur out of date backward Town planners anywhere. We know you don't really want our views or you wouldn't have paid a fortune for these terrible plans. Keep the green spaces where the old rugby club is and the Tranquility /Roots building for community groups. Only a slight reduction in

the profits. This plan is a destruction of green infrastructure. I don't know how you have to even think this provides such a thing. You all continue to vandalise any green space you get near. Given how terrible your cycling provision is you should be disgusted with yourselves for even considering mentioning it. How about fixing the existing cycling infrastructure and expanding it massively before building more urban modern rubbish. This development is NOT progress and nobody wants it. And based on your track record it will be an expensive white elephant. I thought out and poorly received.

Please please update your understanding of what hs2 will do to Stafford. Connections will reduce. 1 train per hour South to London. Liverpool / Manchester and even Crewe trains will bypass Stafford completely. Hs2 North to Stoke & Macclesfield only. No westcoast intercity pendolino trains. Least important route in 10 platform Euston - will be first to be cancelled to accommodate late trains.

We are the owners of a commercial on Greengate Street. The building is largely vacant and have struggled like many to attract new tenants which has been attributed by the rise of on-line retailing, COVID, the shift of the retail focus towards the south of the Town Centre. There is an over supply of retail/F&B in the Town Centre area with a significant vacancy rate. Whilst I generally support the Gateway scheme I am concerned by the proposals for a significant amount of commercial space proposed (c.150,000 sq.ft) that will no doubt come at the cost of the existing Town Centre as the shift in retail offering will move away towards the Gateway. Whilst new offices/workspaces are supported along with a small amount of convenience retailing (c.15,000 sq.ft consisting of metro supermarket and F&B), the main retail offering for this area should remain in the Town Centre and provide an opportunity to strengthen/regenerate the with the anticipated additional demand in services provided by the proposed housing and office stock at the Gateway.

Too much housing, especially the proposed marling terrace, this is a lovely wild green area that needs to be left alone to continue to provide wildlife corridors. The area on the old universal site would benefit from housing. But I see no mention of any pharmacy, gp surgery, school, to provide infrastructure to new homes and the ones already being built in this area. The focus of any upgrade to Stafford needs to start with the town centre, so many empty units it's heartbreaking, a shadow of the county town it use to be. We use to be pioneers of shoe manufacturing with Lotus, now we do not even have a shoe shop, with Clark's closing some months ago in the guildhall, another white elephant. Fix the problems we have already before embarking on another mess

believe the way the project has been put together is flawed. Whilst I support new infrastructure and use of brownfield site, a recent proposal to house immigrants locally failed on a number of aspects, mainly to do with medical, educational, security and pressure generally on local resources, which councillors turned down strongly. I believe the plans are flawed because it appears at face value, no risk assessment has been done to assess the projects impact on our local services which are already strained for our communities to access, and it seems to lack support for homeless people and a good amount of social housing for those who need to need support in

that area. It appears that the project has been ill thought out and needs a lot more support for our communities who already suffer from a lack of resources for themselves. I would like to see a thorough risk assessment which deals with everything first before this is given the go ahead, so those councillors are held responsible if they push this through without risk assessments in all areas being published for local communities to scrutinise before extra pressure is placed on existing services. You appear to be asking all the wrong questions on your feedback form!!

A classic vision of the need to build something on every area of the town, why do town planners assume that building something new on every open space will make the town better. What about Public green open spaces. I doubt anyone responsible for this plan will live here. Fix what we have first, poor public transport, loss of local services, down scaling of Health provision, excessive traffic congestion, a town centre devoid of shops. Stafford is a county town that has been allowed to fall into decline, its so sad.

The town is dying. The town centre is full of empty shops, dozens of them. There is very little parking close to the town centre. Build more commercial premises on the east side of the railway is going to destroy the town even more that has already been done.

This is not needed, there are already hotels and b&bs that aren't being filled, thousands of houses have already been built and quite frankly the quality of them builds you would be better living in a shed. You haven't even got a fully functioning hospital for the people of Stafford is is an absolute joke , the town centre is a pile of crap and you should absolutely be ashamed of that other places have a thriving town centre and makes a real community , you have killed Stafford off , building your proposed junk will not make Stafford any better it will just add to the problem . Sort out what is already here ,make Stafford worth while , the new plans I strongly disagree with. But does our option really matter? Of course it doesn't , because no matter what we say the council etc will make the decision they want ,line there pockets with money and it will get pushed through. This proposal will not help Stafford , it's failing already because you have no real interest in what this town can already offer , it's just greed and because you can.

It's a beautiful green space within Stafford that has helped so many through the pandemic - a crisis which has shown how important access to green spaces is for mental AND physical health - not to mention the wildlife (flora and fauna) that calls this space home, and you want to destroy it with this development purely for profit; please don't try and kid us that it's for any other reason. Shame on you, Stafford Council, you should be doing everything you can to preserve this ecological gem.

Why more retail space when there is so many empty shops in town already. Also where is the infrastructure to support all the extra houses being built. Lack of doctors surgeries, a full functioning hospital and schools.



I disagree on the basis that given all the vacant shops and empty space around the town centre we do not need another new area, we need to regenerate the current areas.

The ambition feels under-evidenced. The ambition in the context of the plans feels contradictory in its support of green space. Housing development either encroaches or would now border green spaces, negating their benefits. There are already existing built up areas in Stafford that could be enhanced without the necessity to build on newly established green spaces, nor have housing on riverbanks.

Maintain the railway route of the old LNWR line to Newport and Wellington. With all these extra people some may be working in Telford and further afield and the need of a rail link via Newport does not wish to be built over.. Do not build the new homes so close to the existing railway that there is no room for expansion if station gets busier and needs more capacity.

I am part of the Castlefields community that is trying to bring about improvements for the benefits of local residents in terms of improving air quality by increasing our trees and hedging and decreasing mowing and hedge-cutting. We greatly value our green spaces, particularly the balancing pond, which is both a haven for nature and wildlife and an oasis for the people who use it. My efforts to work with the council to reduce the hedge cutting, or at least do it sympathetically, and decrease mowing have not been supported in any way, even though these new approaches would save the council the much needed funds it purports to lack. On the subject of funding I would be interested to know how much this report cost and who paid for it. The balancing pond at the junction of Kingsway and Martin Drive has developed organically over a long period of time and is a haven for wildlife and nature. It serves the local community as an oasis of calm and relative isolation, which is a rare find today, away from busy roads and is of great benefit to people's mental well-being. The space around the pond allows for a low-noise and low air-pollution environment that benefits the local community and the wildlife. It is well known now throughout the world how nature and wildlife thrived when we stopped driving our cars around during lockdown thereby stopping both the noise and air pollution that so disrupts our wildlife. The balancing pond is a unique and attractive place for a range of local residents to enjoy just the way it is. We have nesting moorhens, coots and ducks. We have kingfishers and herons. Any 'development' or 'enhancement' of it would destroy the organic nature of the site. Changes would drive away the diverse, not to mention nesting, wildlife. Surrounding it with buildings and roads reduces it to an ornamental water feature and increases noise and pollution. The pond is interactive, playful, unique, and attractive to a diverse range of citizens – for whom it provides both direct and indirect benefits. It is currently sustained by wildlife corridors. On both sides we have an expanse of green space – the area parallel to Martin Drive up to Unicorn Way on one side, and the old rugby field side on the other. Near the balancing pond we have our local community recycling hub and community spaces for events. What are the provisions for these in the plans? In terms of 'uniting the town across the railway tracks' what we need is a vibrant town centre and for that to be the hub of Stafford. At the moment we have a dying town centre with a number of outlying retail parks that have drained the life out of the town leaving it with a large

number of empty buildings and struggling businesses. Riverside seems to have been the nail in the coffin in this respect. I moved to the Stafford 18 months ago with the intention of supporting local businesses and I have struggled to find any to support. The town seems to consist mainly of nail bars, charity shops, discount shops and banks. It is not currently a viable option for small businesses to start up in town and it is such a shame because you can see the evidence, in places, of what was once a thriving town. The most sustainable and low-carbon option would be to utilise existing buildings. For example, there used to be, I understand a lovely hotel where Victoria House now stands. How about redeveloping that into an attractive hotel building, this will take arrivals at Stafford railway station in the direction of town. There is mention of an exemplar low-carbon development and sustainable design features. What is the detail behind these statements? We need SBC/SCC to engage in the reality of the urgent need for climate change action and the protection of our nature and wildlife, and the need to support our town centre and our local communities in every way possible. SCC has stated 'We have pledged to 'think climate change in all we do to limit our impact on the environment'.

I am worried about the amount of affordable housing that will be on offer. Burleyfields currently has a lowest price of ~£220k which you must understand is out of reach for most first time buyers like myself. This plan needs to include good quality affordable housing. While i support the development of stafford, i think it is important that this does not cause a price increase that will cause a lot of people to have to leave, including private renters.

Given the state of the town centre for the county town i call home the future looks very bleak for Stafford. Poor road networks, lack of diversity and a very severe lack of foresight have left it feeling dead. It used to be a vibrant town full of unique shops from local retailers. All we seem to get now are coffee shops, pop up shops which go as quick as they arrive. The whole town structure needs a serious rethink, it needs some life injecting into it and the developers need to be pressed hard to include junction and signal upgrades to improve the flow of traffic round the town

The vision lack mention of providing critical infrastructure (schools, medical facilities, etc.). Also I would like to see a varied community, not just families and you professionals, but provision for homeless people, older people and people on lower income. Inclusivity will provide vibrancy in the community.

Building a new, walkable and social neighbourhood close to the town centre will allow for more people to live close to important transport links and reduce the dependence on cars for people moving to Stafford

The town cannot cope with the current population and you want to bring more people to it?! How about fixing issues in areas that are already built up instead of creating new ones!

I support this venture overall, as long that current nearby residents are considered with respect to any noise, disturbance and possible inconvenience.

I am supportive of the proposals for Stafford Station Gateway. It is great to see that a quality Architects like Hawkins Brown have been engaged to work this scheme up.

This is an opportunity for Stafford and SBC, SCC to make a showcase for Stafford and act as an attractor for the Town Centre. I do feel that a green corridor link approach between the wild areas and pond and Doxey with Victoria Park could be encouraged. This is an opportunity to make a new ecological approach to the Entrance to Stafford. Preceding examples like the High Line in New York are good examples of this Biophilic approach to design. There is also an important role for the Station and as much as the Brutalist style is Marmite to some people it is gaining recognition and popularity. I look forward to seeing the evolution of this scheme and a new herald to how we engage with Stafford.

The proposals lack vision and ambition and are likely to result in many of the past mistakes Stafford suffers from. The vision says it want to provide a place "...where people want to live, work and visit". The details would suggest high density housing creating maximum profit for the developer is the main driver. The detailed proposals contain high density housing with insufficient green, open spaces and priority is given to vehicles rather than walking and cycling.

The proposal should be based on best current practice like Utrecht in the Netherlands. Link here: [A 'Fully Charged' City Built Around Bicycles? | Fully Charged LIVE is coming to Europe! - YouTube](#)"

Will the roads on bagnall meadows be effected? Are they creating another entrance to bagnall meadows and closing the bridge like we were originally told. Will there be a second entrance to the train station? How long will building take? Could you consider vegan friendly cafes and restaurants? Is the college on palmbourne being knocked down as part of this? Is making it eco friendly and green a priority? Will you be planning on adding more schools and doctors to accommodate more people in the area?

1. Will there be an addition (new) pedestrian and/or vehicle access over the railway to access the station from the new development? There are two existing accesses: Newport Road and Castle Street. However, Castle Street is severely inadequate as it only has a footway on one side and that is too narrow for two-way flow.

Consequently, pedestrians often walk in the live carriageway. In addition, the forward visibility over the bridge for drivers is also inadequate. Furthermore, the pedestrian access from Martin Drive to Castle Street is poorly maintained and inadequately lit.

Will this also be improved, so that it will be safe to use? Even if a new access is opened across the railway, Castle Street is likely to remain the closest option for a considerable portion of the development.

2. The first link west of the railway on Newport Street is described a "cycle highway" in Fig 41 (P66) of the draft proposal.

However, it is shown as being as wide, if not wider, as the other links on the development which are marked as 'primary routes'. If this is the case, then cars and vans will use the link to access the development. There are also trees drawn in the live carriageway on this link. This will be dangerous for anyone who uses the link.

3. Will there be parking restrictions on the roads away from the car park? If not, then the area will become congested with drivers parking for free to access the station, etc.

4. The existing area around Newport Road and the station is already very congested, with a complicated traffic light system as you go into through the town.

Adding further traffic to this area will cause numerous difficulties for existing users and residents of Stafford. Please confirm if there are traffic easing proposals in the immediate vicinity as part of your plans. 5. Page 81 of the draft shows a cross section adjacent to the lake. The section is cunningly drawn on the smaller plan at the widest part of the road. Even then, the only dimensions on the cross section suggest that a width of 17.4m will be required, without taking into account the footpath area immediately adjacent to the lake and the trees next to that. Those dimensions do not seem feasible when compared to the overhead plan. 6. Fig 59 shows a possible 'bus-only' link into the Technology Centre. This raises two concerns. First, the only way for a bus to access this link is via the bridge over the railway on Castle Street, which is inappropriate for bus use. Secondly, if that is a bus-only link, then the only other vehicle access to the Technology Centre will be via Martin Drive, forcing more vehicles onto that road. 7. Marling Terrace – the Masterplan suggests linking this development to Unicorn Way, but there is a significant level difference between the road and the current development surfacing, suggesting a significant gradient on any link road. 8. Much of the development has links described as "quiet ways". Is it feasible to have quiet ways through wholly residential areas? 9. Why is the proposed housing so high? This will create an eyesore and dominate the landscape. 10. Where is Roots Recycling facility being relocated to and how will this support a cleaner environmental footprint 11. By developing areas outside of Stafford's main High Street, there is yet again little investment into existing buildings and infrastructure. The town centre has become uninhabited with few shops and footfall. Your plans do not support the High Street at all. You are not future proofing the Town Centre for new generations to come to Stafford. 12. Not clear where green spaces (that are linked and accessible) are. This is vital to the well-being of residents and much more environmentally friendly. 13. Please confirm what land has been bought to date, and by whom.

From my view it's a grossly over intensive development. I have a fear that there are not enough badly needed local resources to care for the people that you hope to attract. Doctors, schools, are in short supply and inadequate for the numbers of people you are trying to attract. Creating homes but few or little towards resources needed. It's far too over intensive in my view. On the balancing lake, work has been needed on that for many years but there never seems anyone to accept responsibility for it. Who will be responsible for its ongoing care and maintenance? It rarely has anything done to it and is used mainly by illegal fishermen not having any rod licence. Caring nothing about the environment. I have a fear that some of the rarer bird life will be frightened away never to return. I do wonder what the underlying thoughts on the plan are and can only conclude that financial gain is the plan. Not a long-term care for the community already in this area or for the environment.

These are my comments on the new Stafford Station Gateway plan. You make great promises about safer and shorter pedestrianisation of this site. Main problem with this site is it is in two parts separated by the main railway line. I'm dividing the site up into two parts, and I'm calling them the Castle site. And the Town site. The castle site. Pedestrians are very conscious of the amount of, time and distance that it takes

walking from A to B. If you wish to get from the castle site, to anywhere in the town side. At the present, maps of this 'new Gateway site' you are still relying on Newport Road Bridge and Castle Street bridge to cross the railway. These are the only two crossing shown. The railway causes the problem. Bridges are very expensive and you Station are not going to put another bridge over the railway, COST? There is in existence a pedestrian bridge over the railway. I refer to the passenger bridge connecting the platforms. I believe this could be utilised. Make a lightweight pedestrian bridge, on top of the present pedestrian connecting railway structure. It is obvious that the railway does not wish to get their passengers which have been checked onto the platforms, and the public wishing to precede over the new bridge getting mixed up. Therefore, it would have to be an entirely separate. The MAIN structure is there already built, approved and in use. If a lightweight pedestrian only structure could be put either at the side or I believe on the top. Lifts and stairway' connecting the new structure and pathways on both Castle and Town sides. The waking distance and time would be reduced considerably, therefore, used considerably more. There would be a cost involved. As the main structure is already in existence. This cost should be on the minimal side. This does not reduce the present access or exit from the site but adds an additional access approximately halfway between, thereby reducing distance and time walking. This a little cost. If this fails, could you please let me know why, only a short message, cost, legal, BR refused, etc. Question. Why make people walk via Newport road or Castle St. to get to the Railway station?"

I agree with plans and looks amazing, My worry is and I feel very strongly about this is the increase of traffic it will create. I live on the A518 in Haughton and we already have a huge amount of traffic going through the village ignoring the speed. The plans for more housing will create more traffic as the families will not all work in Stafford also people will visit Stafford. you have to think about the link roads coming into Stafford.

I agree it is important that Stafford capitalises on the opportunity HS2 offers the town and the area provides opportunity to create a low carbon development. It would have been nice to see more green space in the area as it looks like it is highly built up on the plans shown.

Why not encourage 'innovation and vibrancy' to the town centre which is at the moment full of empty buildings?

We are writing to voice our extreme concerns with the building of properties on the modwen site, our house directly backs on to Martin drive, we purchased our house specifically because we have no neighbours at the back of our house as our lounge faces to the back, hence giving us a rural feel. We have accepted the fact that a bypass runs at the back of the house. We do however Object to the removal of the trees at the back, which obscures any building behind; but more importantly the wildlife that live in the trees will be severely at risk! We care very much for the environment which has already been badly affected because of the vast construction on the estate, the animals have been moved on so much already this is not acceptable and we are going to take this up with our MP

You will be destroying habitats around the pond and the Ridge along Martin Drive. We've already lost so much with the new Burleyfields development, to lose what is left is unacceptable. Also the idea that people will use the train and not their cars is ridiculous and not allowing for more cars on the new estate will make it a nightmare for anyone who lives there. I notice that you say you will keep the existing tree line along Martin Dr but find it difficult to believe that it will be safe as you show houses between it and the Brook, I wouldn't have thought there was enough room for that if you are keeping the Ridge. It's also really unfair on the current Castlefields residents who will continue to have the noise and disruption for the foreseeable future. We will certainly move away from the area if planning goes ahead. Also how can we capitalise on HS2 when it doesn't stop here?

There is not enough green space. Tall large buildings are placed right next to the Lake. There is no allowance for any wild life to exist in the area. The planned housing lacks heat pumps or solar panels. At the moment the traffic is quite fast in the area and the extra development will just make it more noisy and polluted. I walk in to the town centre regularly but its not pleasant because the main roads are so busy.

I live on Newport Road and I am concerned by the level of new traffic this would bring. Newport road is already heavily overloaded with traffic. The noise from the road directly impact our house, increased traffic flow would make this even worse. What are you doing to help the traffic flow to reduce? You are putting in a multi-storey car park which intimates you expect a high level of cars being drawn to the area. Putting delays and additional pressure on Newport road could give visitors to Stafford a bad impression and block up the entrance and exits from this side of town. Really focus needs to be put on the traffic flow systems and mapping to lead traffic away from the Newport road. If this is not done it will have a huge impact on local residents. The houses in the area of Newport road are very nice and house prices are high. I would be concerned if low cost housing is built nearby which could detrimentally effect the house prices within the area. The houses along Newport road have character, the buildings on the outskirts of the project must be in keeping with this.

I cannot support the vision above because the plan does not support it. Why envision a dream and design a potential nightmare? 1. The first paragraph's vision of a "thriving, vibrant new community" does not include plans for the health and wellbeing of the people who may want to live, work and visit the 2040 Stafford Station Gateway. The balancing pond/lake has developed organically over a long period of time and is a haven for bio diverse wildlife and nature. It serves the local community as an oasis of calm and relative isolation, away from busy roads and is of great benefit to people's mental well-being. The space around the pond allows for a low-noise and low air-pollution environment that benefits the local community and the wildlife. The density of the proposed development is over-whelming and dominates not just ground-level but also the skyline, references to 'green and blue assets' simply emphasize the fact that it is a business plan with little or no regard for the natural world and the importance of green space to the mental and physical health of residents of secondary importance.

2. The second paragraph lacks reference to the Environmental Impact on Biodiversity and the document is written on the assumption that no controversy will arise from the plan's over-development. It ignores the importance of protecting the myriad of bio-diverse habitats and wildlife in the whole area. A Green Future – Our 25 year Plan', states that 'new developments will need to demonstrate how they will protect and enhance nature. The 'legal duty for public bodies to conserve and enhance biodiversity', does not seem to be evident at all. The current document is ill prepared in this regard and includes proposals that would damage the vast amount of existing biodiversity and wildlife that thrives on the current site. There is a huge range of bio-diverse habitats within the whole Gateway area that needs to be properly mapped and identified. The plans prioritise aesthetic/amenity value over a sensitive accommodation for biodiversity and wildlife. Ducks and swans do not provide a high biodiversity value and instead reduce it in such a small area. Basking banks and suitable aquatic marginal vegetation will need to be incorporated to increase value for invertebrates and amphibious species. There is not a clear vision for existing green spaces and whether they will be retained intact, protecting the existing biodiversity rather than clearing and re-planting destroying the existing ecology. EG The old cricket ground could be handed to the community and, under the guidance of the wildlife trust be allowed to turn into a nature reserve. The current wildlife corridors around the site should be retained. A new corridor should be created along the Doxey Brook. The former rugby ground should become an 'eco-hub/ community garden' and promote a self-sustaining neighbourhood. It should incorporate an eco-building to house green initiatives such as 'Roots Larder' who could then manage the wider space alongside the community groups (as they do at their current location).The future of the semi –natural watercourse, Doxey Drain, needs to be clarified. It connects the pond/ lake to the River sow as far away as Baswich. Nesting birds use it to swim under the railway line to the Sow. The vision needs to focus on retention, protection and enhancement of existing habitats and links to the wider environment. For example the plans show the current vegetation around the lake/pond is to be completely removed and then replanted. This is pointless and will impact biodiversity. Much of this habitat, including the pond/lake is probably a ""Habitat of Principle Importance"" of which there is no mention only that of designated sites. Will these features be protected? 3. The vision of connectivity in the third paragraph does not seem to be reflected in the proposals with regard to active travel, cycle routes and road layout (see 15).

I disagree with the plans for development in this area. This is down to a few reasons. Firstly, I do not have faith in this idea as a economic saviour when over the last 10 years the council has built several new infrastructures for businesses in the town centre itself and these for the most part remain empty. They have become a financial drain on the town and over the time look worse and worse. This in mine and I'm sure many peoples opinion classes as a failure. Since most people in stafford stand firmly on the idea of actually improving the infrastructure and annemities we have in the actual town centre instead of leaving it to ""rot"". And I know full well the people of stafford feel the council is leaving our town centre derelict deliberately in a

destructive feat. It only takes 1 look on social media on the posts regarding this development plan to tell you that-nevermind if you actually spoke to the local people.

What happens when this is built and the business side of things remains untouched for the most part. Then what will the council have to show for it bar another few hundred houses, which as we all know are being built all the time anyway. Secondly, the plan discusses the prospect of being green, but this does not cater for all the animals in the area does it? That's why you plan on destroying them and their habitats isn't it, as they don't fit the plan. The pond near the old rugby club is home to many species of aquatic creature and birds, including but not limiting to- kingfishers, herons, finches and plenty of variety of natural fish. Plenty of mammals live along the entire areas set for construction. There is land in that area that needs updating and if building infrastructure is the way forward for that then that's 1 matter (the old rugby club sight and back of the train station are less than sightly so could be done) however why is it that the area all along Martin drive needs to be built on when there is housing being built all around that area. There are lots of habitats that have been along the stretch of treeline along that road that house lots of animals but due to building they are being squashed into a tiny area-however in the new plans these will be stamped out. Which of course is simply diabolical, however stafford council does not have a good reputation with locals as far as preservation as it is already which is a shame. I personally feel and I have spoken to many others who feel the same. That the money being thrown into this potential project would be better spent elsewhere, or the current project could be re evaluated. As a town, we struggle. It is all well and good trying to draw in new people from elsewhere but when they come to a failing town around them then they won't remain. Can the council not put the overall progress of stafford and its people first. We are after all suppose to be the county town.

It'll destroy wildlife , tree and habitats for animals. Fix up the high street, not destroy wildlife areas. So many empty buildings in stafford to work with to create homes, hotels, shops and leisure areas. To destroy an area where wildlife is thriving is unimaginative and doesn't benefit the community as we still have empty buildings being an eye sore. Go to the high street

A great opportunity for a strategic location extending the town. Our only nervousness would be the extra traffic absorbed on to Newport road which suffers most weeks with traffic which hopefully will be addressed as part of the scheme. But all in all a real good chance to benefit from HS2 growth and bring opportunities in to the town in a new area.

Not enough amenities such as hospital care, doctors, schools in Stafford to support this plan. Wildlife and nature will be destroyed to pave way for even more houses in the area that cannot be filled due to pricing.

The high street has history yet has been left to become a ghost town - why not put money into building this back up to the town it used to be rather than destroying nature to build new.



Where is the environment in this? How is it improving connection to the wider environment for nature? How is this building nature in? Biodiversity also needs somewhere to reside and should form a key part of the proposals. People benefit from having access to nature and also green initiatives, community growing spaces, recycling hubs.

The words above and the supporting documentation appear to be opposing one another. Starting with the very first sentence, page 24 there is an outline of the map and the area proposed does not come near the marked town center. There is already a community within the area, slightly wider spread, so it's not anything new. As there is no improvement of connections across the railway, apart from opening up what is currently used by the postoffice as an exit from the station, I fail to see how this is connecting areas any more than it does and, once again with the fact that its outside the town center an area that we all hope will get many of the things that are being asked for in terms of small business office space and greater amenities with the government funding that has been allocated, I feel this would be better termed the Stafford back gate project and not take away from the beautiful town we already have and the, hopefully, even better and stronger one we will have very soon. There is much talk of high quality amenities with out any mention of those amenities, a talk of work space, yet most of the offices that are available in town are empty questioning the need for more and the lack of public transport and the inadequate roads to get to the site are all likely to bash the green credentials even without the consideration of the building materials and works that will harm the environment and destroy some incredible diverse natural land. Cheap house, compared to the cities might but thats got to be backed up with the vibrancy, something that stafford council seem to miss out on, in particular when it comes to working with the more exciting smaller businesses that bring that buzz. but most appears to be aimed at larger businesses where I feel the change in working practice, as in the shift to hybrid working, the lack of large companies looking to move to smaller towns as they already occupy the major hubs of Birmingham, Manchester and London, means that most of them are likely to fall to the same fate as the empty offices in town, making the use of all those building materials less.

For Wicketgate and Doxey Road: The cricket pitch should be left as a nature reserve, it acts as a nature balancing pond and any disturbance could result in flooding in the surrounding area in the future. Complaints have been received about the linking of the two estates, Wicketgate and castlefields. More houses mean greater strain on the emergency services, where there is already an issue. Wicketgate would be better suited for commercial use. There is a lack of facilities with Doxey Parish and is a greater need for shops, medical facilities and community spaces.

This area is currently a small part of the town in which wildlife can thrive. The new vision will take this away. The area is currently an important part of my daily life and it has a positive impact on myself and my family's mental health. The new vision would destroy.

It will improve the area, provide jobs and accessibility and help cut crime. Also important to upgrade Stafford hospital.

The infrastructure of this town has been badly neglected by successive councils, as can be seen any weekend on the Litchfield road, Stafford becomes a rat run any time there is an incident on the motorway. Stafford just cannot cope with the constant building of more & more housing estates. A lot of people I have spoken to wouldn't even think of buying these properties quoting small rooms, sound proofing of walls proximity to neighbours, poor general build quality etc. Also the loss of open spaces & wildlife habitat, my final say is that Stafford is in a valley which is extremely prone to flooding, the more concrete rafts that are laid the more susceptible the area becomes to flooding & token balancing lakes are just not enough....

I live locally to Castlefields pool development site, I completely support the plan. Currently it is a site of littering, drug abuse, and antisocial activity. The development will go a long way to addressing these issues

The lack of vision being in dealing with the greatly appreciated green spaces and the Ecosystem and pleasure it all gives to local residents. We do not want this area destroyed by new buildings and the 5 storey building will be approximately 60 feet high. It will dominate the area and is a horrific offering and not needed. We have walked around our lake for relaxation and well being and all the locals are upset by these proposals destroying our treasured green space and the lake with its wildlife. During the stressful years we have all endured with COVID and its problems created these special green places have been so very much needed and appreciated. We have fulfilled the house building numbers

The outline plans show no real consideration for the existing wildlife and fauna, particularly around the balance pool and alongside the old railway line route where vast amounts of undergrowth and tree habitat will be eradicated by these plans. The effects on the wildlife in this whole area will be substantial and hardly considered by the development plans.

As a resident of Castle-fields, I am already feeling the adverse impact of the increase of traffic, due to recent road works on the estate. The proposed massive increase in housing development, in such a small area, can only lead to a more dangerous local traffic problem. There will also be a serious impact on the present green areas and associated wildlife, currently enjoyed, on and adjacent to the estate

Not sure how this will be achieved

This will provide a very different, yet complementary offer, to the housing sites that have been developed in and around the town over recent years and provide a link to and from them. In particular how will it provide a link to Marston Gate development? Unless you are including within the vision some type of public transport system. I think you may only be referring to the land on Castlefields and Burleyfields.

The density of the project is too great.

Tranquil green space is being taken away.

An already busy A518 will become clogged up with the additional traffic causing increased noise, inconvenience to both residents, commuters and Blessed William Howard school traffic. Air quality will be reduced by emissions from heavier traffic.

It is my opinion that retail space should be concentrated in the town centre."

Development of the area, in principle, is OK. but this proposal has too many houses (each of which will want a car) and totally inadequate road access. there are already major road problems in the area - this development will severely exacerbate the situation.

1. There are already 3 routes to the town and station from castlefields/ burleyfields etc. these already have pedestrian/ cycling and car access - 2 of them are major roads. the other is pedestrian /cycling only.

2. To build more offices in a town which already has several empty office buildings does not seem a very clever plan, especially as the current trend is for people to work from home. This particularly applies to the young professionals.

3. High density housing i do not feel that this is the sort of accomodation that vibrant young professionals and young families will find attractive. Where will the children play? What facilities are you putting in place for them? Where will they park their cars? Whatever you like to think people are not going to abandon their cars until they absolutely have to.

4. By building high density properties you are going to take away some of the green open space already available, this is wrong.

5. What shops will they be? local shops were promised along with a school for Burley fields. Where are they?

I suspect you mean cafes and fast food shops.

6. The doctors surgeries already appear to be overloaded (try getting an appointment) you are going to make this worse. Also the hospital is now only run as an adjunct to Stoke. Its a long way to Stoke in an emergency.

7. Why do we need a hotel and a multi storey car park. do you really believe that we are going to get that much business from Hs2 link to London and the north? Car park possibly although there is a very large one at Sainsbury's within walking distance.

Gym and Tonic, which is the gym I use will be demolished. I can't see any reference to it being relocated nearby.

There is no mention of infrastructure for medical service (doctors surgery) or education (new school) which is always lacking from Planning Applications and not covered by Stafford Borough Council Planning Department.

One of the most alarming things about these proposals is the overall density of the development! Trying to squeeze in 1000 new homes, Multi-storey car park, Large amounts of office space. I feel there is no infrastructure to support this such as

doctors surgeries, A hospital that tends to operate on a part time basis as Stoke seems to have adopted most appointments! There is also a large number of roads being proposed which already suffers from speeding especially along Martin Drive (Bypass) Whilst cycling is included as a consideration proposals appear to remove the really clear and well used cycling and walking link between the existing developments of Castletown and the town centre.

No mention of another GP practice or dental practice which are already struggling to accommodate the population. No mention of schooling, with 1000 houses and therefore a huge increase in the population. Why would families want to relocate to Stafford when the town centre has so many empty shops and a glut of hair dressers, nail bars, vaping shops, mobile phone shops and coffee shops and nothing of interest for our elderly population. 50 years ago when I first moved to Stafford it was a town to be proud of, now it is disgraceful and dirty. There is no thought for wildlife and there are so many empty buildings that could be used for offices. Even our lovely Shire Hall stands vacant at an ongoing cost. Please don't chop down all the beautiful trees along Kingsway and Martin Drive, the route for walkers and joggers as that is so destructive when we should be saving our environment.

Everything is crammed into a very small area. What about the wildlife. Who will live in the extra housing and should be limited to three story only.

I am a local fisheries manager ! I'm interested in what is happening with the ballancing lake and weather the council would like to raise revenue from it as a community fishing project !

More good leisure facilities is needed because current leisure facilities is very poor

As long as the infrastructure (roads) is improved to match the extra number of people. So many new housing estates etc being built around Stafford and the roads can't cope.

I find most of these "visions" and "objectives" meaningless. Please skip Q15 where I have been able to say something concrete.

Stafford protect heritage. Enable modern life

We have an empty town centre that has had no investment for many years. Boarded up shop fronts and litter strewn streets of cobbles filled with tarmac need addressing first. Pushing things out of the town centre hasn't worked, you only have to look at the failed Riverside development to see this. Retailers are pulling out of the town centre leaving it virtually a ghost town. This high street is where investment is needed, not in over priced houses without the infrastructure of more schools and medical facilities.

The vision should also have a focus on attracting new business and investment to the area, it's not just about new housing.

We strongly disagree with the scale of these buildings. Why do we need a multi storey car park? This is completely unnecessary and is not in keeping with the area. Squeezing 1000 affordable homes is not appropriate and will put a great strain on

the infrastructure of the area. Affordable housing should be part of a mixed development and not crammed into one area. We have strong views on this development and do not support these plans.

Can you tell me why the recommendations made in 2003 and 2019 in the playing pitch strategy have still not been implemented? In both reports they highlighted a lack of leisure provision within the borough in particular in regards to hockey which has worsened since the latest report was commissioned. This gateway master plan builds over what was the old rugby club why can't this area be retained for sporting provision to enable the borough council to deliver on some of the recommendations made and meet the needs of the borough. The master plan should be aiming to create a green lung within the town by linking the Isobel trail with the lake and the Victoria park. I fail to see why there is such an emphasis on office and retail within the development when we have an abundance of vacant units in Stafford in particular the guildhall which is a terrible advert for the town. The premise of the gateway master plan should be to address the needs of the borough which have been largely ignored by the council as demonstrated by reports such as the playing pitch strategy commissioned by the council and not be driven by developers who want to cash in. In summary it's a poor scheme that lacks imagination and does little to address the current needs of residents.

Not happy about the land it is going to effect especially around the pond area and the green area, lots of wild life live in these locations and have recently had to move because of the western route near doxey, this can not keep going on, the access to the railway is already a lot better than it was 10 years ago and we don't have to destroy more land to make it quicker!.

Destroying too much wildlife, ruining this town

The destruction of existing green space and woodland is unacceptable, the high density housing is unsuitable for the area and the proposed higher story buildings would be out of place and swamp the area, we would regret it for decades.

The main problem with this proposal is that the existing road arrangements in and around Stafford are inadequate for the current amount of traffic making Stafford a place to avoid rather than to visit. This proposal will increase the traffic load and make matters worse. For this proposal to move forward it must include details of how the roads around Stafford will be improved. One massive area for improvement has to be the extension of Beaconside to the M6 south of the town so that it provides a ring road / by pass. There are too many times when there are issues on the M6 that result in Stafford becoming more or less grid locked!

Great vision, hopefully it will bring some life into the town centre along with new businesses, nice restaurants and more retail shops as currently the variety is quite poor.

this is a massive overdevelopment of the site around the balance pond, with little consideration for any neighbours to the site or any existing transport issues and any wildlife. the consultation document is a triumph of doublespeak, a whitewashing of the overdevelopment and destruction of the site.

I disagree for the need to build around the settling pool at castlefields. That pool has been there for years for the castlefields development and is widely used by dog walkers and pedestrians. I live on castlefields and do not want high rise flats around the settling pond, there is just not the need. Castlefields is becoming huge with the recent developments, the roads are becoming dangerous now unicorn way is open as drivers are driving in excessive speeds in Residential areas. If you want to build high rise flats may I suggest getting rid of the eyesore of the old job centre in grey friars. That is underused land that would be prime location as it is already several stories high.

Residents at castlefields do not want the extra development. The council have no regard for the residents, we have already had the residential home built opposite the Kings horse pub and now you feel we need more. We don't and don't agree.

So long as the vision has clearly measurable criteria for success (beyond "make it sustainable"). Measurable needs to be the key to prevent us from falling short of the vision.

I've put strongly disagree as I have reservations and concerns about the impact this will have on the main roads in and out of Stafford, particularly during the development as well as after. The residents on these main roads have had enough to put up with from ongoing increases in traffic, particularly heavy goods vehicles and construction vehicles of all types due to a variety of reasons. The roads were not designed for such a constant, heavy flow of traffic which combined with regular speeding is often causing significant problems for residents on these roads. Made even worse as soon as there is a problem on the M6 near Stafford. What Stafford really needs is a bypass. There is mention of a "low-carbon development" but what about what this will involve to develop in terms of construction traffic etc? Additionally, it seems that the number of homes being developed is increasing in Stafford when essential amenities to accommodate the growing number does not. Stafford does not even have a very much needed 24 hour A&E and every school is over subscribed. I'm skeptical as to whether Stafford town would gain from this project and the HS2 as I think many believe this will only serve to take business and people to the main areas like London and Birmingham and cause a nightmare for residents during development.

The vision is broad enough to be deemed worthwhile as it expresses admirable goals. However it lacks any expression of the principles or values that will underpin these goals.

Great vision. The document has good ideas but is poorly executed - there are many existing feature, orientation, layout and scaling issues. Also, the document presents as an island within the red lines and not a Stafford Gateway. There is very poor pedestrian and cycle flow and safety in the layout. There is poor connection and understanding with Stafford Town, and surrounding housing.

As a draft strategy document I support the objectives, however, links to the town centre are vitally important and in this regard the station is fundamental and any redevelopment of the station must be included in the document. Can you please

publish the proposals for the whole of Stafford to enable a better informed opinion of the individual elements.

More destruction on wildlife habitat is not needed in this part of town

Thriving, vibrant new community? A far-reaching-statement given the High Street and associated area in Stafford has been in decline for more than 10 years with a disappointing lack of decent stores and small businesses. Why invite new people to live in Stafford when the town does little to serve its existing and ever-increasing population? The proposed development is far too dense with ambitious delivery. The Vision should contemplate empty and redundant buildings mirror imaging the desperately run-down High Street with its many empty and redundant buildings. There is a need to place more emphasis on developing the town centre and its infrastructure before committing to any further peripheral development. Stop looking to the future and assuming its needs for 2040 and instead look at the present. Investment is desperately needed to improve the existing facilities and encourage small businesses to thrive in the town centre again. I have seen the heart of Stafford destroyed since the 1960's and the destruction of its legacy as the County Town has left it looking appallingly dishevelled and uninviting. Stafford does not need a development of this size in such a cramped area.

Excessive development and loss of green space. Needs good green space to link town to Millenium Way, Castle etc.

It's great that you want to develop Stafford, I remember when we moved here, early 2000s, the town was vibrant, the high street was thriving, people seemed happy. Since 2010, the loss of the university, the downgrading of County hospital, the loss of some big businesses, the town seems to have lost its' energy. For the amount of people you want to attract to the area, it would be essential to have the hospital reinstated to its' former levels of service, 24hr A+E would be minimum, and Stafford's roads require vast improvement, or we will just be sitting continually in traffic, or improve the cycle paths. I read that management at UHNM are actually planning to downgrade the Emergency Department in County Hospital further, do we not deserve these services in Stafford?

There are a lot of people in Stafford and roads are congested. Are there going to be new schools, GP's and dentists to cope with the new people.

I was disappointed to find no one at the information event could answer ANY of my questions about sustainability and environmental matters. I therefore need to be assured that your ambitious claims are in fact going to be achieved.

I agree with the concept in theory but the vision is over ambitious for the area. I understand that they want to make the gateway a focal point for the area but building high rise buildings and flooding it with even more properties is wrong. If the number of properties were reduced and high rise buildings shrunk then I'd be backing it all the way.

Just a lot of trendy politically correct buzzwords without meaning!

It is unrealistic to think that everyone will travel by train so this development will see a further increase in traffic congestion and all the negative impact for residents and others travelling through Stafford. There is very little of our rich heritage left worth visiting. The high street has been poorly maintained and the retail offer has declined as the council has failed to develop Stafford's unique position as the County town, instead seeming to want it to be like any other town. There is no work available in Stafford for professional people and the workspace planned will provide insufficient opportunities for the occupants of 1000 houses planned (i.e. at least 2000 people). There is no affordable housing for the young people of Stafford, so we do not want to attract more people from outside but rather look after the people who are already here. By encouraging more people come to live in Stafford from outside the town, you are exacerbating the pressure on the wider road structure and the local environment as they will need to travel to work, this is likely to be by car, despite your objective to increase rail travel. The plan makes no mention of services such as schools or doctors. Stafford does not have 24-hour emergency cover, so it is irresponsible to keep trying to attract more people to live in our town. The existing road links cannot cope with the emergency traffic they currently carry. The plan will destroy the 'wild areas' which are used by residents and promote both physical and mental wellbeing. The existing areas of mature bushes and trees should be cherished and expanded at this time of global climate change as they improve both the local air quality and help the global situation (every little helps, and sends the right message).

There is an awful lot contained within those 'vision' paragraphs to expect respondents to distil it down to agree/disagree! not very meaningful really.

I need to be convinced that your current proposals will deliver a local environment in the proposed area which will be environmentally and ecologically sustainable. There is not enough information in the detail to suggest that the environmental and ecological aspects of the proposal will be given the high priority that is required to make a radical difference. Prove me wrong.....

I partly agree, but have a number of reservations. Having made my comments and going on to the questions below, I am very concerned how the questions are framed and the answers will be interpreted. It is surely too cynical to think that whilst many people will agree with various Objectives in the plan but strongly disagree with the HOW those objectives are to be met. I fear that agreeing with the objectives but strongly disagreeing scale of the plans, agreement with the Objectives will be seen as approval for the strategy and objections and disagreements will not be taken into consideration. For example, the former Stafford Rugby Club ground, the pitch is overgrown, and this area could be regenerated. However overall many people I have spoken to, are against the size of the proposed development, the number of dwellings, the impact on the lake, green areas and wildlife of building works, the impact on Doxey Marshes, then increased traffic etc, new roads, school places, health needs. In addition, I am sceptical whether sufficient jobs will be created for those who will live in the area or will Stafford continue to be a commuter town, and whether these and other proposals will do anything to arrest the decline of the town centre, in particular the main street from Gaol Square to the Grapes Public House.



The proposals contain far too many dwellings( up to 1000 ) in particular for the area concerned and needs to be reduced drastically. The draft refers in places to medium to high density development and I am concerned from the diagrams how close together the properties are and what sort of aspect ,,e.g. frontage these properties will have. As a regular walker near the lake I am very concerned with the impact on all forms of wildlife of a prolonged building site and the green areas and how strictly developers and builders will be regulated to ensure no damage and disturbance to wildlife and green areas . In addition , as the proposals stand the lake and green areas will be surrounded and buildings , increased traffic. I have not completed my reading of the 100 plus pages of the draft strategy , but so far I am not aware if these plans take into consideration the impact on healthcare services given the shortage of GP's , Nurses etc , Education more school places as well as increased commuter traffic. I will add further comments by email as I wish to comment on the 7 page summary of the strategy separately and the assumptions and policies therein.

The vision will improve this neglected area. The Hollies building should be retained and transformed.

I agree with your concept of a Stafford Station Gateway. I DO NOT agree with your design and planning concept. Density too high; high rise buildings out of character with the area, loss of bund which was designed to alleviate noise on Castlefields from railway; loss of naturalistic lake supporting rare flora and wildlife; felling of hundreds of trees, etc

The vision for the development appears flawed for a number of reasons including density, amenity, loss of bio-diversity, response to climate change act and climate emergency, and that further progression of the concept is required.

Transport and access appears to have been glossed over from conversations with council representatives at the consultation event, it is clear little consideration has been given to cumulative impact which could cause process challenge for the council moving forward.

The land is not in single ownership so it will require co-ordination and agreement with a number of landowners. Without this the scheme will be undeliverable or even worse delivered piecemeal which could create viability problems and consequently concessions to a vision.

Hospital struggling without bringing more people to Stafford. The place has become a horrible place to live due to people moving here and causing more crime.

This is a misguided waste of money that will destroy a valuable bio diverse wildlife habitat resulting in less green space in Stafford. The money earmarked for this would be better used to revitalise the high street back into one fit for a market town.

I agree that there is tremendous potential for something unique and exciting to be created. However, my reading of the plan as it is, my meeting with one of the planning team, and the research I was able to do during this very short consultation period, reveal some big drawback that should be addressed. I hope that I can make those arguments below. I'mnot finding that your 5 point 'agree- disagree' scale is

very useful, as I don't wish to be negative about the plan, but as it stands, it represents a complete negation of possibilities for forward-looking urban regeneration that enhances Stafford's economy in tandem with mental and physical health, biodiversity and nature regeneration, and climate change mitigation. For example, if I put 'agree' on any of the questions, does that give you power to count it as a vote in favour of the plan as it stands? On all of the questions, I would need to say 'it depends'. If I put 'Neither', does that mean my response is ignored?

The vision is a good idea in general. But there needs to be less housing and more investment in current public services and infrastructure.

The premise of the vision I feel is dramatically unambitious and misses the nationally significant opportunity for a site which is the best connected within the town to the first HS2 station after Birmingham and will have connectivity that is only 3 minutes slower than Birmingham into Euston and from a County Town. This whole survey is predicated that this will be principally housing and makes the subsequent questions leading rather than seeking genuine input for the overall vision. I do support the redevelopment of the site and a radical redevelopment of the site is absolutely necessary, but one that seizes the opportunity rather than just adds more houses to a town which is almost twice its target of new homes.

A lot of the plans I see look as if this will become a city scape. We are a county town and I cannot see any developments that will actively improve the town centre which is poor compared to when I moved here in 1979 where there were a number of independent shops

Firstly I wonder why a new housing development is being proposed at all, when there are large developments already under way on Burleyfields, Marston Grange, Bertelin Fields, Fairway and the former GEC site; and when Stafford lacks the infrastructure and jobs to support such an increased population. Secondly, I have concerns about the independent businesses which are currently on the site (Roots, Tranquility, Tritex Games and Baby Sensory) Independent shops generally fail to thrive in Stafford due to high rents and business rates, and a lack of viable consumer base. Currently these shops are situated off the Newport Road because it is cheaper than being in town, and they are able to provide free parking to customers, as well as a community garden and recycling hub. I'm concerned that the rent and rates on the proposed commercial spaces will be in line with the town centre ones, and inadequate space will be provided for the community facilities they offer, and that therefore they will be unable to continue trading. Thirdly, there is a lack of local infrastructure to cope with a new housing development on that site. The nearest school is a Roman Catholic Secondary, which is not suitable for most families, and the nearest primary school is a mile away. What about medical facilities, libraries, community spaces? Fourthly, access through the station concourse seems like an odd choice to make; a dedicated separate bridge (similar to what Barnsley Council are currently building from the railway station to the redeveloped town centre) would be better. Also the road bridge on Newport Road over the railway needs widening. It's not suitable for current traffic (being too narrow and with accidents or near accidents happening as traffic including heavy goods vehicles try to manoeuvre past

each other) and will be even more congested if the proposed development is built. The current plans for HS2 do not promise to come to Stafford – they suggest the line will now only be built as far as Birmingham, so it will be difficult to encourage commuters to come to the town.

There are some developmental elements with which we do not agree which need to be reconsidered.

The vision is commendable, but I don't believe that the plans suggested will achieve it. I think that there are few people that would disagree with the vision, and objectives below, However, I wouldn't want to see the responses below being quantified as approval of the plans suggested.

Stop building new things and regenerate what we have. The town centre is a mess. All these new developments are constantly destroying the wildlife in the town. Fix what we already have. Build more green spaces. Improve the areas in the centre already to be more green and sustainable. Building a new space does not make the town more green, it's wasteful. This will still go ahead, I'm sure there is plenty of money involved. But the town centre is embarrassing. The balancing pool is a special place and full of nature/wildlife.

I feel this development will add an enormous amount of traffic to a part of town that quite clearly already struggles with traffic on a daily basis. The supposed green areas that it will support will in fact be massively negatively affected and we will lose a number of iconic species which we are blessed to have so close to a busy town. There are already huge developments all around Stafford and in particular many new houses going up around the castle this losing more green land. I strongly believe this project is purely driven by greed with little to no thought for the existing residents and wildlife in which it will affect.

How do you propose the current schools that are oversubscribed cope with the new influx of families at this development.

We strongly oppose the Stafford Gateway Plan. We live on the Castlefields estate where 2500 new homes (Burleyfields) are being built (5 times the current size of Castlefields estate) without the infrastructure to support the people. e.g, new schools, G.P. surgery, dentist with the professionals to provide the service. currently Castlefields surgery has 2 doctors trying to support 10,000 patients with varying success. We do not need any more houses built in this area, nor do we need a hotel as Tillington Hall hotel has been knocked down to make room for more new houses. In and around Stafford there have been thousands of new homes built on green belt land and spaces with no regard to the trees and wildlife lost and never replaced. Many children walk home from school and adults walk into town through the 'cut through' and around the pond looking at the wildlife and picking blackberries. We do not need to destroy any more of our wildlife, we need to protect what we have. The plans would demolish many existing businesses, one of which is a community garden and recycling hub, which we need more of. The plans do not fit with the current buildings in the area, both listed and not. High rise buildings were the planners dream in the 70's and they were a disaster with many being disliked by both

those that lived in them and those that didn't. Many have been flattened so we do not understand why Stafford Council would want more high-rise buildings. We do not need to demolish current businesses or need out-dated high-rise buildings blotting our landscape. businesses and community projects need further investment and support. The development is supposed to re-generate the area with new businesses and jobs but the town centre, if you can call it that is a ghost town with many shops closed. the money would be better spent regenerating what is already in the town to encourage new businesses into the buildings Stafford already has. We do not need more buildings; we need our town centre back; we need it to be vibrant and busy with small bespoke retailers. Go and look at places like Nantwich that is thriving so much better the Stafford. the County Town of Staffordshire. It is a disgrace and an embarrassment to the Council planners of this town. We need the money to provide a hospital (not a county hospital) that is open to provide patients with 24-hour emergency care, 365 days of the year. especially with the current level of new homes being built and families moving into the area. Stafford Gateway is a Planners Pipe Dream which hopefully will NOT come to fruition. Politicians Planners and Magistrates think twice about what you are doing!! Please don't let your madness turn everyone into machines.

Yes I would like to be involved and would like more information about business opportunities that this new project will bring.

**If you strongly agree or disagree with any of our proposals, please could you explain why**

The lakeside area needs to be extended to create a large green space i.e. Stafford arboretum. The lakeside needs to link to Victoria park via castle works and to the old trail to create a green lung through the town. Nice park in this area and improved sport provision is also required.

Not enough doctors and no 24hr a+e in a small town that is growing in houses, is very dangerous. Unless health care is at the front of such project, then it shouldn't go ahead.

Because these consultations are a pr exercise and you will do whatever you want anyway.

Because it is not helping climate change or the environment by building more houses, which introduce more people and more traffic to Stafford, more shops (when dozens already stand empty in the town) and more issues to the already strangled town that has no infrastructure to support more houses abs shops. If you want sustainability and to help the environment make an urban forest, turn it into a wildflower meadow but building more houses and shops will not remotely help the environment or the issues in Stafford as a whole. Complete waste of time and money.

You need to invest in the town centre, public services, and improving the roads. Stop building new things that draw people away from the town. And stop building more homes as we don't have the infrastructure to deal with a larger population. Most importantly, just because something tops up the coffers doesn't mean its good for the

town. The high street used to be thriving with activity and business, but has been destroyed by all the retail parks. When all the big name stores are on the outskirts of town, it draws the footfall from the high street. You need to undo the damage you have done, not add to it!

I think the castle grounds need to be protected and kept as a natural green space

No inspiration. Roads already a mess around stafford

Capitalising on HS2, whilst ambitious, is unnecessary. We categorically do not need more housing in Stafford, to be taken up by people from outside the area and ultimately making Stafford a 'commuter' zone simply for the convenience of HS2. Horrible policy, completely devalues and degrades the significant role Stafford has played in history.

Refer to my initial comments.

As stated earlier, additional retail and leisure units are unnecessary. There is ample space available in the town for growth and occupation already. Your own report highlights empty units at near 25% of existing stock. Retailers must be encouraged and supported to use this stock.

You intend to build more homes, offices and shops yet there are empty homes, offices and shops already existing. You should be regenerating these rather than building more. Stafford simply doesn't have the infrastructure to support this. We don't have a 24hr A&E, our doctors are full, there's a battle for school places.

Traffic situation not addressed, the western relief road is not the fix for all traffic problems. A more holistic solution needs to be found.

Unclear where these areas are but some are already green spaces you want to put houses on !

With such a wealth of innovation to Stafford which is brilliant can it be that heavy duty traffic in its development and aftermath that Heavy Duty Vehicles, Lorry,s etc... utilize the M5 and M6 rather than make short cuts through small villages thus increasing pollution and damaging road surfaces not designed to cope with such traffic ?

Take a look at the town centre..there is nothing there. Nobody comes to shop in Stafford anymore. Stafford has become a commuter town. And why do we need more houses? I thought you were going to spend £20m on revamping the Market Square or has that been pushed to the bottom of the pile now this idea has been put forward. Seriously, the councillors in this town need to take a good hard look at themselves and ask the question " will Stafford benefit from this ?".

See earlier comments

You have let Stafford town go to ruin. The Guildhall centre is nearly empty. It does have an upstairs you know??? The market is a waste of time. The old coop and that site could have been utilized instead of where M&S is now - and now you want to put

another site up even further away from the centre - just knock the whole lot down why don't you.

Disagree because what are going to do to the town and how you going to make local Community better first.

I trade in Stafford market, we need answers to what is happening with the TOWN CENTRE !!! Im fed up with people running the town down, please give us answers, so we can tell customers what is happening with the town centre !!!

The council are blind and so are the developers, Stafford needs a fully functioning Hospital and the roads which are lined with pot holes all over the place need to be fixed with a matter of urgency, this is more of a priority than building more homes which will cause major clogging of Stafford Town Center

You have no thought to the existing people of the area and the impact on my work.

This development will further fragment the town. The majority of the homes will be commuter homes HS2 will support this.

I disagree with the whole prospect. money should be invested in the already crumbling infrastructure in this town. You counsellors have killed it

See above

To much green areas lost to much wildlife already lost

I agree with all the individual elements as presented. It's a good blend but I am nervous that at some point rash decisions will be made which sacrifice the current ambitions and principles. Too often we see the supply of housing for 'young professionals' exceeding demand. They are then handed over to housing associations to accommodate people dumped from other areas. This, combined with our own indigenous 'people in crisis' and a failure of public services to deal with them makes town centre living a living nightmare. This is already happening with much of the growing population seemingly reluctant to stray into the town centre during the day or evening and having to tackle street drinkers, drug addicts and feral youths. Let's face it, Staffordshire Police won't, so why should they? In short, the vision is great, hold your nerve, inward investment is the only thing that will save the town but other services need to step up to make it work.

I believe Stafford is undergoing a period of growth and it is the right time to capitalise on this to encourage new businesses and skilled workers to the area. I believe it vitally important to create new green and blue areas in Stafford and plant native plants, trees and hedgerows encouraging wildlife. This way we can all have a healthier environment to live in. As a new parent more leisure facilities are of great importance to me, I feel their are not a particularly large amount of valuable leisure activities in Stafford and we should encourage more sports for our children.

The scheme needs to include sports pitches and improved outdoor sporting provision. The town needs hockey and football pitches, swimming pool and an improved green infrastructure to create a green lung through the town. This scheme

needs to connect Victoria park. With the idobel trail via the lake within the master plan. The area around the lakes needs to be extended and an arboretum created.

I like the character of the areas

These areas along with other areas in Stafford really need the development and infrastructure and facilities other areas offer. The project offers these areas the development required.

I am very concerned that, despite the lofty ideals of this proposal, it has not taken the complete change in retail habits of shoppers into account. We need more investment into the retail offer in the town centre NOT on the other side of the railway line. The Riverway development has shown that by opening a new retail centre, it has emptied the northern end of Greengate Street. This combined with the huge increase in online shopping due to Covid 19 brings the provision of any extra retail space away from the town centre into question. Anything that pulls people away from the traditional heart of the town must be complemented by investment in the current centre, preferably in the form of lowering the rents and offering new companies incentives to come to Stafford.

My reasons are written in box 4

The proposal is of minimum benefit to the residents of Stafford. It is a means of adding a multi storey car park and hotel on the opposite side to the existing station access, using an existing pedestrian bridge which is not suitable for cyclists and does not create a welcoming invitation to they town, it merely serves the station. The proposed development is an excuse to propose many new houses, with not many facilities. The business and commercial area seems to have been dumbed down, really it is only a hotel and car park now

Giving the new houses only one parking space will potential give the residents in Mansell Close, Oriel View, Merlon Court and Barbican Grove a problem as their cars will end up parking on our streets and on Castlefields.

Do you people not see what is going on in this dead end town. Oooh we have masses of empty shops, I know let's build some more on the only green space left near the town centre. Ooh everyone is working from home, let's build crappy offices that no one will want to rent. There are so many new houses without the necessary green or transport infrastructure to support them, proper segregated cycling provision should come to the all the existing areas of the Borough BEFORE more houses are imposed on us. Where is the new Rowley Park type green space and sports facilities all these new houses need? If you cared about green space and infrastructure then you would keep the old rugby club as green space for communities to use. Keep the trees, the rewilded fields and hedgerows. Keep the area incl Tranquility and Roots. Why not? Obviously I'm aware Tory councils not interestsd in quality of life or the community.

Good Luck - it all looks very interesting . . .

I believe the principal of allowing vehicular access onto the Newport Road is an error of judgement. Obviously whoever drafted the document has never monitored the use

of the entrance/access point particularly at the start and end of the school day when Castlefields becomes an exceptionally busy dropping off and collection point for parents delivering and collecting their children by car. Double yellow lines being consistently ignored. The opportunity shouldn't be missed to close off this access to vehicles and reroute residents and visitors to the backs of the Newport Road houses and the bowling club via Kingsway. If this fact is not taken seriously one and all will live to regret it.

Stafford needs a bus station. Somewhere all the buses from Stoke/Newcastle/Stone, Uttoxeter, Lichfield, Cannock, Wolverhampton, Newport/Telford and Eccleshall could interchange with each other and with the Railway. Currently the stops are spread all over the town.

Been too much disruption on Doxey road 2 years of traffic lights loss of green spaces for dog walking recreation more houses no hospital facilities to cope Stafford has lost so much it was a lovely place to live too much greed from council do not listen to concerns just go ahead anyway

1 train to London on expensive ticket HS2 will not attract investment. Wakeup and lobby for Stafford connectivity if it is not already too late. Stafford is being bypassed by HS2. Your gateway document reads like it was produced by a n outside consultant with nothing invested in Stafford. Your model is based on unformed judgements on Stafford hub attraction. Therefore it should not be supported until more realistic picture is presented.

See answers in 4 above

Too much housing. Leave the wild green areas for our wildlife, no mention of them in the proposals, they already live there.

I can't answer the questions because the basis of any project is the risk assessment that supports it, and I haven't seen anything to see what the impact is on local services, hospital, NHS generally, dentists, G.P surgeries, homeless people, social housing. It feels like a project that is being pushed forward by the council which does not look at it's impact on the local community initially, so it should be turned down before proper and scrutinised plans have been agreed with the local constituents.

Very concerned on the increased traffic levels congesting the town, the A518 Newport Rd is already a busy road and the new western bypass is just a making the traffic worse, speeding drivers increased noise and pollution. There is also significant flooding issues already on the A518 and these development will only make them more of a problem. The 'Lake' is a balancing pond to help manage water drainage, building more on the open spaces will likely increase the risk of flooding. HS2 is not even coming to the town its bypassing it and rail services from the town are being cut back.

How about some of this money and enthusiasm being invested in what we already have, the CountyTown of Staffordshire, and not what is essentially another glorified retail park on the outskirts. The Riverside Centre sucked more than a few



businesses out of the town centre, and they all lay derelict now. It's an embarrassment to town.

This will be great for Stafford and attract investment and visitors.

Don't need to be building anything new like this , work on whats already here and nurture that

You cannot create a centre for 'living, working and relaxing' if it involves destroying one of the very places people use to relax and reduce stress. You talk about creating 'sustainable development existing unique natural assets' 'Providing green spaces and open space places sustainability at its heart' and responding 'to the challenge of the climate emergency' - yet you intend to destroy a beautiful green space which already contributes to reducing carbon emissions; it has been shown that building contributes to greenhouse gases, so why build here?

Why not regenerate the town centre as it is? It's a ghost town and how can it be sustainable to build on the green space. The road and general infrastructure cannot support all the extra traffic. Will the business premises be affordable for local businesses in Stafford?

Housing spaces are being proposed on spaces which have developed naturally into green spaces which will support wildlife and, if furthered, would negate extreme weather impacts. They are also proposed to be built next to the brook. This creates higher risk of pollutants entering water-ways.

My main comment is to make sure with have the facility to reopen the railway to Newport and Wellington. If and hopefully when the route via Shifnal is electrified this route could also be done and provide a electrified rail connection. Also if this route was reopened before the other is electrified there would be a handy diversion route for Shrewsbury/ Wellington (Telford\ ) to access London.

I believe it is how you are going about it that is objectionable. There is no provision for preserving the haven that is the balancing pond, nor are there sufficient green spaces given how much green space is being taken away from the local community and the wildlife. I cannot see any detail of how any of this helps tackle climate change.

i think that doxey itself is a lovely area that has had a lot of investment, and between this village and stafford itself could look a lot better.

I have not been able to access the information with regards to the Character Zones online. I am unable to attend the Drop In session as I am working.

Expanding the town centre and creating a lively mixed use neighbourhood will improve the lives of residents and encourage the movement of people using forms of transportation other than the automobile

Apparently the plan is to complement what is already on offer in the town centre. What town centre there is nothing on offer and as for expecting retail to come flooding back in that is never going to happen. There will be empty shops the other side of the railway station. The Borough council needs to sort out what is on offer in

the town centre never mind moving it to the other side of the railway station. Assumption that instead of using cars residents will use the nearby public transport again what cloud are these planners on. Stating that new bus services be created or old ones re routed to serve the areas. If they haven't notice the bus services are nearly zero you try going anywhere these days with out a car and its impossible.

This is yet again a development which will create a no go area it is being promoted in such a way that a them and us situation is likely to create problems with security and personal safety.

In effect I think is just moving the Town Centre to the other side of the railway station. The way our town is painted in this report is like its a wonderful area, vibrant with lots of retail already and bus and rail services . The reality it looks like a horror movie film set with too many empty shops to count. No where for youngsters to go and I note in the new plans they seem to be missed out again. There is not a great amount of retail available and the buses are ridiculous, and rail services hit and miss. Trying to blind side the public with lots of new pretty good for everyone buildings is not a good thing.

It is not clear what is going to be kept for the character zone "lakeside" which is a balancing pond (BP) that is already a haven for wildlife (Kingfishers, multiple species of insects, amphibians, herons to name a few) and has an abundance benefits already in place for biodiversity. Clearing this site of all that makes it a unique space, and in parts a wild space and replacing it with a 'cleaner' version in my opinion would be unacceptable and a loss to the site and community that value this quiet space. All around this area , both immediate to the BP and nearby, including the old rugby ground) is ivy, native trees, bramble and there are fantastic hedges, mature/established trees and wildflowers. Bramble is a very important native plant which provides for multiple insects. The Environment Bill and its objectives should therefore be noted here for this 'regeneration'. I would hope that expert's have, or will be consulted on how to best approach this area, improving and not replacing everything, based on how biodiversity can be further improved using what is already in situ as much as is possible throughout the whole area this will affect, and not just the immediate BP area.

I am supportive of the proposals for Stafford Station Gateway. It is great to see that a quality Architects like Hawkins Brown have been engaged to work this scheme up. This is an opportunity for Stafford and SBC, SCC to make a showcase for Stafford and act as an attractor for the Town Centre. I do feel that a green corridor link approach between the wild areas and pond and Doxey with Victoria Park could be encouraged. This is an opportunity to make a new ecological approach to the Entrance to Stafford. Preceding examples like the High Line in New York are good examples of this Biophilic approach to design. There is also an important role for the Station and as much as the Brutalist style is Marmite to some people it is gaining recognition and popularity. I look forward to seeing the evolution of this scheme and a new herald to how we engage with Stafford.

The proposals lack vision and ambition and are likely to result in many of the past mistakes Stafford suffers from. The vision says it want to provide a place "...where

people want to live, work and visit". The details would suggest high density housing creating maximum profit for the developer is the main driver.

The detailed proposals contain high density housing with insufficient green, open spaces and priority is given to vehicles rather than walking and cycling.

The proposal should be based on best current practice like Utrecht in the Netherlands. <https://healthyurbanliving.utrecht.nl/our-vision-for-utrecht-in-2040/>

It'll be nice for the area to be updated/upgraded provided that they don't cut corners. There are far too many housing developments in Stafford, without any clear support of the High Street. I do not want additional traffic around an already heavily congested area around Victoria Park. You are ruining what little is left of Stafford. The housing developments are ugly, on top on one another, and far too high.

Stafford has had a huge amount of new housing built over the past several years with no improvement in facilities such as health care and nothing done to address the problem major routes into Stafford which are already blocked during rush hours (Lichfield Road, Stone Road), this development will just make Newport Road the same. More housing is just going to compound these problems. We have the new housing on GEC to come too. There are so many derelict buildings in Stafford that are an eye sore, that need to be developed. There are a huge number of unused office buildings in Stafford - Tipping Street, Peel Building, Martin Street, SP2 - why does this development propose space for business is required when we already have this? With more people working from home and technology allowing people to meet virtually, times have changed from when HS2 was first proposed - more office buildings are not required and there is little need to get to London quicker. The town centre is a sad place to go and has really declined over the past few years, what is being done to rectify that? The new development with M&S has not worked, shops have come and gone from there and it is disconnected from the high street. This will just create another area, separate from the town centre, it is all very disjointed. There seems to be no overall plan for Stafford, it is just now lots of ""bits"", none of which are particularly successful. If this does go ahead I hope the housing plan is more attractive and planned than the ugly development at the top end of the Tixall Road, with a block of flats stuck in the middle of housing, and the Burleyfields development, which is turning out to be equally unpleasant in look.

I view it as over intensive and not providing the recourses locally to help and assist any new residents. Doctors, schools, the hospital not 24 hr. Little policing resources. These services are already stretched, and this will overload them even more. I'm very sceptical of your objectives which are 'pie in the sky' and NOT written in simple language.

You have had plans before but have altered them without informing the public about the changes. Maybe this time it will not happen. This time it will have to be multi-partnerships which will be harder to sweep under the carpet and hide from the public.

I agree with plans and looks amazing, My worry is and I feel very strongly about this is the increase of traffic it will create. I live on the A518 in Haughton and we already

have a huge amount of traffic going through the village ignoring the speed. The plans for more housing will create more traffic as the families will not all work in Stafford also people will visit Stafford. you have to think about the link roads coming into Stafford.

I agree with the need for low carbon housing and increased development of green travel options.

I found it really difficult to answer these questions as they are so badly (or cunningly?) phrased.. If the objectives and artists impressions are so deceptive how can we trust that their execution won't be as bad?

If the building is to go ahead on these sites then no trees should be removed to do so, the animals and we as the residents of Castlefields should be taken in to consideration for once so the aesthetics and natural nature are not compromised.

It's a completely flawed proposition, we already have beautiful green and wild areas that you want to destroy. We should be protecting these areas not building all over them, they should be a green lung for the area. Not all green areas should be places for us to enjoy, they should be havens for wildlife, their protected places. Try looking after the green areas we already have for people to enjoy, so many aren't managed properly as it is. Packing people into tiny flats and houses and destroying habitats is not the answer.

The Lake area is a real space for feeling you are not in an urban concrete environment and the buildings proposed are just too close to the water leaving virtually no green space. There will be very few trees. It appears it will mostly be hard surfaces not grass and trees. Wildlife will disappear.

Road traffic is a major concern

The boundaries of some of the zones seem arbitrary and need to be changed and justified. I strongly support the Castlefields balancing pond/lake being included as an integral and essential part of the whole project. However, it should be an 8th zone and have separate treatment with existing boundaries kept. The "Lakeside zone" on your plan should be renamed the Rugby Ground and exclude the pond/lake and its surrounds especially the hedge planted by Lord Stafford. The two areas of land on the northern side of the pond should NOT be included in the Marling Terrace zone. The Marling Terrace zone on the plan shows two apartment blocks being built on the balancing pond/lake area ( which should be a zone in its own right). The apartment blocks need to be deleted from the scheme as they will be harmful to the bio-diverse wildlife around the pond/lake. In addition, the loss of the existing embankment and trees on the east side of Kingsway would be counterproductive both visually and environmentally. The oak and ash trees along the eastern boundary of the balancing pond are threatened by these draft proposals. The yellow flags and reed mace around the pond and the five black poplar trees on the northern bank all must be protected. The whole of the balancing pond site should be designated as a local nature reserve by SBC. The plan lacks specific reference to sustainable and appropriate new housing and the building designs illustrated in the document appear to be unsustainable. The style of the housing illustrated is not suitable for a medium

size town like Stafford with its own character. It is more suited to a built up city. The document states that high quality buildings will be built to address the challenges of climate change and yet does not specify how. New buildings should comply fully with a standard such as 'Passive House' with integral solar panels and insulation. A significant element of affordable housing should be included, in ALL zones at the correct ratio per zone. All existing buildings need to be retrofitted to as close to the standard whilst protecting their historical relevance. The plans for the buildings off Newport Road are inconsistent. The Grade II listed Victorian houses between the Hollies and the railway bridge are specifically mentioned as worth retention, as is the Royal mail depot ( not listed ). However, the Grade II listed Hollies buildings are to be demolished and replaced by what appears to be inappropriate new housing, with no explanation why. Active travel routes should be included in the design to the local primary and secondary schools. Cycle routes through for business and pleasure need to be more prominent with adequate space for cyclists to go in twos so that parents can cycle with children to school, shops, and leisure activities. The cycle path in the 'Station Gateway' and 'The Hollies' does not match the LTN 1/20 guidelines, being neither separated from traffic nor wide enough for bidirectional flow. The cycle path in 'The Hollies' does not match the LTN 1/20 guidelines, leading directly to the Newport road which has no cycling provision and compresses the existing road space into three lanes over the railway bridge (very dangerous). There are no dedicated cycle paths in Marling Terrace, Castle Engine Works, Wicketgate and Doxey Road. A cycle path, similar to the design used in 'Lakeside' should link all the zones together. Re. road layout, it is striking how few cars appear in your artistic interpretations. The practice of utilising narrow streets, planters and on street parking is a solution to a problem that should not be designed into a new development. This is a solution for the old Victorian terraces around Stafford where the existing buildings and roads offer no other solution. Public spaces should be car free. Cars should have separate routes to communal parking.

Because these areas are fine as they are, the high street in town and the many already built buildings which need to be fixed up and used as something else needs work. Our high street is empty, yet this apparently says it helps the town? How? The towns empty? It'll give more reason to avoid the high street and not support local businesses. Plenty opportunity just easy to destroy trees and wildlife for a blank canvas than to fix up buildings and the high street. All of Stafford isn't happy as we are never heard

We feel the development of the area is very important. It's currently dangerous, used for seedy activities and a cut through. The natural habitat can be improved and the area made safer for enjoyment encourage diverse opportunities.

Not enough amenities such as hospital care, doctors, schools in Stafford to support this plan. Wildlife and nature will be destroyed to pave way for even more houses in the area that cannot be filled due to pricing. The high street has history yet has been left to become a ghost town - why not put money into building this back up to the town it used to be rather than destroying nature to build new.

Existing ecological features at the site should be retained and enhanced for the benefit of biodiversity, not removed and then re-planted. The pond at lakeside appears to become isolated and has all of its bankside and surrounding vegetation removed as part of the proposals. The pond should be for the benefit of nature first and foremost - it should then be extended to incorporate the other important habitats adjacent such as the meadow behind the current Roots larder. As part of the proposals it becomes nothing more than another duck pond, which isn't good for biodiversity. Current proposals will decrease the value of this site for nature.

Firstly I find this a very problematic survey as there are many of the ambitions that I fully agree with while the principles I cannot support, basically, other than this question, once again leading as it only asks on the extremes, it's very easy to portray the results however a person want them interpreted as opposed to clear indisputable facts. Many of the things mentioned seem to either overlook what's already in the area, oppose each other or are just plain wrong. Starting with ""The Gateway study area will benefit from improved connections to London arising from HS2,"" Unless there have been changes, then HS2 isn't coming anywhere near Stafford station and to use it will take longer than services already offered, there is also an element of missing the huge change in hybrid working, reducing the need to travel or, as houses are significantly cheaper here but most business that afford people the ability to buy homes are already situated in the cities around the area as they, by default, have a greater draw. As is called out early on there is a £120m development fund to improve the town centre, an area that appears to have been greatly mismanaged by the local council, allowing business that pulled key foot fall into the area to build out on the edge of the centre causing a knock on issue of shutting down a lot of the top end of the town. Add in there is a considerable amount of space that has been left empty and resistance made by the planning authority to allow people to create the mixed use space that is being proposed right now. There is no evidence that there is going to be an improved connection to the current town centre, likely meaning this development will either detract away from the, hopefully, wonderful work that will have been put in in making the centre of town great again, meaning both areas suffer equally or, even worse, both end up much like things are now, empty, untidy and in no way welcoming to anyone. Furthermore there is talk of the reduction in town centre traffic due to the new Stafford Western Access route, making this idea workable. I suspect a new review of traffic volumes might need to be done as there is still a large amount of congestion around the Newport road area and even worse around the industrial estate that it leads out to in the North of town. There has been no consideration to the traffic flows or usage when considering the usage of Castlefields as a main entrance road. Often cars can be backed up close to that junction and, worse, it's often very difficult to get into the road if travelling west or pull out of that road in either direction, simply due to the persistent flow of traffic, on the main road, in both directions. Furthermore the road itself would need considerable widening as it is very narrow, which would then leave the bowls club with no parking. On top of this, it is very much the favourite drop off point for the local comprehensive school, meaning it's often close to impossible to move around there at school start and end times. The school has also brought many problems with parking, even in areas where all houses have off road parking, that means that resident permits have

become essential. With a development of this size, I am expecting that would also be needed and I wonder how the council, already stretched in this area if we are to believe what we are told, are going to cope with the management of this situation with such a mixed variety of requirements.

The infrastructure is not available within Doxey parish to support more houses.

I strongly disagree with the plans around the balancing pond, We love to see the heron's and king fisher, the foxes and bats whose homes are in the area. This plan will be a disaster for the wildlife that lives here now. I am so upset to see the wildlife that shares our town destroyed. We use the lovely amenities that are already here and they should be protected by making the balancing pond and its surroundings a nature reserve not building unnecessary buildings. The trees and open spaces should be protected.

This is running the homes of wildlife and the residents of Stafford.

helps reiterate; provide jobs; improve social cohesion

See 1st comments

As I have already stated the Pond currently is a lovely area spoiled by littering anti social activity and drug abuse. I regularly litter pick the area frequently collecting large bags of discarded plastic bottles, cans, and take away wrappers. The discarding of take away food has encouraged a large rat population. The development will address these issues whilst retaining the nature of the area.

We have enough empty buildings that should be renovated and reused for offices, businesses and retail. The town centre is a disgrace for the county town and another out of area precinct will detract from using the town even more. A concentrated regeneration should take place on the town centre not another out of area build with HS 2 funding driving it along. The residents here have had to endure pile drivers for the new road build, lorries dust and dirt from Burley Fields build. We see this as another attack on our green spaces, leave them.

The outline plans show no real consideration for the existing wildlife and flora , particularly around the balance pool and alongside the old railway line route where vast amounts of undergrowth and tree habitat will be eradicated by these plans. The effects on the wildlife in this whole area will be substantial and hardly considered by the development plans. Its no point pretending the balance pool is a useful area if your going to destroy the surrounding habitat by building so closely towards it.

Little consideration for the effects of your proposals on the present local community.

I believe there is a disconnect between the vision and how it is being implemented. For example, how does building 1000 houses, a multi storey car park and new work spaces put "sustainability at its heart and respond to the challenge of the climate emergency"? The proposal will disrupt and demolish a lot of mature established plants/ trees/ wildlife by destroying the nature corridor and placing concrete around a currently thriving pond. To address the climate emergency and improve sustainability, it would be better to look at implementing more nature areas, for

example, turning the area into parkland, to help join up wildlife habitats and improve nature corridors. In a time when people are shopping less in towns and more online, there is little need for building more shops or indeed workspaces, when more people are working from home. This proposal takes away the already established cycle system which has been successful for many years and replaces it with an unclear system of paths which do not seem to link well with the town centre. Build up of traffic in the area will only add to climate change, not help work towards mitigating it.

The existing lake and the corridors of green wild space along Martin Drive and the margins of the former rugby ground are vital areas for wildlife and have been for the last 30 years. The lake and environs is land owned by the Borough Council who profess to be concerned about wildlife and biodiversity. If that is the case, which clearly has now been brought into doubt, these areas should have been excluded from the start from any potential development site and declared a local nature reserve. There should be no development in the balancing pond zone and the proposal for apartment blocks should be abandoned. Public access should be at a distance so as not to disturb nesting birds, fish and other wildlife who have colonised the area since it was first created in 1991. Nature does not want new green spaces provided by the loss of a 30 year habitat which has become well established.

Too higher density, taking away green space, and encouraging movement of retail from the town centre.

Firstly, yes we need to build more homes, but not on a high density base. We need 2/3 bedroom homes that are big enough for families, that also have gardens to play in bigger than 10 mtr square and a place for a car to park. These homes should be built with solar panels, good insulation, car charging points, triple glazing and any other carbon reducing technology that is available. It is cheaper to do this at the build stage then later. Will this happen I doubt it. The houses could be built on the old Universal Jen and rugby pitch sites. The old Bagnalls site has been started and could be finished by building over the old car park. But only up to the drainage ditch, the earth bank and trees on the side of Martin Drive should be retained for its wildlife and scenic opportunity. Also the area around the balance pond should be maintained intact as it is. These houses should be connected to the Martin Drive roundabout and the road over Bagnalls bridge closed to traffic.

Gym and Tonic, which is the gym I use, will be demolished. I can't see any reference to it being relocated nearby. That isn't a positive change not one that helps local people to keep fit.

No mention of infrastructure for a medical centre or school.....why not?

Too big for Stafford and a waste of the use of empty offices and homes. Tall buildings not appropriate near listed buildings and out of character. Industrial sites should be reserved for out of town projects.

The town centre needs re-generation. This proposed development will not help.

Too many houses and no service structure in the town ..retore our hospital before adding to the population



The draft plans take the development much too close to the existing lake.

Very good. Create job opportunities and good transport network can attract more young professionals to live in Stafford.

As someone who has lived in Stafford for my whole life investment is needed in other areas. It is no use building pretty walkways and cycle paths in housing estates people within the town cannot afford to live in when the town centre looks unkempt, unloved and unused. Roads are full of potholes, shops have been boarded up, some for many many years (Coop department store is a good example). This is where money needs to be spent, enhancing the town for the people who already live here. There is currently nothing to distinguish Stafford town centre from any other, our identity has been lost. This new development takes away from the town centre, there is no point bringing more people here when the road network is badly managed (A34 is now grid locked most of the day due to the slip road to the new road having mid managed traffic light timings), the town centre is intimidating and empty and new housing estates are popping up without any extra school places or additional health infrastructure. The council needs to get the basics right for its citizens first.

Residents of Castlefields have already endured several years of disruption due to buildings and road works. These new proposals do not benefit Stafford Town Centre. This new area will only take away from the current business in the old Town Centre. Why not generate the empty spaces in the town centre. Already the new access road has proved that the traffic has increased incredibly, although there is a pedestrian crossing, the speed of the cars is a danger to pedestrians. The current green area for pedestrians is very important for residents, especially the walk into town along the access footpath to Castle Street. These proposals will ruin the area for so many people who actually enjoy the walk into town.

We live off the Newport Road and regularly walk our dog around the area these proposals refer to. We have only just been made aware of these proposals by a neighbour, why has these not been more publicity surrounding this?

You talk about extending the town centre at a time when what we have in the town centre needs to be rationalised and more diverse. We need a mixed use offering on the high street not an extended town centre offering more of the same when we have an abundance of vacant units. Master plan should seek to link up the areas of greenery that we have in Stafford ie link Isobel trail to the lake and then form a green king to Victoria park. Enhance the area around the river to create a green lung. Borough council has reports commissioned from 2003 playing pitch strategy which highlighted a severe lack of leisure and sporting provision in the town. Yet nothing has been done in fact the same report commissioned in 2019 states that the situation has deteriorated. Therefore how can you even consider allowing development on the former rugby club. The council should put in a restrictive covenants and safeguard that land for sporting provision to help the borough council address its sporting shortfalls. This development offers nothing to Stafford residents and is developer driven rather than being built on a premise of solving some of Stafford's issues.

Further destroying the community it already has been.

Explained most of the issues at the top, castlefields balancing pond is not a lake!  
Think about the flooding this could potentially get worse.

It's a joke

Too much housing in too small a space

The proposal is being considered in isolation and needs to include real proposals to remedy the major problems with the existing roads

I strongly agree with the proposals as I am hoping it will enable the town to develop, expand and attract new businesses (not just another warehouse, but those more high-tech ones). I am hoping that Stafford becomes a modern town with a lot to offer both in terms of work and leisure.

I do not believe that cramming in hundreds of tiny houses with little or no parking will improve anything about any of the sites with the exception perhaps of the demolished factory. The opening up of the brook could be considered a good move but the pressure placed upon the balancing pond will all but destroy any wildlife present already. It seems completely pointless incorporating any retail when we already appear to have many empty shops in the town centre. The pretty pictures in your document look lovely, but this will not be the finished reality since in general the vast majority of existing landscape is destroyed in the process of building, a few sticks and twigs are planted to replace mature green environment with no thought or money put aside to replace these when they are inevitably vandalised and die through neglect.

Any thoughts that these houses will have fewer cars is also a nonsense, we only have to look at the new Bagnalls development in the same area to see this is simply not the case!!

Castlefields residents do not anticipate the proposed high rise flats domineering the skyline around the settling pond at castlefields. It is a greenspace which should be left alone and not have extra development. Castlefields is getting big enough without extra developments. There are other places to build high rise buildings. Leave castlefields alone.

I generally support the principle of the plan, however I believe we will fall short of key traffic management principles, sustainable travel promotion through design, and the loss of a key flood defence. 1) The dyke positioned along the rear of Marling Terrace against Martin Drive, should be kept in the proposal, this would maintain a key flood defence and maintain a green walkway along a cold and blustery Martin Drive, which without would not promote walking. 2) An increase in number of people does not appear to be supported by new school development (Note: the proposed Burleyfields primary must be built in advance of Stafford Gateway construction as a minimum; additionally a nursery is to be removed in these plans), dentist surgeries, GP surgeries, vets (the development appears to be removing the local vet). Proposal: update the Gateway plan to incorporate these services, especially those the gateway will be removing, and/or ensure these are planned in other local developments (this

must be locked into planning consent, otherwise we will not have a place people can inhabit without needing to look outside of Stafford!) 3) Proposal: Castle Street Bridge should be pedestrianised/become a cycle route. This is essential to ensure traffic does not travel through the development and the Railway Terraces (East side of railway). 4) No flood plan appears to be present within this vision (although appreciation should be raised for the inclusion of a meandering stream with associated wetland). The area is currently a large soak-away and protects the West side of the station from flooding. Proposal: Actual SuDS plans! 5) The Railway Cottages (Newport Road), will be significantly overlooked, whilst I am not a resident, I feel it would be wise to put greater thought into the high-rise location. 6) One thing currently missing is green space (other than lakeside and the cricket pitch), with high-rises not having a garden space and the loss of a local community gardening space, this space should be maintained or relocated within the gateway (potentially near the Makers Space), this would improve local beauty and wildlife, but also quality of life, Stafford does not have a large green space near this development! Unlike similar developments in Lichfield and London. Proposal: Increase in green space, suggested near the Maker's Space and Lakeside, and suggestion to maintain a community garden space. 7) Most roads can feasibly be mixed use, i.e. pedestrian priority with no dropped kerb. Proposal: assurance that most roads in the development will be pedestrian priority 8) Bus Services: Serious consideration should be given to additionally improve the local bus links which were created for a dead-end suburban space as Castlefields was. Proposal: New and improved bus route 9) Currently it is difficult for those with reduced mobility to get to the other side of the railway, consideration should be made for a separate footbridge other than the one through the railway. Proposal: Non-station controlled access over the railway for reduced mobility 10) The area needs a small local convenience stores other than the large supermarkets in the centre of town. Proposal: Provision of small commercial space (i.e. eateries and grocers) 11) The multi-storey must be clear as to its use. If it is to be general/station usage then it is poorly positioned from a vehicular traffic point of view, swapping its position with the Hotel would facilitate this and also provide the hotel with a more beautiful view. Proposal: Swap Hotel with MSCP and plan for traffic management to the MSCP. Note: It's position is appropriate if it were to be for residents only 12) NO ON-ROAD PARKING. If you have a MSCP, use it! Make the roads a place for pedestrians and cyclists, not cars. 13) 2m does not a cycle highway make, 2m t'is but a large cycle lane. Proposal: Better cycle route design 14) Proposal: Protect the foliage surrounding the lakeside.

As per 4. comments.

There is a disconnect between many of the stated objectives and the outline proposals that have been put forward. Indeed there are contradictions even within the outlines of the objectives; an extension of the town centre contradicts a desire for a development with its own 'distinct identity'. Our town centre does not need extending into an anonymous and soulless sprawl into some anonymous area on the edge of town. It does need focus and high quality development in the Guildhall and the north end of the town centre. More than anything it needs to be restricted especially as it has shown itself already too large to sustain the commercial and

social enterprises of a town centre in the past. Stafford Station Gateway is a major development independent of the town centre. It has a pivotal role for the existing residential and commercial interests that are already sited there. It also provides a major opportunity as a catalyst for growth and a means of improving the quality of life for those living, working and visiting the area. It is therefore hugely disappointing that the approach in the planning for the project seems to have focussed on a very high density of the built environment, both residential and commercial. The Green aspect of the development has been squeezed in at the margins, tokenism of the worst kind. I cannot express the depth of my disappointment at seeing the number and size of proposed multi-storey buildings. The long established bowling green of Stafford Bowling Club completely engulfed on three sides by multi-story blocks mocks the platitudes contained in the Vision and the Objectives of this development that the council has published. The outline proposals are suited only for an inner-city development but most definitely not for a development on the edge of a County town.

Strat def 1: Euston complete >2034. Oakcommon not enough platforms to serve Stafford. HS2 is a Stafford bypass. 3tph from Manchester (3300ppl) 1tph from Liverpool (1100ppl) All North towns connect at Crewe and bypass. Stafford (+stoke&macc) has to support 1tph (550ppl) to justify using/keeping handsacre link. Check current season ticket rate to see if likely. Document HS2 dates and confidence are debatable. Also, (Stafford Gateway) Extends town centre - SG does not. Improved connectivity from west into town centre - SG does not. Encourage walking and cycling - SG does not (no desirable through routes) Strat def 2: Hotel - document seems to ignore that Stafford has 2x Premiere Inn. 1x Travel lodge. 1xHoliday Inn. Unless success is judged on the Riverside scheme - pinching anchor tenants already in Stafford. Royal Mail moving? Seems illogical to design a Gateway around an unlikely hood. Retail - no spa / coop please. Tesco and Sainsburys cater very well for this location. 15k of retail would take away from workshop/innovation hubs and f&b leisure. 26% vacancy in Stafford without adding here.33k office space (enough for 350 people). Please do not do this without parking (no mscp as Royal mail). Visit the Stafford tech park for research on offices without adequate parking.

Strat def 3. The lake is a SuDS. The same as planning passed on Melon Close / Martin Drive x2 / Castle Street. The lake is rightly an asset. The more recent additions forgettable. There is a planning lesson in this. Why can't all the SuDS be desirable assets? Won't SG require new SuDS? Strat Def 4: Solar mentioned once - p71. Not even on p54! It would be great to consider housing orientation. Solar panels. Batter storage, insulation, passivhaus, eV vehicle charging provision.

The new development must integrate with the sadly run down town centre and at present the proposals seem to lead to a largely self-contained area. The station needs redevelopment and could link to the town centre as well as providing better pedestrian access to the town centre. The town centre must be re-vitalised along with this scheme, the two are vitally inter-dependent and must be considered as such.

Losing wildlife habitat, no proper infrastructure, Stafford is losing its identity as a small town as too many houses are being built on beauty spots

I'm very sceptical about the ability to deliver such an ambitious plan when so many buildings, both residential and commercial, are proposed. I feel strongly that existing empty and unused buildings within the town should be made priority development and the infrastructure, namely arterial roads, are given adequate funding before any additional projects. Despite the opening of Unicorn Way, travelling from the A518 towards the A449 through the town centre is still a traffic jam nightmare. More housing produces more cars which will not benefit an already struggling road system or be Eco-friendly for air pollution.

The destruction of green space by Martin Dr is bad. It is a significant sound barrier and absorption of traffic noise imposed on Castlefields and Burleyfields by the SWAR. Balancing lake area needs protection, heavily used by residents and wildlife for relaxation and chill time.

Q6 I think this sub objective - "Improving movement, permeability and connectivity and encouraging sustainable modes of transport, walking and cycling." needs rewording. What do you mean by sustainable mode of transport? Isn't that walking and cycling? Shouldn't it say sustainable modes of transport such as travelling by bus, cycling, wheeling and walking? This is more inclusive and actually acknowledges bus travel.

Would prefer that any green existing spaces are kept and developed. Would suggest Stafford does not need endless office space, especially with a lot of people preferring to work from home.

I support the principles but have some concerns about the existing pond and its wildlife, the businesses around the area, the number of houses proposed in a small area, another multi storey car park. I also strongly feel that Stafford's existing ghost main street should have new shops and businesses enabled to open or remain open before new shops are built.

Your top priority should be delivering objective 4. Without this we're all sunk! However much wealth we create if we have no connection with the natural world we lose our compass and ultimately destroy ourselves. This massive development is to be built on areas of brownfield and also areas full of nature including [REDACTED] If you do not keep environmental and ecological concerns in your development plan you renege on your stated commitments. PLEASE uphold the highest standards for the sake of us all!

Marling Terrace area will destroy a substantial tract of greenfield land and all its associated wildlife. The whole area from the old Rugby Club boundary through to Unicorn Way should be left wholly undeveloped. The residential accommodation that would be created within Marling Terrace would more appropriately be created by repurposing the substantial amount of empty shops and premises in the town centre.

The proposed development at Stafford Gateway includes builds which are up to six storeys high. This will make them some of the tallest buildings in Stafford and totally

out of keeping with the listed terrace of houses on the Newport Road These buildings are in fact far more attractive than any of those proposed in the new development. The current tenants of the buildings which are ear marked for demolition or development will be displaced. Where is Royal Mail going? What is happening to the workers? Also, the community focussed business in these buildings have been providing an excellent service, including recycling that the Council does not provide. The proposals do not take into account the rich biodiversity of our area. I am extremely concerned about the fragmentation of the wildlife corridors, the loss of mature trees and wetland habitats. These are important for both wildlife and people alike. We are being encouraged to take daily walks in natural areas for both our physical and mental well-being. The manicured planting proposed will just not replace this loss. I note that the plans for Marling Terrace DO suggest that the bank and existing tree belt between Martin Drive and the new buildings is to be retained but having seen other development around Stafford I am VERY CONCERNED that this will not happen as builders find excuses to remove trees and hedges. The overall density of the development proposed will not make it an attractive place to be. Also, there is insufficient parking allocated to the development so where will the extra cars go? What if the residents are having visitors? Our estate has already suffered from the development of the Martin Drive into a main road so there is substantially more traffic, much of which is speeding. We regularly walk to town, and although you say that you want to encourage walking and cycling, the mish mash of paths and shared roads are much more circuitous than the existing infrastructure. Where are the cycle tracks going to/coming from?

I agree with the principle of developing brownfield sites rather than green fields, but a lot of the proposed developments cover areas that are currently green and semi-wild. The lakeside 'enhancement' seems to consist mainly of removing many of the existing bushes that make it currently so good for wildlife. Town centre green spaces are very important to those who live and work there, like my father who walks there every day from Deans Park Court and sees a heron almost every day.

I think your top priority should be the delivery of Objective 4. Your other proposals should be subordinate to Objective 4. I am not confident that you will do this based on what I have read hence my ambiguity reflected in my answers to most of your questions. I am opposed in principle in any activity around the Lake other than what maintains it as a wildlife area. I am opposed to any building next to the Lake.

I am very concerned about the loss of green space and destruction of wildlife habitats at The Hollies, Lakeside and Marling Terrace in particular, especially as the Lakeside development actually proposes residences along the water's edge. Currently, the area, but especially the lake and the footpath alongside the old Jen factory, is teeming with life and a large number of trees, all of which provide innumerable benefits both to the environment and the people who currently live and work close to the Newport Road and on Castle and Burleyfields. One of the reasons we moved to Rowley Park was its proximity to green space and the moving of the rugby club has already led to the loss of some of this space to the Dean's Park Court Nursing Home. The creation of Burleyfields is now affecting walks to the Castle and to the old Stafford to Newport railway line and I do not welcome the loss of yet more

green space. The three developments seemed crammed with far too many dwellings and too little provision for parking. While I support the general aim to encourage more walking and cycling, inadequate parking provision will lead to congestion and issues in nearby roads.

I have made the majority of my comments above. I strongly disagree with the LAKESIDE proposals because the lake appears to be almost surrounded by and overlooked by townhouses on two sides and apartments on another side. The building works that will take place will have a detrimental effect on the wildlife in the area and this does not appear to have been taken into account. I strongly disagree with the MARLING TERRACE proposals because these appears to be high density dwellings. I support building affordable housing and assume that this is meant to be affordable housing. Whatever the purpose, the consequence is that front doors open out to streets. I strongly object that there is no mention of proper frontages for either the apartment blocks or the townhouses. It appears that far too many properties are being crammed into the area, which is very objectionable to the residents' quality of life. It is unclear if climate change has been taken into account, specifically the likelihood of Doxey Brook flooding. I strongly disagree with the WICKETGATE proposals, because from the 7 page consultation document, it is unclear what is supposed to be. What does "intimate community" mean?, high density properties or what?

The Hollies building should be retained and improved, not demolished.

I support a gateway to Stafford town from the railway station. However, the proposed development does not meet the stated aims of a sustainable development responding to the climate emergency. Neither does it honour the character and history of the area.

In its current form I strongly disagree with the proposals. I refer to comments in item 4. The general ambitions are accepted however insufficient detail and consideration has been given to the concept masterplanning. There is a clear lack of sufficient technical consideration at this stage which could severely hamper deliverability or result in significant development compromise due to commercial pressures on viability. The vision does not answer the queries on emerging sustainable/climate change provisions and in its current form works against sustainable development. One example of this is the loss of mature tree lines to Martins Drive destroying mature flora, fauna, tree lines, hedgerows, biodiverse scrub resulting in ecological impact.

I am tired of seeing this town grow, when roads are already jammed, hospital stafford and Stoke are struggling. This was once a lovely country town and a beautiful and lovely place to live and now it's built up and crime is higher and most of the time I feel unsafe just walking around the town. It's become a horrible place to live since it's got bigger.

This proposal will destroy a valuable bio diverse natural habitat resulting in less green space in Stafford. The focus should be on regeneration of the high street and market square.

Re the Gateway, agree that connectivity to the town centre is key, but how it is done in terms of pedestrian, cycle and car access needs much more thought. Hotel and multistorey carpark may be necessary, but only if done in conjunction with plans for Market Square regeneration and the linking to existing and proposed commercial and hotel, pub, recreational facilities in the town centre. Re the Hollies and Rugby club residential area, the planned housing with narrow streets and mixed -use car-cycle-pedestrian, with islands of tree planting was used as a solution to Victorian terraced streets. The plan is now to create the problematic kind of housing used in 19th century and then solve it, rather than build differently from the start e.g. p70. That seems to contradict this quote: 'Creating high quality open space has a direct impact on the well-being of residents, from physical benefits to environmental benefits such as improved air quality access to sunlight/ daylight etc' (p68). Re Lakeside, Marling, Wicketgate and Doxey, these need to be considered together with the impact of change in one area on all of the others, and in fact, the plan as a whole. The proposal ignores the value of, or does not sufficiently understand the nature of, existing leisure and biodiversity features. The trees, shrubs and ruderal plants around the pond is coming to maturity and would take decades to replicate. There is a rich network of existing bio-diverse habitats. For example, there are several species of wild orchid and other wildflowers in the grassland around Roots-Tranquillity. The triangle of land between the Pond and the footpath to Martin Drive contains mature trees, much bird, mammal and amphibian wildlife as well as providing part of a pollination corridor up Doxey Drain to Unicorn Way and across to Millennium Way. A network like this is really valuable. From the plans, it is planned to destroy these habitats and replace with new planting in some parts e.g. p74. How can this be cost effective? Apartment blocks in that triangle, and the plans for Wicketgate would destroy an existing area of peace and tranquillity used by both residents and people from other parts of Stafford. There is already a mature bank and tree protection for residents on Martin Drive , and to the east, to St Modwen's residents, from the very much increased traffic noise from Martin Drive, Castle Way due to the SW Relief Road. Why destroy this and create another? This bank, the Drain and the narrow strip of post-industrial land between it and St Modwens also offers a haven for wildlife, and a possible way to link Millennium Way to Gateway and to areas beyond. Re all of the areas: has there been a proper survey of: - how much is currently down to concrete/industrial waste and which of those areas it would be better to develop as accessible nature reserves, with walks, seats, viewpoints? - what building in these areas, at the proposed density, will do in terms of floodrisk? What is the existing impact of Burleyfields' attenuation feature on the flood risk in the whole Gateway area? - what wildlife will be disrupted, driven away? I understand the pressure councils are under to supply 500 houses a year, but understand also that the new developments around Stafford, including Burleyfields, more than cater for the next 5 years, after which perhaps housing needs will be revised nationally.

The Hollies, It has legitimate businesses there which residents use, particularly the vets. The pub is also god awful and of anything needs knocking down.



See answer to Q4, the context of the overall proposal I feel significantly undersells the opportunity to develop the first HS2 station after Birmingham and focuses too much on a predetermined mixed use Housing development which feels unnecessary in a town like Stafford.

I used to be able to walk in the country amongst fields soon after leaving my house now I will have to walk in an urban space which is not good for mental health, overall health

Having been born and lived in Stafford for most of my life, I am well aware that we are on marshy land with many natural waterways and flood plains (legend says that the hermit St Bertelin settled here for precisely the reason that it was difficult for people to cross the water to see him!) I am deeply concerned about the proposed plans to change the course of the Doxey Brook and build housing all around it and the balancing pools. I lived on Meadowcroft Park during the flooding of the Pearl Brook and River Penk and saw the devastation that caused to surrounding properties. There is also the loss of habitat for local wildlife, particularly the splitting up of sites which will mean there are no nature corridors for wildlife to travel along.

Many questions above use obscure terminology and jargon rendering meaning often vague.

1. The creation of a new Western Gateway makes good sense with the eventual arrival of HS2. However, the proposals will not improve permeability and connectivity and encouraging sustainable modes of transport, including walking and cycling. There are few high-quality links for walking and cycling into and out of this area, with the exception of the Isabel and Greenway. A big opportunity was missed with provision for cyclists on the new western bypass, with shared provision petering out at the eastern end, with no onward connectivity. 2. Whilst it is important to provide affordable homes, there needs to be a balance with the density of housing. Although described as medium-density in the plans, I think that there would be problems with car parking, given the lack of an attractive public transport alternative. Train connections are good, but continued cuts in bus subsidies are not conducive to reducing car ownership. 3. The diversion of the stream and layout of the housing will break the present green corridor that exists from the Greenway through to the balancing pond. The pond will no longer be the wildlife haven that it now is but just a body of water surrounded by the built environment. 4. In relation to sustainability and climate change. I would expand on my comments in the first and second points. This development can't be seen in isolation. Unless there are cohesive links to and from it that encourage sustainable travel, including walking and cycling and bus routes, it will have little wider effectiveness.

My points are made in 4.

This investment would be better spent on redeveloping our existing high street which is now run down, has many empty shops, and that aside, the current traffic management system would 100% not be able to cope with this new development

We do not need this massive intervention, which will we believe become a white elephant. Think about what Stafford had before the Council left it to degenerate. We

had a Full hospital and a thriving town centre. PUT IT RIGHT.....the Gateway is NOT the answer

**Question: Is there anything missing from our proposals that should be included in the Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF)?**

Green lung to connect the town park, lake and the trail together. Park and some sport provision. Outdoor gym. Larger lake with arboretum. Create a carbon neutral site. Be forward thinking with construction methods used and sustainable technologies.

Gp surgery and 24 hrs hospital.

Yes creating mitigation for biodiversity loss

Common sense?

More GP surgeries, schools, development of hospital services to support the additional population, dentists, NHS services, better flooding protection and drainage to support the additional water usage and living areas

Now is your opportunity to have an 'integrated transport system' by putting the bus/tram( in the future?) close to the Railway Station instead of a 0.4 of a mile walk. Please cease this Opportunity !!!! Remember this is the County Town the Transport System should reflect this

Out of touch with what we really need and want

Actual proper plan for the existing Town Centre there will be nothing to connect to if it dies.

Improving services if we are to have new homes we need a hospital fit for service with a 24hr a and e and a full maternity unit

Traffic planning, adding more housing will turn Stafford into a grid lock without significant traffic planning.

Traffic calming measures

When new homes are mentioned would it not be an ideal situation to make predominantly council housing ? Or if a mixture of both council and private can it be that the private housing be subject to scrutiny that sales should not be to private landlords with vast ownership of housing stock. Those that have multiple homes have to pay an increased levy so that it makes it affordable for the young to have a chance of owning their own homes backed up by a percentage of bungalow styled property's for the elderly to down size thus making larger property elsewhere more available too. No flats please over three stories!

Regeneration of the existing town centre by purchase, repair and bringing back into use derelict retail units, configured into smaller units for small businesses. Providing funding for new business towards reduced rents and subsidised business rates.

Make Stafford a town people want to visit - stop charging over the odds for rents - market and shops - encourage the empty shops and even the carpark above the guildhall to flourish again

More shops in station.

The council are blind and so are the developers, Stafford needs a fully functioning Hospital and the roads which are lined with pot holes all over the place need to be fixed with a matter of urgency, this is more of a priority than building more homes which will cause major clogging of Stafford Town Center

A full time 24/7 fully equipped hospital

Schools. Healthcare facilities. Shopping and restaurants should be focused on regeneration of the town centre.

Yes leave green areas alone

As above, to work as a gateway, it should consider both sides of the tracks and the 'flow' into town.

No

Sporting provision

It is essential to preserve the line of the former Stafford to Wellington Railway for future restoration, as HS2 will create the need for new transport links to Telford and Shrewsbury, and will enhance the importance of Stafford as a railway hub.

Facilities for the ageing population of Stafford, homes, care and leisure

See above

The council are employed to serve the people of Stafford, by putting your own interests first & those of outsiders you have failed.

If the Council wishes to create a Station Gateway, they need to include the additional of a new pedestrian/cyclist bridge over the railway lines adjacent to the Station, similar to the bridge at Telford. This would link the proposed new developments with the rest of Stafford Town Centre, not just the train station. The existing footbridge at the station is only suitable to pedestrians who wish to access the train station, and the existing crossings at Castle Street and Newport Road are intimidating and dangerous for cyclists and do not create a welcoming route into the town centre for pedestrians as the footpaths are too narrow and limited to one side on Castle Street. Improvements will be required to Kingsway, and the Kingsway/Redgrave Drive/Martin Street island if they are to be accessed by additional developments, due to the size of the island traffic goes not slow down to go from Kingsway to Martin Drive, making it dangerous at times accessing the island from Redgrave Drive. Measures also need to be added to discourage the use of the the adjacent residents access Redgrave Drive as a cut through/rat run.

More on street parking. Two bedroom bungalows to encourage older people to downsize from our four bedroomed detached houses. Elderly people are once again forgotten.

During the last year or so a growing number of people using the local college and railway station have been parking their vehicles in and around our new housing estate, clearly to avoid parking charges or fines. I'm extremely concerned that if and when the SRF development begins to open up, the parking in and around this small estate will quickly become completely intolerable. Its also worth noting that as the roads are fairly narrow the current offenders park dangerously on pavements, bends, opposite driveway entrances and often leave cars parked for as long as 3 to 4 days at a time!!! How do you plan to manage this issue once new development goes ahead?

Someone with a clue to design it?

The plan is putting to much emphasis on the HS2 at 55 minutes being a game changer compared to the existing 80mins to London. You have not mention the current rail links to Birmingham & Liverpool Airports or the need to get a direct rail service to Manchester Airport from Stafford & Stoke (and Wolverhampton & Birmingham!!!) stations. Stafford Station rail service going North is poor ie only to Liverpool or Manchester, there is a need for some of the Scottish trains currently passing through Stafford without stopping should in future stop in Stafford and provide a service to the Warrington, Wigan, Preston, Lancaster, Lake District, and Carlisle. At the moment if you go North you have to change at Crewe. Connections make a journey less inviting than a through service

Yes - learn from the errors in Riverside. Access for wheelchairs or pushchairs is appalling. Literally have to enter a multistory carpark! Zero appeal for dwell time. Zero appeal for families., Zero thought on sunshine by river as in shade all year. Ugly fenced off river. No thought to invest with river way link. No thought to tidy river banks invest in Stafford Brooks to prevent flooding. Even shop windows are missing from main shopping aspect! How planning can sleep at night is a mystery. Please give the gateway a little tiny bit of thought.

RISK ASSESSMENTS on services and local population. This proposal has been putting questions forward which don't address local needs first.

Little or no public green open spaces or parkland, we need to increase the amount of green open space in our town and sort out our existing issues impacting the town first.

How about reopening the hospital fully, having a A&E open 24/7 and opening more GP surgeries, instead of just building yet more houses and commercial premises and hoping people will come? If they do come, where will they get medical assistance? The NHS system in this town is collapsing, yet thousand of more families arrive every year. How about repairing the roads that currently lead into the town, they are a disgrace.

No

Make sure the railway route is NOT compromised so it can be reopened, as when the A518 is clogged up with extra traffic there is an alternative. No good having "no non polluting" electric cars if you still stuck in a jam while a railway route could be reopened.

provision for local communities, wildlife, protection of the pond and the area around it, protection of wildlife corridors leading to the pond. Environmentally friendly developments.

more affordable housing that is actually affordable, whether by buying schemes or whatever.

Schools, GP Surgery, Road network (This needs serious thought as the Jct with Station rd, Tesco's and Newport Rd is an absolute joke) Yellow Box markings need enforcing

Amenities such as schools, healthcare and help for homeless does not seem to be included.

Yes what about places for our youngsters to go ! There yet again is nothing teenagers need places they can meet in and relax and not be judged. Parents , carers need to have places they can go with tiny tots to play and let off steam.

A green Corridor connecting Victoria Park and the Town Centre on a pedestrian and cycle level with Doxey Marsh

More detail on sustainability. Currently there is a single mention of "...exemplar low-carbon development...". Where are the requirements that buildings meet passive house standards? Where are the solar panels, battery energy storage, heat pumps, EV smart chargers, rain water collection and use? There are no details of the pedestrian/cycle crossing to Stafford station. The existing bridge, stairs and lifts are not suitable for cycles and would seriously compromise the vision of this being a key route between the development and the station. Wide ramps, segregating cyclists and pedestrians are essential. The existing crossings of the West Coast Main Line along the Newport Road and Doxey Road are narrow and unsuitable for existing traffic flows with poor sub-standard for walking and cycling. No details of public transport provision. This, together with priority for walking and cycling are crucial to making the area attractive for residents and visitors.

Please see my comments

See above please but I would also add that the balancing lake does need ongoing care and maintenance. Something I'm sure will never happen. Lots of trees and hedges will also be destroyed, are these going to be managed or replaced?

If a person wish to use a train why make them walk to the Newport Road or Castle Street to cross the railway line?????

Looking at the surrounding roads and villages that will be impacted by the increase of traffic

Details are lacking. How will the houses be sustainable - will they have solar panels, heat pumps, triple glazing, will they in fact be 'passive houses' and what proportion of the housing will be affordable which is, I'm sure you will agree, what we desperately need in this country. How do you intend to prevent the unique biodiversity of this area whilst at the same time building so many dwellings? Where is the infrastructure to support a new community when services in Stafford are already under great pressure. There is no mention of transport links apart from HS2 so how do you propose to improve bus services between different parts of the town. You do say the plans will improve connectivity but I can't see any mention of providing better bus services and ones that run after 5.30 pm

Not sure

It's unwanted and destructive

More emphasis on being more sustainable. No gas boilers in the new houses. Proper insulation. Heat pumps and solar panels. More walk ways and safe places to cross roads. Less concrete and brick. Green roofs. More trees and bushes.

Traffic mapping to offload traffic away from Newport road

The document does not mention the environmental impact assessment that will be required for any planning application and which should be thoroughly prepared before any further drafts are made.

There is no mention of the role the large balancing pond/lake would have in the overall scheme. This area will become completely isolated and its slender wildlife corridor and links to the wider environment will be lost. Also there are several species of wild orchid and other wildflowers in the adjacent grassland around Roots-Tranquillity. A wildlife mosaic like this is really valuable yet the plan is to destroy these habitats and replace with new planting somewhere else.

There is no reference to the existing wildlife and protected species at the site including plants. There are no proposals for building nature in. Standard features should be bat bricks, bird boxes, swift nests, and wildlife escape ladders. These should be built into any of the proposed buildings or structures and drainage systems.

The ancient public right of way from Castle Street up to Stafford Castle should not be ignored. The native tree copse next to the roundabout off the Kingsway should be retained due to its wildlife value. It is a good example of natural regeneration, having previously been allotments.

The eastern boundary of the balancing pond sites is shown to be part of the Castle Engineering Zone. Yet it is separated from the rest of this zone by the Doxey Drain which is the outlet for the balancing pond. An explanation is needed to show how these two separate landholdings can be incorporated. Assurances are needed that the open drain will not be turned into a culvert and covered in asphalt. The eastern boundary of the pond is used as a nesting place for mute swans that are increasing in number.

The future of the semi –natural watercourse, Doxey Drain, needs to be clarified. It connects the pond/ lake to the River sow as far away as Baswich. Nesting birds use it to swim under the railway line to the Sow

The current plans do not show which green spaces will be retained intact, protecting the existing biodiversity, and which will be cleared and re-planted, destroying the existing ecology. EG The Doxey Road site shows the former cricket pitch but gives no indication of its future use. The pitch has previously been designated as a protected open space or green infrastructure in adopted development plans including the current one. The pitch floods in winter and no cricket is played there. So the plan should clarify what is to happen to the site and whether it will be brought back into recreational use or replaced by another facility in accordance with SBC planning policies.

The plan does not acknowledge the existing businesses on the site. There are several existing community based local eco businesses on the site, and as independent local traders they should be cherished. The council should ensure that units, suitable for the businesses function, are retained by the council on completion and rented at the same rate to the existing businesses. Transitional financial support should be provided, rent, rates etc. The time between the businesses being forced to close and re-open in their new locations should be minimised as much as possible through the phasing of the demolition and building.

The proposal makes several references to 'leisure' but the nature of the leisure pursuits is unclear.

Not in green areas with wildlife. Go to stafford high street, the empty buildings that are on eye sore. That will help stafford use space that's already been used before and make it something new. Help stafford, don't take away our wildlife and kill it

Making sure there is a clear incentive for the use of trains. Engagement with timetable services and rear station entrance will help. The area does not look like there is suitable off road parking which may be a strategic choice to get cars off the roads which can only be a good thing for the area.

Biodiversity - where is it? This should be a key driver. Retain and enhance existing habitats and wildlife. Do not remove and replace, it doesn't work! Marketing material shows few cars and lots of mature trees, very very misleading. Retain and enhance habitats that are there as part of the proposals. Set an example on how Stafford values nature. There is an abundance of established wildlife in this part of town, don't push it out. Also, the current rugby field could be a community hub next to the pond, it could incorporate green businesses such as roots larder, community gardens, green schools, permaculture workshops, recycling hub (as at roots larder) this would serve the whole of Stafford - that is connectivity, that's innovation, that's sustainability. Building communities and nature in.

Continued from above

There is much talk of green spaces, green credentials yet this undertaking is going to remove a significant amount of green space that a huge variety of people use for

many different reasons and in many different ways. There is going to be a huge impact on the biodiversity of the area, Animals wise we are likely to see the displacement of [REDACTED], foxes. There, I believe, are also rare species of bee in the area and there are certainly bats flying around the areas of the factory and lake and there appears to be a number of TPOs in the area that have been ignored. All things that will be destroyed and be replaced with things that will have a huge effect on the environment, offset by carbon credits, aren't even remotely as green as doing least damage possible in the first place. There also appears to be very little useable green space, the majority of which appears to consist of water or paths for people to walk on, no provision for play, no children's play area, no where for those that are living in the flats to ""live work and \_RELAX\_"" , more an ample opportunity for people to just hurtle around on bikes, much like we have seen of late in Stafford.

There is mention in the document of being sympathetic to the surrounding area, yet this only talks about ""fitting in"" with the new developments. Currently nothing has been suggested about making the new buildings work with what makes the town, the county town, or its history. Many of the examples for the space given seem to have come from the same architect that decided the style of Staffordshire place and the Riverside Stafford shopping complex, neither of which are in keeping with anything else in the area and which, some might say, can only be topped for being ugly by the Civic centre. The height of many of the buildings suggested is pushing way above pretty much everything else in the whole of Stafford and certainly in the near proximity. It appears at odds to recent planning applications being rejected for height, especially as the building in question was near enough at that height anyway, yet for these large buildings to be accepted.

Commercial space seems to have just been a random plucking out of the air. There is talk of a highly skilled workforce and 5000 micro businesses, with no reference to how or where this information was obtained and then there are offices that would be much more akin to very large cities. Even if we give consideration to the we-work model, which as I am sure most are aware, hasn't been quite as successful as the dream held, that would still expect so many of these businesses to suddenly need office space, something that most have lived without now. There is also the talk of needing a hotel to service the area, mention of what is available room wise yet the picture excludes the two hotels nearest to the motorway and seems to oppose the easy transport to and from Stafford. It also fails to consider that there is likely a better location, in terms of supporting Stafford as a town, to place a hotel, one that would support the show ground, which I suspect is likely the biggest consumer of hotels rooms in the town, the hospital and the current business and office park in Beaconside and Stafford Technology Park.

no comments

Wildlife reserves

Plans to improve Stafford Hospital and provide 24 hour A&E, paediatrics, Obs and gynaecology and women's health; provide more schools.



The fishing in the pool should come under a club or organisation, to address illegal fishing, fish removal, and fishing without Environment Licenses, there is also a high frequency of discarded bait tins, fishing lines and hooks.

More consultation and understanding that the important things to other people who live locally are not being addressed in an acceptable manner

Where are the detailed impact and assessment studies on the effects of these plans on the existing wildlife. There are no real plans on how to protect the flora and fauna that exists in the wildlife areas around the existing balance pool and alongside the route of the old railway line. The plan to cut down many trees in the area is a destruction of habitat that these plans completely ignore the wildlife needs in this area.

A complete lack of consideration of the adverse impact, on the local community and area, caused by the proposed building of such a densely concentrated construction scheme.

Less high density development - retention of the Hollies building as the only significant building of character on site- retention of the earth mound and landscaping along Martin Drive - far more openspace

A local nature reserve protected from development and including the balancing pond, the green corridor along Martin Drive and the adjoining margins of the former rugby ground.

Ticket barriers for the station. Youth centre or something to keep kids off the streets/out of the station.

Re-design the whole road bridge, Newport/Station road junction, Tesco's. Sort out flooding outside Tesco's.

These questions are phrased to ensure that anyone who disagrees with the proposals sound negative and in denial of climate change. I'm not in support of this style of survey.

See my comment above

More eco charging points to encourage electric cars and make it cheap or free

Regeneration of the existing town centre. There are underused retail and business premises already; it would make it worse to draw trade away to a new part of town.

1) Safe and tidy bike parking space 2) Low-carbon development can add parcels collect point (Manual / Lockers) for small to medium parcels, which can reduce car delivery service around the town and reduce congestion. Residents do not need to wait parcel at home and go out with friends and family. 3) Vision 'Stafford Town Centre where people want to live, work and visit' - In the proposal, mentioned live and work, can elaborate 'visit'. Create a theme for visitors (e.g. modern/ artistic/ historic town), space for art pieces and for photo taking, lockers for travellers. It also benefits local resident. 4) Food and beverage, food hall near station 5) Pets area (Pets Toilet)

See above

If Stafford want to embracing net zero carbon opportunities, council should also encourage people change their car to electric, helping people to install charging facilities on each house, that should not only focus in the limited area!

Will also need additional infrastructure.

Regenerate the Town Centre not the 'out of Town Centre'. I am also concerned for the loss of habitat for the wild life in this area.

There is nothing missing from your proposals, in fact they go too far.

Yes adequate sporting provision see above. Better connectivity between Stafford's natural features / and gems. Ie Isobel trail with the river, lake and Victoria park. The area around the lake should be enhanced not overdeveloped as in this master plan. The site should be utilised for the benefit of residents. Create a large park that incorporates the former rugby club and lake and create a decent sporting facility.

Yes the river sow needs a clean up this could easily attract people with a decent and well maintained park!

Should be scrapped

Scrap them and build on brownfield sites only.

Better access roads in and around Stafford.

Please be mindful of the appalling state of Stafford's roads both in terms of potholes and road markings. I am hoping you will consider creating multiple access roads to the development to reduce the risk of being stuck in traffic jams around the railway station and on Newport Road.

Alternative suggestions.

The principle is sound

A fundamental rethink of this scheme so that it focuses on the existing natural environment and which only enhances it and has low impact within it. Alternatively if the intention is to simply build a couple of housing estates that will act to join together Castlefields, Burleyfields and Doxey and put up some office blocks then please don't waste anyones time with pseudo-consultation.

Consideration of actually forming a gateway: West to East - could be excellent safe through route for 2 secondary schools. North to South - could form great cycle connection to Isobel trail or railway track to Newport. BUT the gateway element requires addressing of how to cross the tracks. Castle Street is a Victorian Terrace where no one wants to drive / walk / cycle via to into town centre. Newport Road is busy 3 Lane traffic light junction often v. congested. Non cycle lane. Non pedestrian friendly. SG is missing a new 6M plus pedestrian cycle link. From s. west of balancing lake to existing taxi rank. Or even better, continuing into park. Minimum is some actual consideration of how walkway - fig 37 - can be adequate for station / pedestrians / cycles / mobility scooters / wheelchair users. The document just seems

cookie cut. not considered with Stafford and the plot reality. Plenty of nice look and feel pictures but without getting the feel right for Stafford. There is scant realism in this document. No uniqueness. Nothing new to dwell on (the best bit, the lake, is already there). No interesting tit bits or quirks. It's cramped living with no house future design featured, a hotel, office, spa, mscp with no connection other than to a private bowling green and a straight cycle Boulevard that has cars crossing! Grade F. Would love to give the redraft an upgrade.

The railway station.

Make it a pedestrian corridor not a housing development

It should be a little less ambitious with its promise to deliver when there is no guarantee that it will be an all-encompassing, dynamic, flourishing blot on the landscape particularly for the existing listed housing along the Newport Road. Typically, with proposed controversial developments there are casualties, and, in this case, there are many. I hope those affected directly by this proposal are heard, listened to, and not swept aside.

Really convenient connection to the town center. Just the existing station footbridge is inadequate and very unattractive. It also has a road traffic crossing causing further congestion and significant hazard. The footbridge should extend over Station Rd into the park area.

Bus infrastructure! The document talks about bus services and calls the stops on Station Road a ""bus hub"" but there is not acknowledgement how this could be improved as it is not adequate, and has a number of issues. There is the opportunity to increase the number of services directly serving the station. Previously there have been more but the bus company removed them as the stops are too congestion.

There is the opportunity to have a seamless public transport system, so you can hop off the bus at the station, walk into the station and within a short time period be on the train to your destination. Each area of Stafford town should have at least one service that will go to the station e.g. Number 5 from Telford/Newport for west side of town, number 101 from Hanley for north side of town but what about the east and south? The number 74 from Cannock used to serve the station but no longer does and because of the walk from the town centre, it doesn't match well with train services. Also the Framework makes no mention of Bus Service Improvement Plan but does include Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan. Does the BSIP not mention connectivity to the station? It is not worth including? Why has it been ignored when other plans have been included? Also why haven't you produced the mapping for bus services? Like you have for walking and cycling (figures 20 and 21) ? Why are you treating bus travel differently? Have you thought about the protect characteristics? Not everyone can walk or cycle to the station from within the town. Therefore they are more likely to use the bus! Has this document been through an equalities assessment?

Please take the opportunity to join this development with existing cycle/footpath 10-11 mile network Stafford to Newport aka the Millennium Way. Please include throughout simple to install at the new build stage all possible environmentally

friendly design features eg hedgehog highways and built in brick swift boxes. Please build solar panels and rainwater run off to flush toilets etc into these developments. Retrofit is much more expensive. So do it now.

Consideration for the people who were born in Stafford and those who have lived here for many years. Developments need to make Stafford attractive, unique, give attention to the fact that it has a proud history and rural identity.

What will happen to existing users of the sites, for example Roots Larder, which provides the only terracycle recycling centre locally, and the only place to offer a re-fill service for many household products? The council should be encouraging such an important green business, not removing their premises!

I believe there is a case for extending the existing Millennium Way in Stafford from its present end to end somewhere in the town centre; extended that is through the catchment area of the proposed work. Doing this as part of the proposed work would seem to be the ideal time to do this and entirely in keeping with the SRF ethos and Objective 4. I would like to see more specific proposals of an environmental/ecological nature as well as more evidence that the SRF will protect existing features of environmental and ecological concern (e.g. recognising the existence of ██████ in the area under review). In summary I want to see evidence of joined up thinking in relation to joined up areas (e.g. a tree lined corridor of land from the area leading into Doxey Marshes.....)

Nothing has been said about Stafford Station - a new, attractive and thoughtfully designed station would enhance the town.

1. Impact on wildlife around the lake and other areas. 2. Best and worst case of the proposals , if sufficient people are not attracted to the area, if there is insufficient take up of small business start ups etc and jobs are not created 3. The impact of increased population on the demand for Health services , Education places , new and improved access roads , 4. Assessment of the possibility of HS2 NOT PROCEEDING as planned .

Details of the relocation of the Royal Mail sorting office

The views and needs of the residents of Stafford. New access from the Stafford Station Gateway towards the existing town centre with improvements to the area to the left of the gateway ie Victoria House.

The vision provides insufficient detail on: Existing natural capital; Biodiversity gains and ecology impacts; Historic value setting and place; Additional green and blue infrastructure and environmental connectivity; Sustainable transport methods, namely pedestrian and cycling connectivity; Detail on air quality changes and general existing amenity loss for local residents, light pollution, noise impacts etc. Flood modelling and the significance of modelling required to update EA mapping ( the recent St Mods development has already led to increased flooding in the locale which is witnessed and documented but no doubt missing from submitted FRA of previous committed development). There has been no cumulative transport assessment based on 'there is plenty of capacity in the immediate network', the

main access geometry looks from the vision, to fall well below the standards of Design Manual for Roads and Bridges which means a derogation from standard at day one. There is insignificant detail on how carbon neutral/net zero development will be ensured. There is no detail on early conversations with current landowners and the necessity for transparent feasibility testing.

A buzzword count. The proposals are full of them and provide only to obscure the fact that this is a plan to build high density housing on an existing green space.

Clear indication, in both commercial, residential and leisure aspects of

- how this development would show a net gain in biodiversity.
- how it will lead to climate change mitigation
- how green infrastructure and construction will be used
- how all this will encourage people to visit Stafford to see the wonderful green urban environment which has been created at such relatively little expense, and yet encouraged new green tech, green business, wellbeing living and shopping.
- how green space will be used for play space, for public meeting space, to compensate for the loss of the rugby club

In short, evidence of informed, joined up thinking that is genuinely based on principles of sustainability

Make the majority of the connectivity pedestrianised. There should be designated bike lanes everywhere. Separate from the road.

Lack of economic focus, or ambition for the town

Leaving more open green spaces for wildlife to flourish

In terms of greening the area – will charger points for electric cars be provided for every home? What about triple glazing, solar panels and good insulation, as well as more sustainable building materials, which will make the homes more environmentally friendly? Have these been included in the costings and plans? Will the developers who currently own parts of the site have to sign up to a standards agreement ensuring they build complimentary and sustainable buildings? Will bus, cycle and walking routes be improved in the town if you are encouraging the residents of this development to use more sustainable transport? Currently most routes only run once an hour and not at all on Sundays, and it's rare to be able to catch a bus from one end of Stafford to the other without changing somewhere along the way. What is the definition of an "affordable" home? Most "affordable homes" on existing developments in Stafford are £180,000. As a Youth Worker, it is impossible for me to afford a home of that price even if I could save a large enough deposit. Truly affordable homes need to be as well designed as possible to lower energy bills, and actually affordable spaces for people earning £12000-£20000 a year.

Social Support Services in the area are already fully stretched (eg. NHS Surgery and Dentistry), and Stafford Hospital A&E is only part-time at present. Local green

spaces, essential for good mental health, are fast disappearing eg. games pitches are now under new housing.

The most striking fault with the plans is the lack of proper cycling and walking routes between the development and the Victoria Park/town centre. The railway creates a significant severance. The A518 bridge over the railway is substandard for both pedestrians and cyclists. This is compounded by the Station Road/A518 junction at which the lack of controlled pedestrian crossing facilities is frankly a disgrace. The historical nature of the hump-back bridge to the north of the station makes it severely substandard for pedestrians and inaccessible for many disabled road users. The proposed link between the development and the town, utilising the present footbridge, presumably with DDA compliant ramps and cycling facilities would not be an attractive gateway to the town. Creative thought needs to be given to how to connect the urban realms on either side of the railway. I hesitate to quote one of our last PM's vanity projects, but something along the lines of a garden bridge, or at the very least an attractively designed and wide bridge needs to be considered. Good luck with getting that past Network Rail, but it does need serious consideration.

As above

We do not need any proposals except for encouraging more G.P's and dentists into the area to work and a 24 hr emergency hospital

**Question: Do you have any other comments on the Draft Stafford Station Gateway Strategic Regeneration Framework?**

Could be a lot better. Reduce the number of houses. Create more green space. Don't just have more retail and offices we have abundance of that already in Stafford which lies empty. Leisure needs to be more than just a private gym. Stafford needs additional sporting facilities, indoor football pitches, tennis courts. Outdoor gym etc.

No

Now is your opportunity to have an 'integrated transport system' by putting the bus/tram( in the future?) close to the Railway Station instead of a 0.4 of a mile walk. Please cease this Opportunity !!!! Remember this is the County Town the Transport System should reflect this

Lack of inspiration. Lack of public services

Not at present till the factual errors are corrected.

Development should rely on contemporary materials. The use of cladding etc should be avoided. This gives a very generic and characterless feel. This transformation should be a standout feature for the town and something which the county can be architecturally proud of

I am please with the proposals but fundamentally the impact on the traffic in Stafford is missing. It is already at grid lock every weekend and this will exacerbate the situation, more thought should be made to avoid all traffic running through the centre causing chaos which only gets worse with the continual road works, or increase capacity in the local network.

Leave the green spaces around the ponds alone

Railway links are important to Stafford incoming and outgoing passengers. If there is an input of business type deliveries can it be linked to a specific route in and out to the great motorway's that run on the exterior of the town. To state Green and Environmentally friendly Town's, Cities etc... is politically correct but how is it served? Not large fuel polluting vehicles that damage what you are trying to achieve, deliveries before 10 am and after 10 pm electrically operated if not an entry to the town surcharge or large vans and no big vehicles increases job opportunity.

This consultation document is written in such obtuse language that it is likely to be difficult for people to understand, let alone respond to. For example what on earth is "green and blue infrastructure"? Similarly "Integrating social value into the fabric of the Gateway and ensure that its' future development delivers social capital". What on earth does that mean? If you genuinely want to get the views of the local community cut the jargon and spell out your plans in plain English!

Don't do it - improve and fill Stafford Town Centre - empty co op - empty m&s - 3/4 empty market 80% empty guildhall both floors - no Samuels - no Monsoon - no Shoezone

What are you gonna do in local community.

The council are blind and so are the developers, Stafford needs a fully functioning Hospital and the roads which are lined with pot holes all over the place need to be fixed with a matter of urgency, this is more of a priority than building more homes which will cause major clogging of Stafford Town Center

This is not needed , hs2 is a pointless excercise with no Benefit or access from anywhere in Staffordshire

Scrap the whole idea

Get a planning team in with moral's that actually give the people of Stafford some consideration

No

Read the playing pitch strategy produced by the borough council in 2918 and 2003 and implement the recommendations as part of this scheme.

See above

It should be rejected until the town centre is restored for the purpose it was created & the super stores moved to the outskirts where they should be with a road system that works.

Calling this a Station Gateway is not really accurate, it is an excuse to build more houses, a hotel and a car park. I am not against these development, but it is ingenuine to use the so called Station Gateway as a justification for them. Better connectivity could be achieved with the addition on a new dedicated pedestrian and cyclist bridge, as detailed on my response the Q.16

I strongly object to the whole ill thought out identikit offering and it's destruction of the green environment.

There has been no attempt to safeguard the route of the former railway line to Wellington. Shrewsbury & Telford has a poor service to London via Wolverhampton and re-instatement of the line from Stafford to Telford has been suggested as an alternative. For Telford passengers the 55 rather than 80 minutes would make a real difference. Equally residents of Stafford Borough in Gnosall and next to Newport would also benefit.

It would be great if Stafford was adequately connected to HS2 - connections to London, Manchester Airport etc. 400m trains bringing in people and investment. Sadly, it does not seem like you understand what HS2 is like for Stafford Station. 200m hybrid train. 1 train per hour. Connecting London, Stafford, Stoke, Macclesfield. Stafford Stoke Macclesfield on existing track. It is a sad joke. Your pretty gateway is just a housing plan. Investment will be towards hubs - like Crewe and Wolverhampton even. Gateway is a dead duck which you will find hard to get investment in other than house builders.

I am concerned that the access onto the estate opposite Stafford Bowling Club will cause problems with vehicles using it as a cut through bringing congestion at the junction with the Newport Road. This could also cause a potential danger to students attending Blessed William Howard Catholic High School as they use this route to walk to school and the main crossing is next to the junction on the Newport Road.

Good idea for brown site, but ill thought out by council and the project manager about implementation. At the moment this form is biased in favour of the development rather than balanced in every respect.

It would have been nice to have had a residents survey first on what the people of Stafford really want in terms of facilities and development of the town, rather than have a group of people getting paid probably too much to tell us what they think we would like in our town.

I personally think it is a commercial enterprise being built purely for someone's profit. HS2 won't actually come through Stafford itself, so the '54 minutes to London' notion is surely a joke.

This is purely for profit benefitting a few people. The 'affordable homes', as has been shown in other areas won't even be affordable for those who truly need and won't help to reduce the list of those who are homeless.

As a local business owner directly affected by these plans I would like to know the timeline for the different parts of the plan.

It is currently quick and easy to get from the town centre and beyond to castlefields for example. I regularly cycle or walk from greyfriars to the greenway or Newport road using the footpath by the balancing ponds or the new access route. Not sure the benefit of this proposal from a connectivity perspective. My main concern though is the dead town centre and periphery. I am not sure how creating yet another zone which will take people away from the town centre improves Stafford (e.g. like the



Riverside development). I would like to see the towncentre invested in with appropriate free parking to encourage people to visit.

The multi-purpose focus should be applied to other areas of the town (e.g. the town centre where large retail units have stood abandoned or get only transient use. This area already shows the recovery nature can achieve when development such as this does not interfere. It should be helped along, not covered with houses.

Great to capitalise on the HS2 route but remember people also work and socialise in other places - NOT just London, make sure public transport (rail) links to other places are in place.

We need the council to listen to the concerns and needs of the local community and also to stand behind it's 2019 statement 'Our strategic plan highlights climate change as one of its key principles. We have pledged to 'think climate change in all we do to limit our impact on the environment'.' I note the 'all'

all good in theory, but the real important things need to be addressed

Should the plan come to fruition, let not the needs and services of other residents fall behind. It is all well and good creating a modern neighbourhood for new residents, but other modernisations should also come about because of it. Hopefully the County Council will consider the fact that others in Stafford have little encouragement to bike/walk. In short, build more bike lanes

Yes when the City council and Borough Council sort out the town centre and its surrounding areas I will then believe that this plan is a good idea. Until then you consistently ignore what residents say on any form of social media and I would like to know how many councillors pockets are going to be lined by the millions of pounds this development is professing to bring to Stafford. We are yet to see the outcome of other areas of promised improvement for example the Town Square one new bench a new tree and yet more paving slabs are not going to attract people . The Victoria Park lottery funded that seems to have been a watered down version of what was originally promised where has all the money gone.

Collaboration with Local Partners - Local Architects - Landscape designers - Makers and other creative forces.

This is an opportunity to follow the example of countries like the Netherlands where town centres and the surrounding residential areas prioritise cycling and walking, creating a future-proof highly desirable development suitable for a low carbon, green future. Instead, you present us with a development that looks backwards that is unlikely to deliver on your vision. The majority of the development should be car free with parking close to the station and at the extremities of the site. Movement around the site should be designed for pedestrians and cycles with exceptions only for loading/unloading and people with reduced mobility. To promote walking and cycling there should be no through routes for cars. Include an EV car sharing option for residents and plenty of high speed EV charging at car parks for residents and visitors.

In writing the plan, I wish it had been simpler to fully understand. I'm interested in how many comments and views you do get, and will this be printed and available to the local community? This is the group of people that it most affects. In my view you are destroying our area, not enhancing or improving it.

ONE public meeting for a project this big is laughable. Lots of empty shops. models, video tape shows etc available 24hours a day needed.

I think it would be an idea to actually consult local people about the future of THEIR town rather than just imposing. There are several reasons why many town centres are in decline but in the case of Stafford one contributory factor has to be the recent new shopping centre housing Marks and Spencer and other chain stores. This has been greatly detrimental to the town centre which I remember many local people warned would be the case when that was at the 'consultation' stage. We are lucky in Stafford in that most parts of the town have easy access to wildlife areas (despite the best efforts of developers to cover everything in concrete) This was especially appreciated during Lockdown. So many people felt the benefit of being out in nature. Please don't forget this.

Please keep Castlefields Green as this is what we fell in love with when we moved here 23 years ago! This is our home and sanctuary and want it to remain so!

It's unnecessary and won't work

It's incredibly dense allowing virtually no green open space. The proposed buildings are mostly unattractive. A vets surgery, a gym and other local businesses are being replaced by housing. Will there be a building for the gym and the vets? Also all the businesses based in the old show factory, where will they move to?

I am not against the whole general idea and some parts of the vision of the consultation document but the ideas and proposals are flawed and not sufficiently considered. To implement the draft plan as it currently stands would be squandering a unique opportunity for Stafford to redevelop the land sustainably around the railway and to the north. The vision and implementation should be to provide housing, employment, land and recreation space by keeping the current immense value that the land already has for biodiverse wildlife and potentially even more. The density of building development would have to be significantly reduced and the 'green and blue assets' would have to be extended and enhanced so that the whole site is genuinely inspiring and innovative.

Leave the greenery and wildlife alone. Go to the high street and buildings that need a new purpose. Don't kill wildlife when what will really help Stafford is fixing the high street giving it a new lease on life, give people a reason to go in to the high street support businesses. Stafford high street needs this as it's been dead for years

Sooner the better, maximising the opportunity and at the same time promoting more eco diversity in the area whilst addressing the existing challenges of congestion around the Newport road to town centre area.

Not enough amenities such as hospital care, doctors, schools in Stafford to support this plan. Wildlife and nature will be destroyed to pave way for even more houses in

the area that cannot be filled due to pricing. The high street has history yet has been left to become a ghost town - why not put money into building this back up to the town it used to be rather than destroying nature to build new.

Wildlife and biodiversity don't seem to be a focus here, we should be building nature in and setting an example. Retain and enhance existing habitats for the benefit of nature. In addition, will there be bird boxes, bat bricks in the buildings, and not just those for compensation or mitigation? green roofs? no mention of anything to do with how this supports Stafford wildlife and connects people to it. Will you be working with local groups such as the Staffordshire Wildlife trust?

I truly believe the residents of the area want to support a redevelopment but at the current moment the vision is from someone who has never been to Stafford and thinks everything should look and feel like the "cool" areas of big cities, while getting the support from a fame seeker.

no comments

I support it totally.

I have also written to my MP regarding this whole proposal.

More involvement from groups supporting the flora and fauna in the area rather than faceless council members who have no concern for the residents of Stafford that enjoy the area around the balance pool.

Please rethink this proposal in light of the climate emergency and the Government's 25 year environment plan with particular reference to improving waters to be close to their natural state, providing richer wildlife habitats, recovering nature and connecting people to the environment. This will not be achieved by building 1000 houses, a car park and office space in a currently thriving community which provides a mature nature corridor and wildlife rich area.

I've now had an opportunity to visit the open event at the Civic Offices and also look at the proposals online. In principle I'm not opposed to using the land around the Station to enhance the town and to encourage more economic activity in Stafford however I would make the following comments ;1) It has become common practice in development terms for the planning authority to seek wherever possible for new development to be located on brownfield land to help reduce the need to take up green field sites . It appears in Stafford's case that the authorities are looking at development on both brownfield and greenfield sites at the same time which seems odd . 2) The proposals appear to be very high density; some of the buildings seem to be in excess of 3 storeys . I think it is now commonly agreed that the pandemic has revealed the importance of both private and public open space and the use of a high density development would I feel be a detrimental step . The development should seek to include as much open space as possible in preparation for future Covid type events that require people to isolate . The development should be much more weighted to the provision and retention of open areas and enhancing the water features running through the site . It appears that the proposals are paying lip service to the existing pond on site rather than making it a major feature within a more

comprehensive plan around open space water and footpaths 3) I feel the access route on foot from the existing development in Castlefields along the extension of Castle Street to the town centre is a fabulous example of using existing wildlife habitats and features along walkways, footpaths and cycle routes . Its not clear in the proposals if the features and existing hedgerows along this route are going to be retained and enhanced or not . I would urge you in the proposals to keep this sanctuary. 4) The loss of the earth bund and associated trees and shrubs along Martin Drive is surprising and seems to be contrary to the stated aims in the supporting documents for taking advantage of the local areas existing amenities .To clear an area of land that acts as a natural barrier to new housing , reducing noise and enhancing the road in the this area is most definitely bad planning . 5) There has been much debate over the impact of climate change and the increase in temperatures , particularly in towns and cities .It has been acknowledged that an abundance of green areas and trees make a significant contribution to lowering temperatures and helping to alleviate the impact of climate change. It seems odd that the area subject of this proposal is currently helping significantly in this area but these proposals seem to undermine what nature is currently doing to help in this area . The development should be much more weighted to green spaces and water rather than dominated by development 6) I can see in the proposals that it is the intention to demolish the Hollies ( former SBC building ) . I suppose as it's not a listed building this is understandable but it is one of the only substantial buildings on the whole site that has some history and character and is a well recognised feature of the Newport road entrance into Stafford. If you approach the town on other main road routes there is now very little of character that could be seen as a welcoming entrance to the town . It would be a real shame if this building could not be incorporated into the development similar to Green Hall on the Lichfield Road . 7) I think the original proposals were talking about the main Station entrance being switched to the west side of the railway line ( access form this development ) . It's not too clear from the drawings if this is still the case or if the only adjustment is to provide an alternative entrance only . It would be nice if the scheme boundary could be extended to include the former tax offices ( Victoria House ) and some of the development funding could

Strange way of rejuvenating the town centre by creating a retail area outside the town centre.

Should not be connected to the station, theres a perfectly good road bridge both ends of the station to provide access

Generally, a very poor proposal aimed at maximum return for investors, with little thought for the environment.

To extend the town centre and make it into a vibrant place is very good, but in recent years the resale outlets have been contracting and apart from food outlets and hairdressers Stafford is in dire straits. Go and visit Shrewsbury - yes they have closed shops and redevelopment but there are still more shops than Stafford. Even Cannock area is better. Regarding walking, we walk into town several times a week. Have you looked at the state of the pavements around the town in general and

Market square lately. The councillors should be ashamed. I know the square is going to be redeveloped but it has taken long enough.

Reducing the allocated parking for each property doesn't work, it just clogs up the streets. I say this as a keen cyclist and walker.

Too big all in one place.

There is much talk of ""character"" in the documents but the main characterful feature is the existing lake which will become urbanised, hemmed in by unnecessary roads on two sides and 5-storey blocks on the third. It is sensible to plan to redevelop the brownfield sites in the area but there is space for a more imaginative treatment of the landscape that retains more of its rewilded character.

The park/ lakeside, suggest planting some species, like Sakura tree or Maple tree. It looks beautiful and attract people to work, live and visit here.

This consultation has not been advertised widely enough. Nobody I have spoken to since reading that this is the last consultation day knew anything about it. I only saw it online inadvertently reading BBC news.

Concerned that lots of businesses will be impacted by this development so would be good to understand where they will relocate to?

It will be a disaster for the residents, more building works and noisy dirty roads for the foreseeable future.

Poor, lacks imagination and is developer driven. Master plan should be geared towards what Stafford residents need rather than how much the developer can make. We don't need more of the same. We need the deficiencies within the borough met. It should be a source of embarrassment that a large number of sporting clubs can't play in the borough and you have done nothing about despite being told in 2003. 19 years of inaction is shambolic. Stafford bc has a poor history of delivering schemes that are supposed to be the benefit of the residents. I remember hearing / reading similar spiel when the riverside shopping centre was built and that has never been fully let.

Hs2 is not stopping in Stafford, I can't understand why you have mentioned it

It very much looks as though it is really is nothing more than a vanity project.

Some people seem to be opposed to change, but the truth is that the town needs investments, new businesses, highly skilled people who live and spend money in the town centre in order to sustain the existing businesses and attract new ones.

Some ideas are beneficial but extra development to cattlefields is not welcome.

Fundamentally the development has got good initial ideas, but serious consideration needs to be made for how we are marking the proposal against its aims

This is a great opportunity to create a development that is beautiful and that will enhance, for generations, the lives of people living and working there. The outline proposals as published will do the polar opposite.

Station Gateway: Boulevard a mixed use residential block with on street parking. With a dangerous crossroads and Multiple T junctions. Not a great mix. Boulevard - one end mid kingsway. Other end Royal Mail or bowling green. What is the point in this layout? Neither end desirable locations to end up. Newport Road access across Boulevard - this is crazy poor lazy planning by Hawkins Brown. Cycle routes out on to a non cycle Newport road. Please consider outside the red lines with your connections. This area of Newport Road is not suitable for this access. Hollies: 29 houses plus a whole residential block within a similar space as 11 existing cottages next door. P72. Not certain this is quality. Lakeside: T junctions onto Boulevard! 11 desirable South facing plots of 145. Best aspect is the lake - and then put the only wide main road along it. Not great. Marling Terrace: Southwest plots all in shade due to raised tree bank. All other plots face north. Mosquito pit front garden (no larvae eating fish in small brook). Nice. Check your scaling. Wicket Gate: More brook nonsense resulting in twice as much road. Creates a nice space - unfortunately right near Castle View Park and so a little poorly located.

Please can I reiterate my request for information on the complete stafford transformation plans, particularly an up-date on the Eastgate Street proposals and the main street.

No

I hope you reconsider the density of the housing and commercial buildings within this proposal and that it is significantly reduced.

Adding an extra retail focal point to Stafford is wrong. It dilutes the activity/footfall in the town center further accelerating its decline.

This is a transformational scheme but yet it has a massive multi-storey included in it, and no inclusion of bus infrastructure in the drawings or information. Are we all still to drive to the station? Is that what you want to encourage? Until you provide a seamless system people will continue to drive to the station because using the bus includes walking from the town bus stops to the station and often results in not being able to catch desired train and having to wait for the next one. This adds additional time making bus/train travel unattractive. I sincerely hope that you take on board these comments and I see recognition of that in forthcoming revised documents, otherwise you will be missing a huge opportunity and will end up trying to squeeze in a solution when it is too late.

I have yet to be convinced that we need a new hotel on this site as there are disused buildings close to the station which could either be repurposed or else demolished and a new hotel built. I refer here to the site of the original Station Hotel opposite the Victoria Park, now an unsightly empty (for circa 30 years!) office block called Victoria Park House. Equally given the plethora of empty retail outlets in the centre of Stafford, I can see no logical reason to build more retail units so close to these empty and sad looking places. This exodus was exacerbated by the last retail development where M&S et al relocated. Your current plans if enacted would destroy an existing thriving community of caring, environmentally proactive people of all ages and backgrounds. The people who run these enterprises have been

awarded environmental awards and recognised by the local authorities. How ironic it would be if they were forced to close as a direct result of your proposals!

Most of it is a meaningless set of politically correct buzzwords. The whole project relies on a big if. IF the HS2 branch is ever comes into Stafford because, with the current political and financial uncertainties, that is by no means certain, Therefore the council should postpone the whole project for some time.

It appears that very few people in the Stafford area are aware of these proposals. If they are not informed, they cannot express their views, and this is unfair as it will have a huge impact on the lives of many residents. The planning document is extremely verbose, full of jargon and sentences that do not make sense. This makes it difficult to understand. Finally, this form seems to have been constructed in order to achieve the answers that the council desires.

I believe that a better location for the proposed hotel would be the location currently occupied by the 60's style 5 storey office block aka "Victoria Park House" which has been either underused or empty for many years. One of life's many ironies is that it replaced a Victorian Hotel from the early railway era.... It is so close to the current station and if it was built with latest current enlightened thinking about what constitutes a "green" building; could be a statement of intent by the local council. I also believe that priority should be given to current retailers in the catchment area (eg Roots Larder, Aroma Tranquility) when it comes to occupying the created areas for retail and that the Council should offer such opportunities to them first, at heavily discounted terms..... There is no underlying reason why these retail buildings should be offered to chain store retail outlets; the same ones in other words who have deserted Stafford High St, leaving it the wasteland it currently is- I don't want to see some of the few remaining retail outlets move to the catchment area and further leave Stafford Town Centre any more a ghost town than it currently is ! It makes sense to me that there should be small sustainable retail areas for small local business..... Simple.

I hope the new multi-storey car park will be affordable, unlike the current provision, which actively encourages rail users to park on nearby roads. I welcome the proposals to provide retail that complements the town centre, but think it is important that it does not compete with it, on account of the high proportion of empty retail properties in Stafford centre. I am also concerned that there will be insufficient demand for the office/workspace being proposed. Has any formal assessment been undertaken to try to assess whether there is actually any demand for this before green space is destroyed? It will be good to see development at Wicketgate, but again, I am concerned about the number of houses being proposed and the impact on the Western Bypass.

I feel some of the assumptions and proposals are over -optimistic. Stafford like many towns has been in decline for many years and it is difficult to reconcile any reference to Stafford as a key Regional town , with a High street that has a high number of empty properties , has lost a University campus site , had it's Hospital downgraded etc . I am interested to know how much affordable housing is proposed Is it realistic that Stafford will move to a digital high value economy - whatever that

means. Many colleagues perceive that Stafford has become a commuter town and indeed that appears to have been the policy of those in power at the Borough Council for a number of years. I do not think that these proposals will shift the focus from a commuter town unless more jobs are created locally. Is it viable to include a hotel in the proposals, and what is a 80 key hotel? Development Principle 2 a Connected Stafford needs to be more realistic. Local Bus services are being reduced or cancelled not enhanced.

Disappointing that only 2 printed copies of the full version of the document were available at the Civic Centre by appointment. All previous plans of this type, certainly back to the Structure Plan of the early 1970s, have been available in libraries for the public to see. Putting it online is not a substitute for printed documents. Population predictions and alleged housing needs should be treated with great scepticism. In the 1973 Structure Plan, the old Stafford MB town area was predicted to have 96,000 people... by 1991! It was actually about 60,000. The 3 blocks of flats built in the town 1966-67 were to cope with the huge population increase. The two blocks at Highfields were always difficult to let; one has now been demolished, and one sold off. The survey was flawed in that it insisted on answers to every question.

Another addition to the town centre is not needed. The main shopping centre needs to be revitalised first before further additions are undertaken. The town is spread too thinly around the area already. The welfare of the town and its residents has not been taken into consideration.

The lack of cumulative assessment means that the impact on amenity is not understood in enough detail to settle on the plan in its current form. This in my experience suggests that the adoption of the vision in its current state would expose the SRF to judicial challenge. The consultation is inadequate, the vision document details the walking times and distances of the immediate residents and yet none of these residents has been contacted directly to discuss amenity advantages and disadvantages. This is especially disappointing given this is a significant change to an already adopted local plan and therefore disproportionate.

Scrap it.

There are already small businesses to the north of the Bowling Club which are serving the community in many valuable ways. They should be prioritised from the start. I hear people talking about how they will be destroyed, so they might as well stop using them now, which must be a worry for their owners. Some statement needs to be made public to show Roots, the Recycling hub, the Nursery, the carwash will still be there, to help public confidence and as a basis for the ethos for the all of the Gateway retail business planning. I am a customer but in no way involved in any of these businesses. Similarly to the already existing green assets of these areas, these small commercial activities should be supported. I would say it is essential for us to have continuing information on how the consultation is proceeding.



It's a good idea over all so please don't just make it a cash grab selling as many houses as possible. Out thought into how best to make It a community space which attracts people. Not just another estate.

See above

I think this type of development could be great if sustainability is at the core of the building, appropriate community and commercial spaces and infrastructure are included (see older developments such as Parkside, Weeping Cross and Wildwood where schools, shops, libraries, places of worship and surgeries/pharmacies are at the heart of the community, or Meadowcroft Park which is built around green spaces and play parks), and housing is actually affordable for most residents. But the current place is not the right place to do this because of the impact on current businesses and wildlife.

Community focus businesses have developed well in the area and need to be maintained. Any high-rise building would be totally out of keeping with the area's domestic architecture, as well as exposing private gardens to scrutiny from above!

Please do not dress up any agreement with the principles of the scheme as showing support for the concept plans, which I think are flawed, and in their present form, will not fulfil the strategic policy's objectives.

As above

An appallingly bad idea, throw it out!!!!

yes I would like the opportunity to purchase a shop to complement our business