

**EXAMINATION OF THE NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME AND STOKE-ON-TRENT  
CORE SPATIAL STRATEGY**

**FURTHER WRITTEN SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF  
MORSTON ASSETS LIMITED**

**CHD9 Schedule of Changes Version 2**

**1. Introduction**

1.1 An objection was made on behalf of our Clients, Morston Assets Limited to the Core Spatial Strategy on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2008, in written submissions made to the Examination on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2009 and in a further written submission to the initial Schedule of Changes. With regard to the Area Spatial Strategy the representations were in respect of the failure to deliver specific policies, such as a core policy to provide a strategic access link to Etruria Valley from the A500 road to support the aims set out in Spatial Principle SP3, and a core policy to set out the Councils' aspirations for Newcastle-under-Lyme Town Centre.

1.2 Morston Assets would now wish to respond to the invitation from the Inspector to make further representations on the Council's Schedule of Changes (Version 2) published on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009. These are set out below.

**2. Further Representations.**

**(a) Core Policies.**

- 2.1 Our Clients welcome the acceptance by the Council – albeit belatedly – that the Area Spatial Strategy should contain policies. However, they would argue that simply transferring some paragraphs from what might be regarded as supporting evidence in the Submission and converting them into “policies” undermines the validity of those policies and serves to ensure that they will remain ineffective as a catalyst for change or as a development control tool. As they now stand, we would contend that many of the proposed policies are merely observational, descriptive or statements as well as being excessively lengthy and confusing. We strongly believe that the opportunity for the Core Spatial Strategy to contain succinct, clear and accessible policies should be grasped now rather than their lack of clarity becoming a hindrance to delivery and implementation, leading to pressure for their early review.
- 2.2 Proposed Policies ASP1 and ASP2, by way of example, possess no introductory paragraphs or statements of intent to provide a context for the schedule of items that comprise the policies. As a consequence, the policies are wholly inadequate in that they do not spell out the intent of the local planning authorities.

**(b) Etruria Valley.**

- 2.3 Our Clients welcome the recognition in proposed Policy ASP2 of the need for a new link road from the A500 to the city centre and Burslem and the provision of park and ride facilities. However, we would argue that the confusing wording of the policy, including the lack of an introductory statement and intent (as referred to above) could jeopardise its effectiveness. We would recommend, therefore, that an introductory statement is added to Policy ASP2 and that Item 13 should be amended to read:

**‘13 Etruria Valley:**

**(a) The Valley is designated as a strategic opportunity for mixed use development with an emphasis on employment in the south and housing in the north; and**

**(b) A new direct access from the A500 will be provided as part of a comprehensive plan to unlock the development potential of the Valley. In view of the strategic importance of this link, the Council will investigate ways in which the provision of this road can be brought forward in the early stages of development, and publicly funded. Any developer contributions sought will be dependent on viability as and when developments come forward.'**

### **Recommendation**

3.1 In the light of the above, Morston Assets Limited would urge the Inspector to recommend:

(a) That the core policies be amended on the lines suggested above; and that

(b) Item 13 (Etruria Valley) is amended as proposed above.

**Tyler-Parkes Partnership**

**30<sup>th</sup> April 2009**