

THISTLEBERRY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Response to Inspector's Questions Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan

MATTER TWO – VISION AND OBJECTIVES

Issue 2

2.1.a If anything it reflects the vision and objectives of national government and there seems to be no alternative to that given the revised NPPF rules to comply or the plan will be rejected. The estimates of need and supply have been handed down from national government.

2.1.b Don't know. This is for the Inspector to decide.

2.1.c Don't know. The emphasis seems to be on Newcastle expanding into the country side and green belt in order to extend its jurisdiction and to join up villages with the borough. This has been a 'desire' since the 1930s to link Newcastle with Keele, especially. It will also be joined to Silverdale if the Golf Course development plan goes ahead.

2.1.d Don't know, and this would not be known until implementation takes place.

2.1.e Don't know. Villages such as Betley appear to have escaped any development.

2.1.f The land on Keele campus has been prepared for development for many years, its infrastructure installed but development has been slow. Some of the development is not necessarily university related. Much will depend on which development plans come forward and how and when these are implemented. It is only recently that the borough council and the university have joined forces although the university has been present since 1949.

2.2 The Lepus Report states that the borough is largely rural thus brown field sites might be in short supply this means that in order to comply with a regular 5 year land supply for housing and employment the countryside and green belt will have to be utilised - thus limiting its rurality. Certain employment development sites - eg landfill are not necessarily compatible with rural or urban landscape uses as Newcastle borough council has discovered to its cost and will remain so until 2046 - and yet resolution is

not mentioned in this Local Plan - perhaps because the damage has been done and might be irreparable.

2.3 Unclear. As mentioned above some of the Key Issues identified by the Sustainability Assessment Report are not addressed in a clear way by the policies suggested in the Draft Local Plan.

2.4 Don't know - although perhaps we should. The sites that the borough council wanted to be developed have been chosen, and despite considerable public opposition. The site the TRA identified as suitable for the Gypsy/Traveller site (the 9 hole section of the golf course has not even been mentioned/considered). Just ignored.

Re flood risk houses are currently being built on flood plains and former mining areas and despite the findings of the Lepus Sustainability Assessment Report re flood risk in the borough.

2.5 Surely this is for the Inspector to decide - and the Boundary Commission to consult residents?

2.6 Don't know. Time limits seem vague even absent? The start time for the new Gypsy/Traveller site was 2027. However given the current site proximity to the now closed landfill site (49 m) and what that implies and given the landfill's long restoration period (to 2046) a new site seems long overdue. Evacuation from the present site, given the findings of the Lepus Report, and the issue of the dangers of particulates to human health appears not to have been contemplated. The Caravan Site has been in existence since 1994 when the quarry was already active and clay was being excavated. In 1998 the SCC changed the permit for landfilling of the quarry from inert waste to putrescent waste. The NBC and Planning Inspectors have subsequently permitted the development of housing around the site. Currently the EA are importing large amounts of earth to the landfill site in preparation for final capping. The whole scenario This might have serious implications for equality issues and the pronouncements made in this Draft Plan (also for settled households living in close proximity - some in recently built houses (100-89 m). Nowhere in this draft Plan has this site been mentioned.

2.7 See responses to above some of the above questions and surely this is for the Inspector to decide?

Dr A Drakakis-Smith

Chair

TRA

29 April 2025