



**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME AND STOKE-ON-TRENT**  
**CORE STRATEGY**

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION STATEMENT**



## **Contents**

### **Section**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Early Consultation**
- 3. Pre-Submission Consultation**

## **Section 1 Introduction**

- 1.1 This statement sets out details of all of the participation exercises undertaken for the preparation of the Submission Draft Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy.

## **Section 2 Early Consultation (Regulation 25)**

### **Commencement**

- 2.1 Preparation of the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy formally commenced in November 2004. A commencement leaflet was published to inform of the preparation of the document and to ask interested parties if they wished to become involved in the process. The leaflet included an invitation to comment on key issues that would need to be addressed by the Core Spatial Strategy or key opportunities that should be taken into account.
- 2.2 The commencement leaflet (copy of leaflet at Appendix A) was publicised on Stoke-on-Trent City Council's dedicated website at [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf) and made available at the City Council offices at the Civic Centre. Copies were available at all City Council libraries and area offices. Copies were sent to all Stoke-on-Trent City Council Members (copy of letter at Appendix B) and approximately 880 leaflets were distributed to local residents and interest groups via the Community Facilitation Service that was in operation by Stoke-on-Trent City Council at the time.

### **Issues and Options**

- 2.3 An Issues Paper was subsequently produced in March 2005 (copy shown at Appendix C).
- 2.4 The Issues Paper set out the Issues and Options for a number of strategic themes: including regeneration, sustainable communities and housing market renewal, our natural and built environment, future economic prosperity, high quality design and changing the way we travel.
- 2.5 Some of the issues set out for people to consider included:
  - How do we make North Staffordshire a more exciting and attractive place to live and work?
  - How do we ensure our centres remain lively and attractive enough in the future to support shops, leisure, office, community facilities as well as supporting a quality urban living experience?;
  - How and where should we provide attractive locations for jobs and new businesses?
  - How do we make sure accessibility to and between all our main centres is improved in the future?
  - What needs to be done to ensure we are not too dependant on the car and have a good quality public transport system?, and
  - How can we improve the overall image of North Staffordshire environment to encourage future investment and to reduce outward migration from the area?

- 2.6 In accordance with Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 copies of the Issues Paper were sent to each statutory and general consultation body identified on the Local Development Framework database. The list of consultees included specific and general consultation bodies as well as individuals and interest groups identified from previous consultation exercises. Over 800 letters and leaflets were initially sent to groups and individuals (list of bodies included at appendix D). A copy of the letter that was sent with the leaflets is attached at Appendix E.
- 2.7 The Issues Paper was also publicised on the City and Borough Councils dedicated LDF websites – [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf) and [www.newcastle-staffs.go.uk/ldf.asp](http://www.newcastle-staffs.go.uk/ldf.asp) It was made available at the Council offices and copies were available at all libraries and local centres. In addition copies of the leaflet were made available in GP surgeries in Newcastle-under-Lyme.
- 2.8 A Comments Form was provided for making representations on the Issues Paper (copy attached as Appendix F). A deadline of 13 May 2005 was set for the return of these.
- 2.9 Between the 5 and 8 April 2005 three workshop events were held in Stoke-on-Trent to discuss a number of emerging Local Development Framework documents including the Core Spatial Strategy. The three events were aimed at developers (66 invited to attend), community and local interest groups (62 invited) and Stoke-on-Trent City Council Members (60 invited).

<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Approx. Nos.</b>
5 April 2005	Hothouse 2, Longton, Stoke-on-Trent	Developers Workshop	Developers, landowners and housebuilders	24
6 April 2005	Hothouse 2, Longton, Stoke-on-Trent	Community Workshop	Residents associations, interest groups, neighbourhood groups	5
8 April 2005	Civic Centre, Stoke-on-Trent City Council	Members Workshop	Stoke-on-Trent City Council Members	6

- 2.10 A joint Member's Workshop involving Members from both Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council was subsequently held on 10 May 2005. The purpose of the workshop was to provide members with a better understanding of the new planning framework and to begin to explore the various issues and options to be taken into consideration in preparation of the Core Strategy.

- 2.11 During April 2005 members of the Planning Policy Team of Stoke-on-Trent City Council participated in a series of Local Strategic Partnership events across the City (list of venues and dates attached as Appendix G).
- 2.12 The consultation exercise at the Issues and Options stage generated a wealth of information which helped to shape the initial development of the spatial vision, objectives and policies of the Preferred Options Report.

## **Section 3 Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulations 26/27)**

### **Preferred Options**

- 3.1 The City and Borough Councils published a 1<sup>st</sup> Draft Preferred Options report for a six week period of public consultation from 26 June to 7 August 2006 with details outlined in Appendix H.
- 3.2 Over 925 representations were received. These were taken into account in preparation of the Revised Preferred Options.

### **Revised Preferred Options**

- 3.3 During 2006 Government's detailed expectations of the requirements of Local Development Framework documents became clearer both locally and nationally. This suggested the need for change in the style, form and content of the Core Spatial Strategy. To press on regardless would have been to risk that this important planning document was found to be 'unsound' at public examination.
- 3.4 Consequently the document was comprehensively rewritten and the Preferred Option stage was repeated drawing, where appropriate, on the issues and comments made in respect of the 1<sup>st</sup> Draft. In addition the plan making horizon was rolled forward to 2026 to mirror that of the revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy.
- 3.5 The Revised Preferred Options were published between 18<sup>th</sup> June and 30<sup>th</sup> July 2007 as detailed in Appendix I.
- 3.6 Appendix J shows the matrix of how representations were taken into account in taking the document forward to this stage.



# Appendix A - Commencement leaflet

For further information please contact:

Development and Transport Plans Team,  
 Directorate of Regeneration and Community,  
 PO Box 2461,  
 Civic Centre,  
 Glebe Street,  
 Stoke on Trent  
 ST4 1WR

or by email:  
[stoke.ldr@stoke.gov.uk](mailto:stoke.ldr@stoke.gov.uk)

or by telephone on:  
 01782 232302

or in person to:  
 Directorate of Regeneration and Community ,  
 c/o Reception Desk,  
 Floor 1,  
 Stoke on Trent City Council,  
 Civic Centre,  
 Glebe Street,  
 Stoke on Trent

Or

Regeneration and Planning Service  
 Civic Offices  
 Merial Street  
 Newcastle-under-Lyme  
 ST5 2AG


or by e-mail  
[Planningpolicy@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](mailto:Planningpolicy@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk)






or by telephone  
 01782 742452 or 01782 742467

or in person to  
 Regeneration and Planning Service  
 Civic Offices  
 Merial Street  
 Newcastle-under-Lyme

**CITY OF STOKE ON TRENT  
 AND  
 BOROUGH OF NEWCASTLE-U-LYME**

**North Staffordshire  
 Core Spatial Strategy  
 Commencement (November 2004)  
 Ref: SOT/NUL/LDD1**



**Vision for the future?**

North Staffordshire is a diverse sub-region with many towns and one distinctive City Centre set within an attractive rural area. We have great assets in talented and hard working people, a rich and diverse culture, many world-class businesses, attractive countryside and diverse wildlife.

But in order to compete as a place in which more people will choose to live, work and invest in the future we need to alter the face of North Staffordshire. This is likely to involve considerable change in where and how we live and work, including our means of travelling around.

At the heart of North Staffordshire, we have a City Centre with massive potential surrounded by attractive historic towns including Newcastle under Lyme. We have two universities including a medical school. Our parks and open spaces make us one of the greenest urban areas in the UK. We have three magnificent canals, the Trent & Mersey, the Shropshire Union and the Caldon. Alton Towers and the Peak District, both of national importance, are in close proximity and enhance the attractiveness of North Staffordshire.

North Staffordshire is ideally situated, in terms of its accessibility to a significant proportion of the UK population. Thanks to the M6, A500, A50 and the West Coast main line, almost ten million people can reach the area within an hour.

In short, the Core Strategy aims to make North Staffordshire a better place to live, work and visit. We need to have a strong vision of how we all want the conurbation and its rural hinterland to develop in the future. This issues paper brings together some key ideas and lays out ideas of how it could be done. What do you think?



**What's important?**

**Regeneration**  
 The major urban areas of Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent offer the greatest potential for sustainable growth and investment. We need to consider regeneration in the broadest sense including both urban and rural areas and by improving health and education services, focusing on people's lives and communities.

**Housing Market Renewal**  
 We need to reverse the tide of people leaving the urban area. Encouraging people to choose an urban lifestyle means providing more high quality homes and co-ordinating better education, policing, health and other community services. We need to carefully set out the amount and timing of new homes to be built, ensure we build on previously developed land first, recognise the need to provide affordable homes and provide more choice to achieve social and community well being.

**Our natural and built environment**  
 We have a responsibility to look after the environment for future generations. The environment plays a big part in social and economic regeneration. It also provides physical links between places, such as along our canals and rivers and between town and country.

**Future economic prosperity**  
 The most affluent and skilled households are leaving North Staffordshire. We need to retain our young qualified people, and ensure we encourage diverse communities with higher incomes by ensuring there are sufficient jobs for the future i.e. greater emphasis on professional and managerial services alongside the traditional manufacturing and logistics firms. Ensuring better skills and types of jobs will also help local people to increase their earnings.

**Good design and a sense of place**  
 New development needs to be well designed and well integrated in line with the Government's Urban Renaissance agenda. If we are to make North Staffordshire feel and look good then we need to provide much better central shopping and leisure facilities and exploit the potential for appropriate canal-side and city and town centre development that blends in well within existing communities.

**Changing the way we travel**  
 There is major congestion in and around Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle, which will have an adverse effect on our economy. There needs to be a shift to more sustainable forms of transport, to public transport and to a culture change that encourages more walking and cycling. In terms of locating new development we should plan to reduce the need for long journeys and concentrate growth in locations accessible by public transport.

**Other Key Plans**

The Core Strategy will lead to the further refinement of the **West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy** approved by the Government in 2004.

In addition the Core Strategy should have regard to other local and regional policies and strategies particularly community strategies and economic development, regeneration, education, health, crime prevention, waste and recycling, environmental protection and local transport plans.



**Appendix B - Copy of Letter Sent to Stoke-on-Trent City Council Members  
February 2005 re: Commencement Leaflets**

Your Ref:  
My Ref: RS/CMI/34/13  
Date: 7 February 2005  
Direct Dial: (01782) 232302  
e-mail: stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk

Cllr

PO Box 2461  
Civic Centre, Glebe Street  
Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 1WR  
Telephone: 01782 234567  
Fax: 01782 232235  
Email: regeneration@stoke.gov.uk  
Text Messaging: 07786 200700  
www.stoke.gov.uk  
DX21058 Stoke-on-Trent  
Minicom 01782 232331

**Director:**  
Bob Collins

Dear Cllr

**PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004  
CITY OF STOKE-ON-TRENT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
COMMENCEMENT LEAFLETS**

Further to my letter dated 22 December 2004 informing you of the preparation of the new style Local Development Framework (LDF) which will replace the adopted City Plan 2001 and Structure Plan 1996-2011 in due course - I enclose for your information a copy of the leaflets which have been produced to publicise the commencement of the LDF process.

'Local Development Framework' is the collective term for the folder of different documents that make up the development plan at the local level. It is anticipated that the first round of documents to be produced as part of the LDF will consist of the following:

- A Statement of Community Involvement setting out how communities and stakeholders can contribute to the preparation of Local Development Documents;
- A Core Spatial Strategy setting out the broad vision, strategic objectives, core policies and spatial strategy to secure regeneration produced jointly with Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council;
- A Development Portfolio setting out the approach to delivery of strategic housing and employment land;
- Area Action Plans to target development in a number of specific areas of the City;
  - Hanley South and the University Quarter;
  - Burslem, Middleport and the Etruria Valley;
  - Meir;
  - The City Centre and Etruria Road Corridor;
  - Waste and Minerals Development Plan Documents;

- A suite of Development Control Policies; and
- A Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Document.

I also enclose a copy of the report which was considered at the Directorate of Regeneration and Community's Chief Officer Meeting on 6 December 2004 which sets out the approved measures that are being put in place to notify interested individuals and organisations that statutory plan preparations have commenced.

We wish to engage you in the next stage of plan making 'Issues and Options' and will be writing to you shortly to suggest ways in which you may become involved.

Further information and regular updates on LDF progress can be obtained via the City Council's website at [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf)

If you should have any queries please do not hesitate to contact a member of the Development and Transport Plans Team on (01782) 232302, 235706, or 232139 or via the above e-mail address.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "B. J. Davies". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke at the end of the name.

Development and Transport Plans Manager

# Appendix C – Issues Paper

### Key Issues

Key questions for the Core Spatial Strategy for North Staffordshire

**CS1. How do we make North Staffordshire a more exciting and attractive place to live and work?**

**CS2. How should we improve the quality of the environment of North Staffordshire so that people wish to invest and don't want to leave?**

**CS3. How do we ensure our centres remain lively and attractive enough in the future to support shops, leisure, office, community facilities as well as urban living?**

**CS4. How and where should we provide attractive locations for jobs and new businesses?**

**CS5. How do we make sure accessibility to and between all our major centres is improved in the future?**

**CS6. What needs to be done to ensure that we are not dependent on the car and have a good public transport system?**

**CS7. How can we improve the image of North Staffordshire by greening the main transport corridors and improving quality of design?**

Do you think that there are other issues that we need to look at or opportunities we should consider?



### Public consultation

We will be holding a series of focus group meetings for local councillors, community groups and developers to explore these issues in more detail. If you wish to talk to someone about this or any other Local Development Framework issue you can telephone us on 01782 232302 (Stoke) or 01782 742452 (Newcastle), view the documents in the Civic Centres or local libraries or read our dedicated web pages on [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf) and [www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](http://www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk)

### Comments and contacts

All comments should be sent to:

**Development & Transport Plans, Stoke-on-Trent City Council, PO Box 2461, Civic Centre, Ghebe Street, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 1WR or Regeneration and Planning Services, Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council, Civic Offices, Merrial Street, Newcastle, Staffs ST15 2AG**

You can use one of the comment forms provided or write to us quoting ref: **SOT/LDD1** You can also email us if you wish on [stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk](mailto:stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk) or [planningpolicy@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk)

### What happens next?

We intend to summarise all the comments received and make them available for inspection. This will help us to identify options. The options will be examined and together with other things that matter will help us to produce a draft Core Spatial Strategy in Summer 2005 and this will be the next formal opportunity for you to make representations.

If you have difficulty reading this leaflet or require further information, please call 01782 232302

ਜੇ ਕਰ ਚੁੱਕੀ ਇਹ ਕਿਤਾਬਚਾ ਨਹੀਂ ਪੜ੍ਹ ਸਕਦੇ ਤਾਂ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਢੰਗੀ ਢੰਗੀ ਡੁਹਾਓ ਸੰਦਰਭ ਕਰਵਾਓ। 01782 232302

यदि आप यह पुस्तिका नहीं पढ़ सकते तो हमें बताएं हम आपकी सहायता करेंगे। 01782 232302

اگر آپ کو اس کتابچے (کیب) کو پڑھنے میں مشکل پیش آئے تو ہم سے رابطہ قائم کریں۔ ہمیں کیلئے آگاہی مدد کر سکتے ہیں۔ فون نمبر 01782 232302

## CITY OF STOKE-ON-TRENT & NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

### North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy

#### Issues Paper April 2005



### What's it all about?

Government has introduced a new planning system that enables us to plan creatively for the future of North Staffordshire.

The Local Development Framework will explain how we intend to go about the spatial planning for North Staffordshire and how other strategies such as Economic and Transport strategies will impact on and be impacted by this. For example it will indicate the areas where we wish to concentrate development that we think is right for North Staffordshire, and will also indicate those areas we wish to protect or enhance because of their significance to communities or their value as open space.

The starting point is to set out the key issues that we need to look at and to give you the opportunity to tell us what realistic choices you believe we should consider. We set out our key choices in the Core Spatial Strategy. This strategy is to be prepared jointly by Stoke on Trent City Council and Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council because this way it can cover the whole of the major built up area of North Staffordshire as well as the villages and countryside of the Borough.



### Vision for the future?

North Staffordshire is a diverse sub-region with many towns and one distinctive City Centre set within an attractive rural area. We have great assets in talented and hard working people, a rich and diverse culture, many world-class businesses, attractive countryside and diverse wildlife.

But in order to compete as a place in which more people will choose to live, work and invest in the future we need to alter the face of North Staffordshire. This is likely to involve considerable change in where and how we live and work, including our means of travelling around.

At the heart of North Staffordshire, we have a City Centre with massive potential surrounded by attractive historic towns including Newcastle under Lyme. We have two universities including a medical school. Our parks and open spaces make us one of the greenest urban areas in the UK. We have three magnificent canals, the Trent & Mersey, the Shropshire Union and the Caldon. Alton Towers and the Peak District, both of national importance, are in close proximity and enhance the attractiveness of North Staffordshire.

North Staffordshire is ideally situated, in terms of its accessibility to a significant proportion of the UK population. Thanks to the M6, A500, A50 and the West Coast main line, almost ten million people can reach the area within an hour.

In short, the Core Strategy aims to make North Staffordshire a better place to live, work and visit. We need to have a strong vision of how we all want the contribution and its rural hinterland to develop in the future. This issues paper brings together some key ideas and lays out ideas of how it could be done. What do you think?

### Other Key Plans

The Core Strategy will lead to the further refinement of the **West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy** approved by the Government in 2004.

In addition the Core Strategy should have regard to other local and regional policies and strategies particularly community strategies and economic development, regeneration, education, health, crime prevention, waste and recycling, environmental protection and local transport plans.







### What's important?

#### Regeneration

The major urban areas of Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent offer the greatest potential for sustainable growth and investment. We need to consider regeneration in the broadest sense including both urban and rural areas and by improving health and education services, focusing on people's lives and communities.

#### Housing Market Renewal

We need to reverse the tide of people leaving the urban area. Encouraging people to choose an urban lifestyle means providing more high quality homes and co-ordinating better education, policing, health and other community services. We need to carefully set out the amount and timing of new homes to be built, ensure we build on previously developed land first, recognise the need to provide affordable homes and provide more choice to achieve social and community well being.

#### Our natural and built environment

We have a responsibility to look after the environment for future generations. The environment plays a big part in social and economic regeneration. It also provides physical links between places, such as along our canals and rivers and between town and country.

#### Future economic prosperity

The most affluent and skilled households are leaving North Staffordshire. We need to retain our young qualified people, and ensure we encourage diverse communities with higher incomes by ensuring there are sufficient jobs for the future i.e. greater emphasis on professional and managerial services alongside the traditional manufacturing and logistics firms. Ensuring better skills and types of jobs will also help local people to increase their earnings.

#### Good design and a sense of place

New development needs to be well designed and well integrated in line with the Government's Urban Renaissance agenda. If we are to make North Staffordshire feel and look good then we need to provide much better central shopping and leisure facilities and exploit the potential for appropriate canal-side and city and town centre development that blends in well within existing communities.

#### Changing the way we travel

There is major congestion in and around Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle, which will have an adverse effect on our economy. There needs to be a shift to more sustainable forms of transport, to public transport and to a culture change that encourages more walking and cycling. In terms of locating new development we should plan to reduce the need for long journeys and concentrate growth in locations accessible by public transport.

## Appendix D – List of Consultees for Issues Paper

802 individual residents

Councillors, MPs, MEPs

English Nature

Countryside Agency

British Gas (West Midlands)

Stoke Sea Scouts

ADAS

Adderley Green and District Residents Association

Advantage West Midlands

Age Concern North Staffordshire

Airport Operators Association

Allan Moss Associates Ltd

Allied Insulators Ltd.

Alternative Technology Co-op.

Ancient Monuments Society

ARCH North Staffs

Arthur Wood and Son (Longport) PLC

Association for Industrial Archaeology

Association of British Drivers

ATIS REAL Weatheralls

AWA Ltd

AWM

Ball Green Residents Association

Barclays Bank Plc

Barratt Chester Ltd. (Ellesmere Port)

Barry D Trentham (Midlands) Ltd.

Beat the Cold

Bentilee Community Housing Ltd.

Bentilee Neighbourhood Project

Bereavement Care

Beresford Transport Ltd.

Biffa Waste Services Ltd

Blatchford and Friends Residents Association

Blurton Farm Residents Association

Bolton Emery Partnership

Bovis Homes Ltd.

Boys Brigade

British Astronomical Association

British Ceramic Confederation

British Ceramic Research Ltd.

British Gliding Association Ltd.

British Holiday & Home Parks Association

British Horse Society

British Institute for Geological Conservation Ltd., University of Bristol

British Motorcycle Federation (Staffordshire Representative)

British Pipeline Agency Ltd.

British Red Cross

British Trust for Conservation Volunteers

British Trust for Ornithology

British Waterways (North West Region)

British Wind Energy Association

Broad Street Properties Limited

Brown Edge Action Group

Burslem Chamber of Trade

Burslem Community Development Trust

Burslem Methodist Church

Burslem Port Project  
Business in the Environment  
Butters john bee  
Caldon Canal Society  
Canals Regeneration Group  
Carpenter Planning Consultants (Manchester Office)  
CB Hillier Parker  
CDS Development Services Ltd  
Central Electricity Generating Board  
Central Trains Ltd.  
CENTRO  
Ceramic and Allied Trades Union  
CH Design Europe Ltd  
Chell Heath Estate Management Board  
Chessington Crescent & Meadow Lane Action Group  
Chesterton (Planning and Economics)  
Church Commissioners  
Citizens' Advice Bureau  
City Centre Management  
Civic Trust  
Civil Aviation Authority  
Cliff Walsingham and Co.  
Cliffe Vale Residents Association  
Coalville Residents Association  
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)  
Commission for New Towns  
Commission for Racial Equality  
Community Council of Staffordshire  
Community Partnership  
Confederation of British Industry  
Consignia (Legal Services)  
Copeland Tours Ltd.  
Council for British Archaeology (West Midlands)  
Council for the Protection of Rural England (Staffordshire Branch)  
Country Land & Business Association (Staffordshire Branch)  
Countryside Agency  
Cross Country Trains Ltd.  
Crown Estate Commissioners  
CSJ  
CT Planning  
Cycling 2000  
Cyclists Touring Club (National Office)  
Cyclists Touring Club (North Staffordshire)  
Daniel and Hulme  
David L Walker Chartered Surveyors  
David Wilson Homes (North West)  
DE Central (Shrewsbury)  
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions  
Development Planning and Design Services  
Disability Rights Commission  
Disability Solutions  
Disabled Persons, Transport Advisory Committee (DPTAC)  
District Valuer  
Don Bur (Bodies and Trailers) Ltd.  
DPP  
Dresden Residents Association  
Drivers Jonas (Manchester Office)  
DTZ Piedad Consulting  
Dudson Ltd.  
East Vale Residents Association

Employment Service  
English Golf Union  
English Tourism Council  
English, Welsh and Scottish Railway Ltd.  
Entec UK Ltd  
Environmental Services Association  
Equal Opportunities Commission  
Fegg Hayes Residents Association  
Fenton Residents Association  
First City Limited  
Focus  
Forestry Commission (Midlands Conservancy)  
Forestry Enterprise (Regional Office)  
Frayling Furniture Ltd.  
Freight Transport Association (Midlands Region)  
Friends of Forest Park  
Friends of the Earth  
Fuller Peiser (Birmingham)  
Galloway/Thornhill Road Residents Association  
Garden History Society  
General Aviation Awareness Council  
Geologists Association, (North Staffordshire Group)  
George Wimpey North Midlands Ltd  
Georgian Group  
Gingerbread Advice Centre  
GL Hearn  
Gladstone Pottery Museum  
GMA Planning  
Goms Mill Residents and Friends Association  
Goodwin PLC  
Gough Planning Services  
Grange Residents Association  
Green Field Residents Association  
Greenpeace  
Groundwork, Stoke-on-Trent  
GVA Grimley  
Gypsy and Traveller Reform Coalition  
H M Prison Services  
Hamil Road Residents Association  
Hanley Bank Pottery Local Residents Group  
Hanley One Residents Association/Neighbourhood Watch  
Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy  
Harsthill Residential Association  
Hartshill Residents Association  
Hawes Street Residents Association  
Health and Safety Executive  
Heart of England Baptist Association  
Heart of England Tourist Board  
Helical Retail  
Henry Boot and Sons PLC  
Heritage Associates  
Heron Cross Residents Association  
Highways Agency  
Hollybush Residents Association  
Home Office Headquarters  
Home Start Stoke-on-Trent  
Honeywall Residents Association  
Hoskins Estate Residents Association  
House Builders Federation  
Housing Corporation (Regional Office)

HSBC Bank plc  
Hulme Upright  
Humberts Leisure  
HWH Community Residents Association  
Ian Darby Partnerships  
Inland Waterways Association  
Inland Waterways Association (Stoke-on-Trent Branch)  
Innes England  
Insignia Richard Ellis  
InStaffs. (UK) Ltd.  
Inventures (NHS Estates)  
James Barr Consultants  
James F A Moss and Partner  
John Emms Commercial  
John German Chartered Surveyors  
John Tams Ltd.  
Joiners Square Residents Association  
K B F Properties  
Kent Jones and Done  
King Sturge  
Knight and Sons  
Knight Frank  
Landmatch Limited  
Lattice Property  
Learning & Skills Council (WM Region)  
Lichfield Diocesan Pastoral Committee  
Lichfield Diocesan Office  
Lightwood Chase Residents Association  
Local Government Management Board  
Longton and District Chamber of Trade  
Louis Taylor Chartered Surveyors  
Lovell Jons  
Malcolm Judd and Partners  
Mason Richards Partnership  
Matthews & Goodman  
McDyre and Co.  
Mediation Advisory Services  
MENCAP  
Michelin Site Action Group  
Michelin Tyre PLC  
Middleport Environment Centre  
Middleport Residents Association  
Midland Red (North)  
Mill Hill Residents Association  
Milton Parochial Church Council  
Milwood Homes Ltd.  
MIND North Staffs (Housing)  
Mobile Operators Association  
Mollison and Friends Residents Association  
Mycal Developments Ltd.  
N. Stoke Primary Care Trust  
N.S.G.G.A. (North Staffordshire Group of the Geologist Association)  
NAI Fuller Peiser  
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners  
National Farmers Union (National Office)  
National Farmers Union, (East Midlands Region)  
National Federation of Women's Institutes



National Grid Company PLC (Midlands Area)  
National Grid Transco  
National Playing Fields Association  
National Power PLC  
National Trust (Mercia Regional Office)  
Network Rail  
New Victoria Theatre  
Newcastle PCT  
Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council  
Newford and Smallthorne Residents Association  
Newstead Residents Association  
Normacot Residents Association (Lightwood)  
North Staffordshire Bridleways Association  
North Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry  
North Staffordshire Combined Health Care (Estates Department)  
North Staffordshire Combined Healthcare NHS Trust  
North Staffordshire Field Club  
North Staffordshire Friends of the Earth  
North Staffordshire Health Authority  
North Staffordshire Health Promotion Service, HIV and Sexual Health Unit  
North Staffordshire Hospital Trust  
North Staffordshire Landlords Association  
North Staffordshire Partnership  
North Staffordshire Rail Forum  
North Staffordshire Rail Promotion Group  
North Staffordshire Society of Architects  
North Staffordshire Tourism Association  
North Staffordshire Trade Union Council  
North Staffordshire Trades Council  
North Staffordshire Trades Union Council  
North Staffs & Cheshire Rape Crisis  
North Staffs Heart Committee  
North Staffs Racial Equality Council  
North Stoke Primary Care Trust  
North West Regional Assembly  
Northern Rail Ltd  
Norton Arms Ball Green Youth and Adult Football Club  
Norton Football Club  
Norton Green Residents Association  
Norton Local Housing Forum  
Norton Residents Association  
NSPCC  
Old Blurton Community Association  
Open Spaces Society  
Packmoor Area Residents Association  
Parish Office  
Paul Dickinson & Associates  
Peacock and Smith  
Peak and Northern Footpaths Society  
Penkhull Residents Association  
Phillips Planning Services (Midlands Office)  
Pittshill Residents Association  
Platts (Longton) Ltd.  
Portland Road Residents' Association  
Portmeirion Potteries (Holdings) PLC  
Potteries Ecology Network  
Potteries Environment Network  
Potteries Heritage Society  
Potteries Pub Preservation Initiative  
Property Holdings

R P S  
 Rail Passenger Council Midlands  
 RailTrack PLC  
 Railtrack Plc (London Office)  
 Railtrack PLC (Property)  
 Ramblers Association (Staffordshire Area)  
 Rapleys  
 Red House Residents Association  
 Regional Housing Partnership  
 Relate  
 Residents Who Care  
 right to ride network  
 Ripon Road Residents Association  
 Riverside Housing Association  
 Road Haulage Association  
 Robert Turley Associates (London)  
 Robertson Chartered Surveyors  
 Roebuck & Lakeside Residents Association  
 Roger Tym & Partners  
 Royal Forestry Society (NW Midlands Division)  
 Royal Mail  
 Royal Mail (Property)  
 Royal Mail Address Management  
 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds  
 Royal Town Planning Institute  
 RPS  
 RPS Group  
 RPS Group PLC  
 RSPB Local Group  
 S.A.G.E.  
 Satnam Investments Limited  
 Seddon (Stoke) Ltd.  
 Severn Trent Water Ltd  
 Simpson  
 Sneyd Green Residents' Association  
 Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings  
 South Stoke Primary Care Trust  
 Spode Ltd.  
 Sport England (National Office)  
 Sports England (West Midlands)  
 St. Modwen Developments Ltd.  
 Staffordshire and Cheshire Barn Owl Conservation Project  
 Staffordshire Bat Group  
 Staffordshire Business & Environment Network  
 Staffordshire County Council  
 Staffordshire Enterprise Chamber of Commerce  
 Staffordshire Family Practitioner Committee  
 Staffordshire Federation of Women's Institutes  
 Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service  
 Staffordshire Gliding Club Ltd.  
 Staffordshire Guide Association, County Secretary  
 Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust  
 Staffordshire Industrial Archaeology Society  
 Staffordshire Moorlands Parish Assembly  
 Staffordshire Moorlands PCT  
 Staffordshire Partnerships  
 Staffordshire Playing Fields Association  
 Staffordshire Police  
 Staffordshire Police (Burslem LPU)  
 Staffordshire Police (City Centre LPU)

Staffordshire Police (Eastern LPU)  
Staffordshire Police (Fenton LPU)  
Staffordshire Police (Hanley LPU)  
Staffordshire Police (Longton LPU)  
Staffordshire Police (Stoke Local Policing Unit)  
Staffordshire Police (Tunstall LPU)  
Staffordshire Police SOT Police Division  
Staffordshire Probation Service  
Staffordshire RIGS Group  
Staffordshire Training and Enterprise Council  
Staffordshire University Students Union  
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust  
Staffs Developments Ltd  
Stanfields Residents Association  
Steelite International PLC  
Stevensons of Uttoxeter  
Stockton Brook and Baddeley Green Residents Action Group  
Stoke South Primary Care Trust  
Stoke-on-Trent City Centre Chamber of Trade  
Stoke-on-Trent City Community Forum  
Stoke-on-Trent College  
Stoke-upon-Trent Chamber of Trade  
Stoneleigh Planning Partnership  
Strategic Rail Authority  
Strutt and Parker (Chester Office)  
Sustrans  
Sustrans (Midlands)  
Sydenham Place Residents Association  
Tawney Rood Residents Association  
Teachers' Benevolent Fund  
Tekdata Holdings Ltd.  
Terence O'Rourke PLC  
Tetlow King Planning  
The Burslem Port Project  
The Close Residents Association  
The Coal Authority (Department of Mining Information Services)  
The Coal Authority (Department of Mining Projects and Property)  
The Gypsy Council  
The Lawn Tennis Association  
The Multiple Sclerosis Society (North Staffs. Branch)  
The Parish Church of St Mary and All Saints  
The Planning Bureau Limited  
The Saltbox Christian Centre  
The Salvation Army  
The Tyler-Parkes Partnership  
The Villages Initiative  
The Women's National Commission  
The Woodland Trust  
The Works Trust  
Theatre Group  
Theatre Trust  
Tony Thorpe Associates  
Town and Country Planning Consultant  
Townsend Residents Association  
Transport 2000  
Transport and General Workers Union  
Trent and Mersey Canal Society  
Trent and Peak Archaeological Trust  
Trent Vale Residents Association  
Trent Valley Protection Society

Tunstall Inner Area Residents Association  
Turley Associate  
Turley Associates  
Twentieth Century Society  
UK Coal Mining Ltd  
Union Street & Forest Park Estate Residents Association  
United Nations Association  
United Utilities, External Planning Liaison  
Uplands Avenue Chell and Area Residents Association  
Valuation Office  
Victoria Residents Association  
Virgin Trains  
Virgin Trains (North West)  
Voluntary Action, Stoke-on-Trent  
Wade Ceramics Ltd.  
Wardell Armstrong  
West Midlands Arts  
West Midlands Bird Club  
West Midlands Environment Network  
West Midlands Regional Health Authority  
West Midlands Regional Housing Board  
West Midlands Regional Sports Council  
Westbury Homes (West Midlands)  
White Young Green Planning  
Whitfield Valley Wildlife and Conservation Group  
Womens Institute  
Wood Frampton  
Wood Goldstraw and Yorath  
Woodfarm Residents Association  
Wooliscrofts and Sons  
Worldwide Fund for Nature (Stafford)  
YMCA  
Youth and Community and Continuing Education

## Appendix E- Copy of Letter sent with Issues and Options Leaflets

Your Ref:  
My Ref: RS/BJD/JH/34/13  
Date: 31 March 2005  
Direct Dial: (01782) 235706 (Brian Davies)  
e-mail:

PO Box 2461  
Civic Centre, Glebe Street  
Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 1WR  
Telephone: 01782 234567  
Fax: 01782 232235  
Email: regeneration@stoke.gov.uk  
Text Messaging: 07786 200700  
www.stoke.gov.uk  
DX21058 Stoke-on-Trent  
Minicom 01782 232331

**Director:**  
Bob Collins

Dear

### **Local Development Framework (LDF) Issues and Options - Leaflets**

As you are aware the City Council has commenced preparation of the LDF, the new style planning documents introduced by Government last year. Further details can be found on [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf). Consultation is now beginning on those issues that need to be addressed in the LDF as well as inviting suggestions as to potential options which the City Council should take into consideration.

The City Council is using a variety of means to do this. To help stimulate discussion and encourage participation in the preparation of the various documents a series of leaflets have been prepared. The North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy leaflet has been prepared jointly with Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, the remainder have been prepared by the City Council. I have enclosed copies of these leaflets. You will note that the copies attached are black and white. Larger colour versions of these leaflets are currently being printed and these can be made available on request. They will also be available in the Civic Centre, libraries and for downloading from the dedicated LDF web site.

We have so far sent black and white copies of the leaflet to elected representatives, community groups, statutory consultees and members of the public who have previously expressed an interest in the preparation of the LDF. A series of public exhibitions and other events over the next few weeks will be used to seek the input of as wide a cross section of the public as possible and the colour version of the leaflet will be distributed at those events.

Yours faithfully



B. J. Davies  
Development and Transport Plans Manager

**Appendix F - Comments Form Issues and Options Stage**

**City of Stoke-on-Trent Local Development  
Framework**

**Issues and Options Stage Consultation: April 2005**

**Comments Form**

Each of the leaflets produced by the City Council contains a number of questions on which we would like your comments. . But we would also like to hear any other thoughts you have. The Local Development Scheme sets out information on the new planning process and the timetable for all the documents we are producing. You can see this in libraries, the Civic Centre and from our dedicated web site, [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf)

**All comments to be considered at this stage should be received by 13<sup>th</sup> May 2005.**

**Your Details**

Name .....	Organisation
Address .....	Telephone
.....	Fax
.....	E-mail
.....	
Are you an agent acting on behalf of a client?	Yes / No (Please indicate)
If yes, please give their details.	
Name .....	Organisation
Address .....	Telephone
.....	Fax
.....	E-mail
.....	

**Comments**

Which Local Development Document do your comments relate to? .....
---

What Issues would you like to be considered in preparing the Document? Are there any specific options which you would specifically like to see considered?

Please continue on a separate sheet if required

Please return your completed form to: Development and Transport Plans,  
Stoke-on-Trent City Council, PO Box 2461, Civic Centre, Glebe Street, Stoke-  
on-Trent, ST4 1WR

**Appendix G - List of Venues and Dates for Local Strategic Partnership Events April 2005**

Community Engagement Venues April 2005

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Address</b>
Abbey Green	Monday 11 <sup>th</sup> April	Abbey Hulton Community Centre	Abbotts Road, Abbey Hulton
Norton and Bradeley	Monday 11 <sup>th</sup> April	Chatterley Centre	Wilding Road, Ball Green
Weston & Meir North	Tuesday 12 <sup>th</sup> April	St Andrews Church	375 Weston Road, Weston Coyney
Longton South	Tuesday 12 <sup>th</sup> April	Longton Town Hall	Times Square, Longton
Bentilee & Townsend	Tuesday 12 <sup>th</sup> April	Willfield Education Centre	Lauder Place North, Bentilee
Burslem North	Tuesday 12 <sup>th</sup> April	Dimensions Leisure Centre	Scotia Road, Tunstall
Chell and Packmoor	Tuesday 12 <sup>th</sup> April	Chell Heath Community Buildings	461 Chell Heath Road, Chell Heath
Hanley West & Shelton-	Wednesday 13 <sup>th</sup> April	Race Equality Council	Raymond Street, Shelton
Northwood and Birches Head	Wednesday 13 <sup>th</sup> April	Northwood Stadium	Keelings Road, Northwood
Berryhill & Hanley East	Wednesday 13 <sup>th</sup> April	Joiners Square Community Centre	Cornes Street, Joiners Square
Blurton	Wednesday 13 <sup>th</sup> April	Blurton Community Centre	Oakwood Road, Blurton
Burslem South	Thursday 14 <sup>th</sup> April	Burslem School of Art	Queen Street, Burslem
Meir Park & Sandon	Thursday 14 <sup>th</sup> April	Meir Park Community Hall	Lysander Road, Meir Park
Stoke & Trent Vale	Tuesday 19 <sup>th</sup> April	Boothen Neighbourhood Centre	Summer Street, Stoke
Longton North	Tuesday 19 <sup>th</sup> April	Longton Town Hall	Times Square, Longon
Fenton	Thursday 21 <sup>st</sup> April	Fenton Community Centre	Manor Street, Fenton
East Valley	Monday 25 <sup>th</sup> April	Sneyd Green Community	Ralph Drive, Sneyd Green



		Centre	
Hartshill & Penkhull	Monday 25 <sup>th</sup> April	Penkhull Church Community Centre	Trent Valley Road, Penkhull
Trentham & Hanford	Wednesday 27 <sup>th</sup> April	Trentham High School(youth annex)	Allerton Road, Trentham
Tunstall	Thursday 28 <sup>th</sup> April	Tunstall Community Centre	High Street, Tunstall

**Appendix H - Preferred Options Stage:** Hi) Statutory Letter; Hii) Non-statutory letter; Hiii) details of locations where document was available; Hiv) who it was sent to; Hv) and the Press Notice.

Hi) Copy of Preferred Options Consultation Letter - Statutory Consultees



Our reference SOT & NUL NSCSS / LDD1

Date 22 June 2006

Ms Sarah Hunt  
Northern Planning and Transport Division  
Government Office for the West Midlands  
5 St Phillips Place  
Birmingham  
West Midlands  
B3 2PW

**Stoke-on-Trent City Council  
Regeneration and Heritage  
Office of the Council Manager**  
Civic Centre Glebe Street  
Stoke-on-Trent ST4 1RN

Steve Smith  
**Assistant Chief Executive**

**Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council  
Regeneration and Planning Services**  
Civic Offices Merrial Street  
Newcastle-under-Lyme ST5 2AG

Neale Clifton  
**Head of Regeneration and Planning  
Services**

Dear Ms Hunt

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE CORE SPATIAL STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT**

Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council are jointly preparing a North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Development Plan Document.

The Preferred Options Report for the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy will be subject to a 6 week period of public consultation **commencing on Monday 26 June 2006 and ending on Monday 7 August 2006.**

I enclose 2 copies of the document and accompanying sustainability appraisal for your information and comment. An electronic copy of the documents has also been sent to you via e-mail.

For your information copies of the Core Spatial Strategy Preferred Options document are also available for inspection at the following locations:

- Regeneration and Heritage Department, Stoke-on-Trent City Council, Floor 3 Reception, Civic Centre, Glebe Street, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 1WR, Monday to Thursday 8.45 – 17.00 and Friday 8.45 – 16.30 hours.
- Regeneration Services, Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, Civic Offices, Merrial Street, Newcastle, ST15 2AG, Monday to Friday 9.00 -17.00 hours.

- Libraries within the City of Stoke-on-Trent and the Borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme.

The document may be viewed on either of the Council's websites at [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf) or [www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](http://www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk)

A standard form for making comments on the document is available on the websites and at the locations referred to above. It may also be photocopied if required.

Please note that any representations on the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Preferred Options Report should be sent in writing to a central point at Stoke-on-Trent City Council. The address is as follows:

Development Plan Team  
 Department of Regeneration and Heritage  
 Stoke-on-Trent City Council  
 Civic Centre  
 Glebe Street  
 Stoke-on-Trent  
 ST4 1WR

or by email to [stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk](mailto:stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk).

Please note that only those representations which are made in writing and arrive at the above address **no later than 17.00 hours on Monday 7 August 2006** will have a right to be considered.

I understand that GOWM is the central point of contact for consultation with the following Government Departments:

- Home Office
- Department for Constitutional Affairs
- Department for Culture Media and Sport
- Department for Transport
- Department for Education and Skills
- Department for Health
- Department of Trade and Industry
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

Please contact either of the Development Plan Teams on (01782) 232353 / 232302 (Stoke-on-Trent) or 742467 (Newcastle-under-Lyme) in the event of any queries.

Yours sincerely,



Brian Davies  
**Development Plan Manager**  
**Manager**  
**Regeneration and Heritage**  
**Services**



Trevor Carter  
**Planning and Housing Strategy**  
**Regeneration and Planning**

Hii) Copy of Preferred Options Consultation Letter – Non Statutory  
Consultees



Our reference SOT & NUL NSCSS / LDD1  
Date 22 June 2006

«Salutation» «First\_Name» «Last\_Name»  
«Job\_Title»  
«Organisation\_name»  
«Building»  
«Street»  
«District»  
«TownCity»  
«County»  
«Post\_Code»

**Stoke-on-Trent City Council  
Regeneration and Heritage  
Office of the Council Manager**  
Civic Centre Glebe Street  
Stoke-on-Trent ST4 1RN

Steve Smith  
**Assistant Chief Executive**

**Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council  
Regeneration and Planning Services**  
Civic Offices Merrial Street  
Newcastle-under-Lyme ST5 2AG

Neale Clifton  
**Head of Regeneration and Planning Services**

Dear «Salutation» «Last\_Name»

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE CORE SPATIAL STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT**

Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council are jointly preparing a North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Development Plan Document. This document forms part of a new Local Development Framework. The Local Development Framework is a collection of planning policy documents that will replace the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan 1996-2011 and local plans covering the City of Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme.

The Core Spatial Strategy sets out a broad framework for the future development of the whole of Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme. The other plans produced in the Local Development Framework must be in line with the Core Spatial Strategy.

The Preferred Options Report for the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy will be subject to a 6 week period of public consultation **commencing on Monday 26 June 2006 and ending on Monday 7 August 2006.**

Copies of the Core Spatial Strategy Preferred Options document are available for inspection at the following locations:

- Regeneration and Heritage Department, Stoke-on-Trent City Council, Floor 3 Reception, Civic Centre, Glebe Street, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 1WR, Monday to Thursday 8.45 – 17.00 and Friday 8.45 – 16.30 hours.
- Regeneration Services, Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, Civic Offices, Merrial Street, Newcastle, ST15 2AG, Monday to Friday 9.00 -17.00 hours.
- Libraries within the City of Stoke-on-Trent and the Borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme.

The document may be viewed on either of the Council's websites at [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf) or [www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](http://www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk)

A standard form for making comments on the document is available on the websites and at the locations referred to above. It may also be photocopied if required.

Please note that any representations on the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Preferred Options Report should be sent in writing to a central point at Stoke-on-Trent City Council. The address is as follows:

Development Plan Team  
Department of Regeneration and Heritage  
Stoke-on-Trent City Council  
Civic Centre  
Glebe Street  
Stoke-on-Trent  
ST4 1WR

or by email to [stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk](mailto:stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk).

You may include with your comments a request to be notified at a specified address when the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy is later submitted to the Secretary of State for examination and of the adoption of the document

Please note that only those representations which are made in writing and arrive at the above address **no later than 17.00 hours on Monday 7 August 2006** will have a right to be considered.

Please contact either of the Development Plan Teams on (01782) 232353 / 232302 (Stoke-on-Trent) or 742467 (Newcastle-under-Lyme) in the event of any queries.

Yours sincerely,



Brian Davies  
**Development Plan Manager  
Manager  
Regeneration and Heritage  
Services**



Trevor Carter  
**Planning and Housing Strategy  
Regeneration and Planning**

Hiii) details of locations where document was available:

Core Strategy Preferred Options Stage

- ❖ Inspection copies of all documentation at both Councils Civic Offices, libraries, local centres.
- ❖ Documents published on websites of Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council.

Hiv) who it was sent to:

**List of Consultees (Regulation 26/27)**

**Specific Consultation Bodies**

- Government Office for the West Midlands
- North West Regional Assembly
  
- Local Planning Authorities adjacent to the area covered by the Plan:
  - Stafford Borough Council
  - Staffordshire County Council
  - Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
  
- Countryside Agency
- Countryside Agency (Regional Office)
- Environment Agency
- Highways Agency
- English Heritage (West Midlands Region)
- English Nature
- Advantage West Midlands
- Strategic Rail Authority
  
- Bodies to who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority:
  - British Telecom (Head Office)
  - NTL UK
  
- Bodies who exercise services in any part of the area of the local planning authority:
  - North Staffordshire Combined Health Care (Estates Department)
  - North Staffordshire Combined Health Care NHS Trust
  - North Staffs Primary Care Trust
  - South Stoke Primary Care Trust
  - British Gas (West Midlands)
  - Biffa Waste Services Ltd
  - Severn Trent Water Limited
  
- Councillors, MEPs, MPs

- Individual residents listed on database

**Government Departments :**

- Home Office Headquarters
- Department for Works and Pensions
- Department of Constitutional Affairs
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport
- Ministry of Defence
- Office of Government Commerce
  
- District Valuer
- Employment Service
- H M Prison Services
- Staffordshire Probation Service

**General Consultation Bodies :**

- ARCH North Staffs
- Asian Cultural Centre
- Bagnall PC
- Barlaston PC
- Beat The Cold
- Biddulph PC
- Bereavement Care
- British Red Cross
- Brown Edge PC
- Business in the Environment
- Caverswall PC
- Church Commissioners
- Citizens' Advice Bureau
- City Centre Management
- Disability Solutions
- Draycott in the Moors PC
- Endon & Stanley PC
- Forsbrook PC
- Fulford PC
- Heart of England Baptist Association
- Hindu Cultural Centre
- Home Start Stoke on Trent
- Instaffs (UK) Ltd
- Islamic Cultural Centre
- Islamic Educational and Community Centre
- Kidsgrove PC
- MENCAP
- MIND North Staffs (Housing)
- North Staffs Racial Equality Council
- NSPCC
- Relate
- Royal Town Planning Institute
- Swynnerton PC
- The Multiple Sclerosis Society (North Staffs. Branch)

- The Saltbox Christian Centre
- The Salvation Army
- Voluntary Action, Stoke on Trent
- Werrington PC
- Women's Rape & Sexual Violence Centre
- YMCA

### **Other Consultees**

- 89<sup>th</sup> Sea Scouts
- Adderley Green and District Residents Association
- Age Concern North Staffordshire
- Airport Operators Association
- Ancient Monuments Society
- Arriva Midlands North Limited
- Association for Industrial Archaeology
- Ball Green Residents Association
- Bentilee Community Housing Ltd
- Bentilee Neighbourhood Project
- Blatchford and Friends Residents Association
- Bloomfield Ltd
- Blurton Farm Residents Association
- Boulevard Residents Association
- Boys Brigade
- British Astronomical Association
- British Ceramic Confederation
- British Ceramic Research Ltd
- British Chemical Distributors and Traders Association
- British Gliding Association Ltd
- British Holiday & Home Parks Association
- British Horse Society
- British Motorcycle Federation (Staffordshire Representative)
- British Pipeline Agency Ltd
- British Trust for Conservation Volunteers
- British Waterways
- British Waterways (North West Region)
- Burslem Chamber of Trade
- Burslem Community Development Trust
- Canals Regeneration Group
- Cemetery of Friends
- Central Electricity Generating Board
- Central Trains Ltd
- Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (Bangor)
- CENTRO
- Ceramic and Allied Trades Union
- Chell Area Residents Association
- Chell Heath Estate Management Board
- Chell Heath West Residents Association
- Chessington Crescent & Meadow Lane Action Group
- Civic Trust
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Coalville Residents Association



- Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)
- Commission for New Towns
- Commission for Racial Equality
- Community Council of Staffordshire
- Confederation of British Industry
- Consignia (Legal Services)
- Council for the Protection of Rural England (Staffordshire Branch)
- Country Land & Business Association (Staffordshire Branch)
- Cross Country Trains Ltd
- Crown Estate Commissioners
- CTC (right to ride - Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent)
- Cycle 2000
- Cyclists Touring Club (National Office)
- DE Central (Shrewsbury)
- Disability Rights Commission
- Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee (DPTAC)
- Dresden Residents Association
- East Vale Residents Association
- English Golf Union
- English Tourism Council
- English, Welsh and Scottish Railway Ltd
- Environmental Services Association
- Equal Opportunities Commission
- F Proctor & Sons Coaches
- Fegg Hayes Residents Association
- Fenton Residents Association
- First City Ltd
- Forestry Commission (West Midlands Conservancy)
- Forestry Enterprise (West Midlands Forest District)
- Freedom Bridleways Association
- Freight Transport Association (Midlands Region)
- Friends of Forest Park
- Friends of the Earth
- Galloway/Thornhill Road Residents Association
- Garden History Society
- Georgian Group
- Gladstone Pottery Museum
- Goms Mill Residents and Friends Association
- Grange Residents Association
- Greenpeace
- Groundwork, Stoke on Trent
- Gypsy and Traveller Reform Coalition
- Hamil Road Residents Association
- Hanley Bank Pottery Local Residents Group
- Hanley One Residents Association/Neighbourhood Watch
- Hawes Street Residents Association
- Health & Safety Executive
- Heart of England Tourist Board
- Help The Aged
- Heritage Associates
- Heron Cross Residents Association
- Hollybush Centre

- Hollybush Residents Association
- Honeywall Residents Association
- Hoskins Estate Residents Association
- House Builders Federation
- Housing Corporation (Regional Office)
- HWH Community Residents Association
- Inland Waterways Association
- Inland Waterways Association (Stoke on Trent Branch)
- Joiners Square Residents Association
- Keele University
- Learning & Skills Council (WM Region)
- Lichfield Diocesan Office
- Lichfield Diocesan Pastoral Committee
- Lightwood Chase Residents Association
- Longton and District Chamber of Trade
- Longton United Reformed Church
- LSP Community Engagement Strategy Group
- Meir Park Residents Association
- Michelin Site Action Group
- Middleport Environment Centre
- Middleport Residents Association
- Midland Red (North)
- Mill Hill Residents Association
- Milton Parochial Church Council
- Mollison and Friends Residents Association
- Moorlands Buses
- N.S.G.G.A. (North Staffordshire Group of the Geologist Association)
- National Farmers Union (National Office)
- National Farmers Union, (East Midlands Region)
- National Federation of Women's Institutes
- National Grid Transco
- National Playing Fields Association
- National Power PLC
- National Trust (Mercia Regional Office)
- Network Rail
- New Victoria Theatre
- Newcastle College
- Newcastle PCT
- Newford and Smallthorne Residents Association
- Newshaw Walk Residents Association
- Newstead Residents Association
- Normacot Residents Association
- North Staffordshire Bridleways Association
- North Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- North Staffordshire Field Club
- North Staffordshire Health Promotion Service
- North Staffordshire Hospital Trust
- North Staffordshire LIFT Project
- North Staffordshire Rail Forum
- North Staffordshire Rail Promotion Group
- North Staffordshire Society of Architects
- North Staffordshire Tourism Association

- North Staffordshire Trades Council
- North Staffordshire Trades Union Council
- North Staffs Heart Committee
- North Staffs Landlords Association
- North Staffs Public Services Alliance
- Northern Rail Ltd
- Norton Green Residents Association
- Norton Local Housing Forum
- Norton Residents Association
- npower
- Old Blurton Community Association
- Open Spaces Society
- Packmoor Residents Association
- Parish Office
- Peak and Northern Footpaths Society
- Penkhull Residents Association
- Pittshill Residents Association
- Portland & Cobridge Residents Association
- Potteries Environment Network
- Potteries Heritage Society
- Potteries Pub Preservation Initiative
- Powergen PLC
- Property Holdings
- Rail Passenger Council (Midlands)
- Red House Residents Association
- Regional Housing Partnership
- Residents Who Care
- Ripon Road Residents Association
- Road Haulage Association
- Royal Forestry Society
- Roebuck & Lakeside Residents Association
- Royal Forestry Society (NW Midlands Division)
- Royal Mail Address Management
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
- RSPB Local Group
- S.A.G.E.
- Scottish Power
- Scraggs Coaches
- Society of the Protection of Ancient Buildings
- South Walk and Friends Residents Association
- Sport England (National Office)
- Sport England West Midlands
- Springfields Residents Group
- Staffordshire and Cheshire Barn Owl Conservation Project
- Staffordshire Bat Group
- Staffordshire Business and Environment Network
- Staffordshire Enterprise Chamber of Commerce
- Staffordshire Family Practitioner Committee
- Staffordshire Federation of Women's Institute
- Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Staffordshire Guide Association
- Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust

- Staffordshire Industrial Archaeology Society
- Staffordshire Moorlands Parish Assembly
- Staffordshire Moorlands PCT
- Staffordshire Partnerships
- Staffordshire Playing Fields Association
- Staffordshire Police
- Staffordshire Police (City Centre LPU)
- Staffordshire Police (Eastern LPU)
- Staffordshire Police (Fenton LPU)
- Staffordshire Police (Hanley LPU)
- Staffordshire Police (Longton LPU)
- Staffordshire Police (Stoke LPU)
- Staffordshire Police (Tunstall LPU)
- Staffordshire Police SOT Police Station
- Staffordshire RIGS Group
- Staffordshire University
- Staffordshire University (Health)
- Staffordshire Wildlife Trust
- Staffordshire Gliding Club Ltd
- Stanfields Residents Association
- Stevensons of Uttoxeter
- Stockton Brook and Baddeley Green Residents Action Group
- Stoke on Trent 6th Form College
- Stoke on Trent City Centre Chamber of Trade
- Stoke on Trent City Community Forum
- Stoke on Trent College
- Stoke on Trent Sixth Form College
- Stoke-upon-Trent Chamber of Trade
- Sustrans
- Sustrans (Midlands)
- Tawney Wood Residents Association
- The British Wind Energy Association
- The Burslem Port Project
- The Burslem Regeneration Company
- The Close Residents Association
- The Coal Authority (Department of Mining Projects and Property)
- The Gypsy Council
- The Lawn Tennis Association
- The Parish Church of St Mary and All Saints
- The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain (Midland Section)
- The Theatres Trust
- The Women's National Commission
- The Woodland Trust
- The Works Trust
- Theatre Group
- Townsend Residents Association
- Transport 2000
- Transport and General Workers Union
- Trent and Mersey Canal Society
- Trent and Peak Archaeological Trust
- Trent Vale Neighbourhood Support Group
- Trent Valley Protection Society

- Tunstall Inner Area Residents Association
- Twentieth Century Society
- Union Street & Forest Park Estate Residents Association
- United Nations Association
- United Utilities (External Planning Liaison)
- Uplands Avenue Chell and Area Residents Association
- Upper Shelton Residents Association
- Urban Vision
- Valuation Office
- Virgin Trains West Coast
- West Midlands Arts
- West Midlands Bird Club
- West Midlands Environment Network
- West Midlands Regional Housing Board
- Whitfield Valley Wildlife and Conservation Group
- Women's Institute
- Woodfarm Residents Association
- Worldwide Fund for Nature (Stafford)

#### **Non-statutory – Developer/Agent Consultees**

- Allan Moss Associates Ltd
- Amec
- ASK Property Development
- Aspire housing
- ATIS REAL Weatheralls
- bache treharne
- Barratt Chester
- Beresford Transport Ltd
- Bovis Homes Limited Central Region
- Broad Street Properties Limited
- Broadway Malyan
- Butters John Bee
- Capital Shopping Centres Plc
- Carpenter Planning Consultants
- CB Richard Ellis
- CDS Development Services Ltd
- CH Design Europe Ltd
- Cliff Walsingham and Co.
- Colliers CRE
- Countryside Properties
- CrownLine Developments Ltd
- CSJ Brooke Smith
- CT Planning
- Dalton Warner Davies LLP
- Daniel & Hulme
- Davenport Projects Ltd
- David L Walker Chartered Surveyors
- David Lock Associates
- David Wilson Homes North West
- Devplan UK
- dialogue

- DPDS Consulting Group
- Dransfield Properties Ltd (North West Office)
- Drivers Jonas (Manchester Office)
- DTZ Peida Consulting
- Eddisons
- EKOS Consulting (UK) Ltd
- Emery Planning Partnership
- Essex Goodman Suggitt
- Fairclough Homes Ltd
- Fisher German
- Fordham Research Ltd
- Forshaw Greaves and Partners
- Forth Estates
- Framptons
- Fusion On Line Ltd
- George Wimpey North Midlands Ltd
- Gerald Eve
- GL Hearn
- GMA Planning
- Gough Planning Services
- GR Planning Consultancy Ltd
- GVA Grimley
- Hancock Town Planning
- Harris Lamb
- Helical Retail Ltd
- Henry Boot and Sons PLC
- Hepher Dixon
- Holmes Antill
- How Commerical Planning Advisors
- Hulme Upright Manning
- Humberts Leisure
- Ian Darby Partnership
- Immediate Solutions
- Innes England
- Inspired Developments
- James F A Moss and Partner
- John Emms Commercial
- Jones Lang LaSalle
- KBF Properties
- Kent Jones and Done
- King Sturge
- King Sturge (Birmingham)
- Knight & Sons
- Knight Frank LLP
- Landmatch Ltd
- Lands Improvement Holdings
- Lattice Property
- Louis Taylor Chartered Surveyors
- Lovell Jones
- Malcolm Judd & Partners
- Manchester Property & Development Ltd
- Marksan Ltd

- Mason Richards Planning
- Matthews & Goodman
- McDyre & Co
- Milwood Homes Ltd
- NAI Fuller Peiser
- NJL Consulting Ltd
- P.R.D. Properties
- Paragon Planning
- Paul Dickinson & Associates
- Peacock & Smith
- Pegasus Planning Group
- Persimmon Homes Mercier
- Phillips Planning Services
- Planning Issues
- Property Intelligence Ltd
- Radleigh Homes
- Rapleys
- RD Planning and Land
- Richard Ellis St Quintin
- Riverside Housing Association
- Robert Turley Associates (London)
- Robertson Chartered Surveyors
- Roger Tym & Partners
- Rowan Peak Ltd
- Royale Estates
- RPS Group PLC
- Salisbury Jones Planning
- Satnam Investments Ltd
- Seddon (Stoke) Ltd
- Simpson
- St Modwen Developments Limited
- Staffs Developments Ltd
- Stewart Ross Associates
- Stoneleigh Planning Partnership
- Strutt and Parker (Chester Office)
- Swithland Estates Ltd
- Terence O'Rourke PLC
- Tetlow King Planning
- The Barton Willmore Planning Partnership - Midlands
- The Development Planning Partnership
- The Mineral Planning Group
- The Planning Bureau
- The Planning Consultancy
- The Tyler-Parkes Partnership
- Touchstone Housing Association
- Turley Associates
- UK Coal Mining Ltd
- VFM
- Wardell Armstrong
- Wardell Armstrong LLP
- Westbury Homes (West Midlands)

- White Young Green Planning
- William Boulton Vibro Energy Limited
- Wilson Bowden Developments
- Wood Frampton
- Wood Goldstraw & Yorath

#### **Non-statutory – Developer/Agent Consultees**

- Aggregate Industries
- Allied Insulators Ltd
- Arcotherm (UK) Limited
- Arriva Midlands North Limited
- Bassett Group Holdings Ltd
- Biffa Waste Services Ltd
- British Telecom (Head Office)
- Copeland Tours Ltd
- Don Bur (Bodies and Trailers) Ltd
- Dudson Ltd
- Entec UK Limited
- F Proctor & Sons Coaches
- First City Ltd
- Francesco Group
- Fraylings Holdings Limited
- Fraylings Holdings Limited
- Geens Chartered Accountants
- Goodwin PLC
- HSBC Bank plc
- John Tams Ltd
- Josiah Wedgwood & Sons Ltd
- Jumpred Ltd
- LaFarge Aggregates
- Lidl UK
- Michelin Tyre PLC
- Mobile Operators Association
- Moorlands Buses
- NTL UK
- Platts (Longton) Ltd
- Portmeirion Potteries (Holdings) PLC
- Project Management (Staffordshire) Ltd
- Rees Jones Solicitors
- Scraggs Coaches
- Severn Trent Water Limited
- Spode
- Steelite International Plc
- Tekdata Holdings Ltd
- United Co-operatives Ltd
- Wade Ceramics Ltd
- Williamson Brothers Ltd
- Woolliscroft and Sons



Hv) the Press Notice.

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND)  
REGULATIONS 2004 – REGULATION 26

NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE CORE SPATIAL STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
DOCUMENT: PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT  
NOTICE OF PRE-SUBMISSION PARTICIPATION

Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council have jointly prepared a North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Development Plan Document: Preferred Options Report for public participation.

The Core Spatial Strategy sets out a broad framework for the future development of the whole of Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme. It sets the context for the other plans that are being produced as part of the Local Development Framework.

The North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Preferred Options Report will be subject to a **six week period of public consultation commencing on Monday 26 June 2006.**

Copies of the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy will be available for inspection free of charge at the following locations:

- Regeneration and Heritage Department, Stoke-on-Trent City Council, Floor 3 Reception, Civic Centre, Glebe Street, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 1WR, Monday to Thursday 8.45 – 17.00 and Friday 8.45 – 16.30 hours.
- Regeneration and Planning Services, Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, Civic Offices, Merrial Street, Newcastle, ST15 2AG, Monday to Friday 9.00 – 17.00 hours.
- Libraries within the City of Stoke-on-Trent and the Borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme.

The document may also be viewed on either of the Council's websites at [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf) or [www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](http://www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk)

Any representations should be sent in writing to the Development Plan Team, Regeneration and Heritage Department, Stoke-on-Trent City Council, Civic Centre, Glebe Street, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 1WR or by email to [stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk](mailto:stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk). A standard form for making comments is available.

Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address when the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy is later submitted to the Secretary of State for examination and of the adoption of the document.

Only those representations which are made in writing and arrive at the specified address **no later than 17.00 hours on Monday 7 August 2006** will have a right to be considered.

Please contact the Development Plan Team at Stoke-on-Trent City Council on (01782) 232302 in the event of queries.

**Appendix I - Revised Preferred Options Stage:** li) Statutory Letter; lii) Non statutory letter; liii) details of locations where document was available; liv) who it was sent to; Iv) the Press Notice

li) Copy of Revised Preferred Options Consultation Letter – Statutory Consultees



Our reference SOT & NUL NSCSS / LDD1  
Date 11 June 2007

Ms Sarah Hunt  
Northern Planning and Transport Division  
Government Office for the West Midlands  
5 St Phillips Place  
Birmingham  
West Midlands  
B3 2PW

**Stoke-on-Trent City Council**  
**Directorate of Regeneration**  
PO Box 630 Civic Centre Glebe Street  
Stoke-on-Trent ST4 1RF

Steve Smith  
**Assistant Chief Executive**

**Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council**  
**Regeneration and Planning Services**  
Civic Offices Merial Street  
Newcastle-under-Lyme ST5 2AG

Neale Clifton  
**Head of Regeneration and Planning Services**

Dear Ms Hunt

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE CORE SPATIAL STRATEGY  
REVISED PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT**

Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council are jointly preparing a North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Development Plan Document.

A Preferred Options document was published for consultation in June last year. However, in order to meet Government's emerging procedural requirements and accommodate the shifting goalposts being provided through the Regional Spatial Strategy Phase 2 Revision the Core Spatial Strategy has had to be extensively re-drafted. The revision builds on all of the representations that have been submitted to date.

The Revised Preferred Options Report for the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy will be subject to a 6 week period of public consultation **commencing on Monday 18 June 2007 and ending on Monday 30 July 2007.**

I enclose 2 copies of the document and accompanying sustainability appraisal and appendices for your information and comment.

For your information copies of the Core Spatial Strategy Revised Preferred Options document are also available for inspection at the following locations:

- Directorate of Regeneration, Stoke-on-Trent City Council, Civic Centre, Glebe Street, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 1RF, Monday to Thursday 8.45 – 17.00 and Friday 8.45 – 16.30 hours.
- Regeneration Services, Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, Civic Offices, Merrial Street, Newcastle, ST15 2AG, Monday to Friday 9.00 -17.00 hours.
- Libraries within the City of Stoke-on-Trent and the Borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme.

The document may be viewed on either of the Council's websites at [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf) or [www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](http://www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk)

It would be helpful if representations could be submitted electronically. The document can be downloaded from the above web sites. To read this document you will need Adobe Acrobat Reader. To download a free copy of Adobe Acrobat Reader log on to [www.adobe.com](http://www.adobe.com) Alternatively, you can send your comments in writing.

Please note that any representations on the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Revised Preferred Options Report should be submitted to a central point at Stoke-on-Trent City Council. The address is as follows:

Planning Policy Team  
Directorate of Regeneration  
Stoke-on-Trent City Council  
PO Box 630  
Civic Centre  
Glebe Street  
Stoke-on-Trent  
ST4 1RF

or by email to [stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk](mailto:stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk).

Please note that only those representations which are made in writing and arrive at the above address **no later than 17.00 hours on Monday 30 July 2007** will have a right to be considered.

I understand that GOWM is the central point of contact for consultation with the following Government Departments:

- Home Office
- Department for Constitutional Affairs
- Department for Culture Media and Sport
- Department for Transport
- Department for Education and Skills
- Department for Health
- Department of Trade and Industry
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

Please contact either of the Planning Policy Teams on (01782) 232353 / 232302 (Stoke-on-Trent) or 742467 (Newcastle-under-Lyme) in the event of any queries.

Yours sincerely,



B. J. Davies

Brian Davies  
**Planning Policy Manager**  
**Manager**  
**Directorate of Regeneration**  
**Services**

Trevor Carter  
**Planning and Housing Strategy**  
**Regeneration and Planning**

lii) Copy of Revised Preferred Options Consultation Letter – Non Statutory Consultees



Our reference SOT & NUL NSCSS / LDD1  
Date 11 June 2007

**Stoke-on-Trent City Council**  
**Directorate of Regeneration**  
PO Box 630 Civic Centre Glebe Street  
Stoke-on-Trent ST4 1RF

Steve Smith  
**Assistant Chief Executive**

**Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council**  
**Regeneration and Planning Services**  
Civic Offices Merrial Street  
Newcastle-under-Lyme ST5 2AG

Neale Clifton  
**Head of Regeneration and Planning Services**

Dear Sir/Madam

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE CORE SPATIAL STRATEGY  
REVISED PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT**

Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council are jointly preparing a North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Development Plan Document. This document forms part of a new Local Development Framework. The Local Development Framework is a collection of planning policy documents that will replace the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan 1996-2011 and local plans covering the City of Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme.

A Preferred Options document was published for consultation in June last year. However, in order to meet Government's emerging procedural requirements and accommodate the shifting goalposts being provided through the Regional Spatial Strategy Phase 2 Revision the Core Spatial Strategy has had to be extensively re-drafted. The revision builds on all of the representations that have been submitted to date.

The Revised Preferred Options Report for the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy will be subject to a 6 week period of public consultation **commencing on Monday 18 June 2007 and ending on Monday 30 July 2007.**

Copies of the Core Spatial Strategy Revised Preferred Options document are available for inspection at the following locations:

- Directorate of Regeneration, Stoke-on-Trent City Council, Civic Centre, Glebe Street, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 1RF, Monday to Thursday 8.45 – 17.00 and Friday 8.45 – 16.30 hours.
- Regeneration Services, Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, Civic Offices, Merrial Street, Newcastle, ST15 2AG, Monday to Friday 9.00 -17.00 hours.
- Libraries within the City of Stoke-on-Trent and the Borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme.

The document may be viewed on either of the Council's websites at [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf) or [www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](http://www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk)

It would be helpful if representations could be submitted electronically. The document can be downloaded from the above web sites. To read this document you will need Adobe Acrobat Reader. To download a free copy of Adobe Acrobat Reader log on to [www.adobe.com](http://www.adobe.com) Alternatively, you can send your comments in writing.

Please note that any representations on the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Revised Preferred Options Report should be submitted to a central point at Stoke-on-Trent City Council. The address is as follows:

Planning Policy Team  
 Directorate of Regeneration  
 Stoke-on-Trent City Council  
 PO Box 630  
 Civic Centre  
 Glebe Street  
 Stoke-on-Trent  
 ST4 1RF

or by email to [stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk](mailto:stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk).

You may include with your comments a request to be notified at a specified address when the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy is later submitted to the Secretary of State for examination and of the adoption of the document

Please note that only those representations which are made in writing and arrive at the above address **no later than 17.00 hours on Monday 30 July 2007** will have a right to be considered.

Please contact either of the Planning Policy Teams on (01782) 232353 / 232302 (Stoke-on-Trent) or 742467 (Newcastle-under-Lyme) in the event of any queries.

Yours sincerely,



Brian Davies  
**Planning Policy Manager**  
**Manager**  
**Directorate of Regeneration**  
**Services**



Trevor Carter  
**Planning and Housing Strategy**  
**Regeneration and Planning**

liii) details of locations where document was available:

Core Strategy Revised Preferred Options Stage

- ❖ Inspection copies of all documentation at both Councils Civic Offices, libraries, local centres.
- ❖ Documents published on websites of Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council.

liv) who it was sent to:

**List of Consultees (Regulation 26/27)**

**Specific Consultation Bodies**

- Government Office for the West Midlands
- North West Regional Assembly
- West Midlands Regional Assembly
  
- Local Planning Authorities nearby to the area covered by the Plan:
  - Cheshire County Council
  - Crewe & Nantwich Borough Council
  - East Staffordshire Borough Council
  - North Shropshire District Council
  - Shropshire County Council
  - Stafford Borough Council
  - Staffordshire County Council
  - Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
  
- British Waterways
- Countryside Agency
- Countryside Agency (Regional Office)
- Environment Agency
- Highways Agency
- English Heritage (West Midlands Region)
- English Nature
- Advantage West Midlands
- Strategic Rail Authority
  
- Bodies to who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority:
  - British Telecom (Head Office)
  - NTL UK
  - Vodafone Ltd
  
- Bodies who exercise services in any part of the area of the local planning authority:

- North Staffordshire Combined Health Care (Estates Department)
  - North Staffordshire Combined Health Care NHS Trust
  - North Staffs Primary Care Trust
  - North Staffs Hospital Trust
  - South Stoke Primary Care Trust
  - British Gas (West Midlands)
  - Biffa Waste Services Ltd
  - Severn Trent Water Limited
  - National Power PLC
  - National Grid Transco
  - Network Rail
  - Powergen plc
  - Railtrack Midlands
  - Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Services
- Councillors, MEPs, MPs
  - Individual residents listed on database

**Government Departments :**

- Home Office Headquarters
  - Department for Works and Pensions
  - Department of Constitutional Affairs
  - Department for Culture, Media and Sport
  - Ministry of Defence
  - Office of Government Commerce
- District Valuer
  - Employment Service
  - H M Prison Services
  - Staffordshire Probation Service
  - Housing Corporation

**General Consultation Bodies :**

- Audley Rural PC
- Asian Cultural Centre
- ARCH North Staffs
- Asian Cultural Centre
- Bagnall PC
- Barlaston PC
- Beat The Cold
- Betley PC
- Biddulph PC
- Bereavement Care
- British Red Cross
- Brown Edge PC
- Business in the Environment
- Caverswall PC
- Chapel & Hill Chorlton PC
- Cheswardine PC
- Church Commissioners
- Citizens' Advice Bureau



- City Centre Management
- Clayton & Burslem United Reformed Church
- Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
- Disability Solutions
- Doddington & District PC
- Draycott in the Moors PC
- Eccleshall PC
- Endon & Stanley PC
- Forsbrook PC
- Fulford PC
- Heart of England Baptist Association
- Hindu Cultural Centre
- Home Start Stoke on Trent
- Hough & Chorlton PC
- Instaffs (UK) Ltd
- Islamic Cultural Centre
- Islamic Educational and Community Centre
- Keele PC
- Kidsgrove PC
- Loggerheads PC
- Maer PC
- Madeley PC
- Market Drayton PC
- MENCAP
- MIND North Staffs (Housing)
- Mitcheline Site Action Group
- Newcastle-under-Lyme Civic Society
- North Staffs Racial Equality Council
- Norton in Hales PC
- NSPCC
- NSRZ
- Odd Rode PC
- Relate
- Royal Town Planning Institute
- Silverdale PC
- Staffordshire PC Association
- Sutton upon tern PC
- Swynnerton PC
- The Multiple Sclerosis Society (North Staffs. Branch)
- The Saltbox Christian Centre
- The Salvation Army
- Voluntary Action, Stoke on Trent
- Werrington PC
- Westbury and Clayton Youth Club
- Weston & Basford PC
- West Midlands Environment Network
- West Midlands Planning Aid
- Whitmore PC
- Womens National Commission
- Women's Rape & Sexual Violence Centre
- Woore PC
- Wolstanton Rectory

- YMCA

### **Other Consultees**

- 89<sup>th</sup> Sea Scouts
- Adderley Green and District Residents Association
- Age Concern North Staffordshire
- Airport Operators Association
- ARCH North Staffs
- Ancient Monuments Society
- Airport Operators Association
- Arriva Midlands North Limited
- Arts Council West Midlands
- Association for Industrial Archaeology
- Ball Green Residents Association
- Bakerbus
- Beat the Cold
- Bentilee Community Housing Ltd
- Bentilee Neighbourhood Project
- Bereavement Care
- Blatchford and Friends Residents Association
- Bloomfield Ltd
- Blurton Farm Residents Association
- Boulevard Residents Association
- Boys Brigade
- Bradwell Hospital
- Brindley Ford RA
- British Astronomical Association
- British Ceramic Confederation
- British Ceramic Research Ltd
- British Chemical Distributors and Traders Association
- British Geological Survey
- British Gliding Association Ltd
- British Holiday & Home Parks Association
- British Horse Society
- British Motorcycle Federation (Staffordshire Representative)
- British Red Cross
- British Pipeline Agency Ltd
- British Trust for Conservation Volunteers
- British Waterways
- British Waterways (North West Region)
- Broughton RA
- Burslem Chamber of Trade
- Burslem Community Development Trust
- CABE
- CAB
- Campaign to protect Rural England
- Canals Regeneration Group
- Cemetery of Friends
- Central Electricity Generating Board
- Central Network
- Central Trains Ltd

- Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (Bangor)
- CENTRO
- Ceramic and Allied Trades Union
- Chell Area Residents Association
- Chell Heath Estate Management Board
- Chell Heath West Residents Association
- Chessington Crescent & Meadow Lane Action Group
- Chesterton Community Forum
- Church of England
- City Centre South AMI Community Steering Group
- Civic Trust
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Coalville Residents Association
- Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)
- Commission for New Towns
- Commission for Racial Equality
- Community Council of Staffordshire
- Community Empowerment Network
- Confederation of British Industry
- Connexions
- Consignia (Legal Services)
- Council for the Protection of Rural England (Staffordshire Branch)
- Council for British Archaeology (West Midlands)
- Country Land & Business Association (Staffordshire Branch)
- Cross Country Trains Ltd
- Crown Estate Commissioners
- Culture West Midlands
- CTC (right to ride - Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent)
- Cycle 2000
- Cyclists Touring Club (National Office)
- DE Central (Shrewsbury)
- Defence Estates
- Directorate of Health Promotion
- Disability Rights Commission
- Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee (DPTAC)
- Dresden Residents Association
- East Vale Residents Association
- Employment Services
- English Golf Union
- English Tourism Council
- English, Welsh and Scottish Railway Ltd
- Environmental Services Association
- Equal Opportunities Commission
- Farming and Rural Conservation Agency
- F Proctor & Sons Coaches
- Fegg Hayes Residents Association
- Fenton Residents Association
- First City Ltd
- Ford Green RA
- Forestry Commission (West Midlands Conservancy)
- Forestry Enterprise (West Midlands Forest District)
- Freedom Bridleways Association

- Freight Transport Association (Midlands Region)
- Friends of Chatterly Whitfield
- Friends of Forest Park
- Friends of the Earth
- Galloway/Thornhill Road Residents Association
- Garden History Society
- Georgian Group
- Gladstone Pottery Museum
- Gingerbread
- Goms Mill Residents and Friends Association
- Grange Residents Association
- Greenpeace
- Green Fields RA
- Groundwork, Stoke on Trent
- Gypsy and Traveller Reform Coalition
- Head of England Baptist Association
- Health and Safety Executive
- Hamil Road Residents Association
- Hanley Bank Pottery Local Residents Group
- Hanley One Residents Association/Neighbourhood Watch
- Hawes Street Residents Association
- Health & Safety Executive
- Heart of England Tourist Board
- Help The Aged
- Heritage Associates
- Heron Cross Residents Association
- Hindu Cultural Centre
- Holden Lane Residents Association
- Hollybush Centre
- Hollybush Residents Association
- Holy Trinity Presbytery
- Home Office Headquarters
- Home Start
- Honeywall Residents Association
- Hoskins Estate Residents Association
- House Builders Federation
- Housing Corporation (Regional Office)
- HWH Community Residents Association
- Inland Waterways Association
- Inland Waterways Association (Stoke on Trent Branch)
- Instaffs (UK) Ltd
- Islamic Educational and Community Centre
- Islamic Cultural Centre
- Joiners Square Residents Association
- Job Centre Plus
- Keele Golf Centre
- Keele University
- Kidsgrove Environmental Watch Response
- Learning & Skills Council (WM Region)
- Leek Police
- Lichfield Diocesan Office
- Lichfield Diocesan Pastoral Committee

- Lightwood Chase Residents Association
- Local Strategic Partnership
- Longton and District Chamber of Trade
- Longton Hall RA
- Longton United Reformed Church
- LSP Community Engagement Strategy Group
- MADE
- MENCAP
- Meir Park Residents Association
- Michelin Site Action Group
- Middleport Environment Centre
- Middleport Residents Association
- Midland Red (North)
- Mill Hill Residents Association
- Milton Park Community Group
- Milton Parochial Church Council
- MIND North Staffs
- Mobile Operators Association
- Mollison and Friends Residents Association
- Moorlands Buses
- Museums Libraries and Archives WM
- N.S.G.G.A. (North Staffordshire Group of the Geologist Association)
- National Express
- National Schizophrenia Fellowship
- National Farmers Union (National Office)
- National Farmers Union, (East Midlands Region)
- National Federation of Women's Institutes
- National Grid Transco
- National Playing Fields Association
- National Power PLC
- National Trust (Mercia Regional Office)
- Network Rail
- New Cross Heath RA
- New Victoria Theatre
- Newcastle CAB
- Newcastle College
- Newcastle Churches Together
- Newcastle CVS
- Newcastle Communities Forum
- Newcastle Countryside Project
- Newcastle PCT
- Newford and Smallthorne Residents Association
- Newshaw Walk Residents Association
- Newstead Residents Association
- Normacot Residents Association
- North Staffordshire Asperger / Autism Association
- North Staffordshire Bridleways Association
- North Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- North Staffordshire Field Club
- North Staffordshire Health Promotion Service
- North Staffordshire Hospital Trust
- North Staffordshire Landlords Association

- North Staffordshire LIFT Project
- North Staffordshire Mind
- North Staffordshire Racial Equality Council
- North Staffordshire Rail Forum
- North Staffordshire Rail Promotion Group
- North Staffordshire Society of Architects
- North Staffordshire Tourism Association
- North Staffordshire Trades Council
- North Staffordshire Trades Union Council
- North Staffs Heart Committee
- North Staffs Landlords Association
- North Staffs Public Services Alliance
- Northern Rail Ltd
- Norton Green Residents Association
- Norton Local Housing Forum
- Norton Residents Association
- Npower
- NSPCC
- Office of Government Commerce
- Old Blurton Community Association
- Open Spaces Society
- O2 Ltd
- Orange
- Packmoor Residents Association
- PARINS
- Parish Office
- Parkinsons Disease Society (North Staffs Branch)
- Parksite Action Group
- Peak and Northern Footpaths Society
- Penkhull Residents Association
- Pittshill Residents Association
- Portland & Cobridge Residents Association
- Potteries and Newcastle Urban Wildlife Group
- Potteries Antique Centre
- Potteries Environment Network
- Potteries Heritage Society
- Potteries Pub Preservation Initiative
- Powergen PLC
- Property Holdings
- Property Services Agency
- Rail Freight Group
- Rail Passenger Council (Midlands)
- Ramblers Association (North Staffs)
- Red House Residents Association
- Refugee Council
- Regional Housing Partnership
- Relate
- RENEW
- Residents Who Care
- Ripon Road Residents Association
- Road Haulage Association
- Royal Forestry Society

- Roebuck & Lakeside Residents Association
- Roebuck Shopping Centre
- Royal Forestry Society (NW Midlands Division)
- Royal Mail Address Management
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
- RNIB Stoke
- RSPB Local Group
- RTPI
- S.A.G.E.
- Saltbox Christian Centre
- Salvation Army
- St Marks
- St Lukes
- St Andrews
- St Wulstans
- St Barnabus
- St Georges
- Scottish Power
- Scraggs Coaches
- Shropshire Union Canal Society
- Silverdale Information Shop
- Society of the Protection of Ancient Buildings
- South Walk and Friends Residents Association
- Shopmobility
- Sport England (National Office)
- Sport England West Midlands
- Springfields Residents Group
- SSAFA Forces Help
- Staffordshire and Cheshire Barn Owl Conservation Project
- Staffordshire Badger Conservation Group
- Staffordshire Bat Group
- Staffordshire Blind
- Staffordshire Business and Environment Network
- Staffordshire Gliding Club Ltd
- Staffordshire Enterprise Chamber of Commerce
- Staffordshire Family Practitioner Committee
- Staffordshire Federation of Women's Institute
- Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Staffordshire Guide Association
- Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust
- Staffordshire Industrial Archaeology Society
- Staffordshire Moorlands Parish Assembly
- Staffordshire Moorlands PCT
- Staffordshire Partnerships
- Staffordshire Playing Fields Association
- Staffordshire Police
- Staffordshire Police (City Centre LPU)
- Staffordshire Police (Eastern LPU)
- Staffordshire Police (Fenton LPU)
- Staffordshire Police (Hanley LPU)
- Staffordshire Police (Longton LPU)
- Staffordshire Police (Stoke LPU)

- Staffordshire Police (Tunstall LPU)
- Staffordshire Police SOT Police Station
- Staffordshire RIGS Group
- Staffordshire University
- Staffordshire University (Health)
- Staffordshire Wildlife Trust
- Staffordshire Gliding Club Ltd
- Stanfields Residents Association
- Stevensons of Uttoxeter
- Stockton Brook and Baddeley Green Residents Action Group
- Stoke on Trent Access Group
- Stoke on Trent 6th Form College
- Stoke on Trent City Centre Chamber of Trade
- Stoke on Trent City Community Forum
- Stoke on Trent College
- Stoke on Trent Parent Partnership
- Stoke on Trent Sixth Form College
- Stoke-upon-Trent Chamber of Trade
- Strokes R Us
- Sustrans
- Sustrans (Midlands)
- Tawney Wood Residents Association
- Tennis Staffordshire
- The British Wind Energy Association
- The Burslem Port Project
- The Burslem Regeneration Company
- The Community Council of Staffordshire
- The Close Residents Association
- The Coal Authority (Department of Mining Projects and Property)
- The Gypsy Council
- The Lawn Tennis Association
- The Lyme Trust
- The Multiple Sclerosis Society
- The National Trust
- The Parish Church of St Mary and All Saints
- The Sentinel
- The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain (Midland Section)
- The Theatres Trust
- The Women's National Commission
- The Woodland Trust
- The Works Trust
- Theatre Group
- Thisleberry RA
- Tmobile
- Tourism West Midlands
- Town Centre Association
- Townsend Residents Association
- Transport 2000
- Transport and General Workers Union
- Trent and Mersey Canal Society
- Trent and Peak Archaeological Trust
- Trent Vale Neighbourhood Support Group



- Trent Valley Protection Society
- Tunstall Inner Area Residents Association
- Twentieth Century Society
- Underwood Road Action Group
- Union Street & Forest Park Estate Residents Association
- University Quarter
- United Nations Association
- United Utilities (External Planning Liaison)
- Uplands Avenue Chell and Area Residents Association
- Upper Shelton Residents Association
- Urban Vision
- Valuation Office
- Victorian Society
- Virgin Mobile
- Virgin Trains West Coast
- West Midlands Arts
- West Midlands Bird Club
- West Midlands Environment Network
- West Midlands Regional Housing Board
- Whitfield Valley Wildlife and Conservation Group
- Women's Institute
- Woodfarm Residents Association
- Worldwide Fund for Nature (Stafford)
- YMCA

#### **Non-statutory – Developer/Agent Consultees**

- AC Robinson & Associates
- Allan Moss Associates Ltd
- Ancer Spa (Midlands)Ltd
- Anchor Trust
- Amec
- ASK Property Development
- Aspire housing
- ATIS REAL Weatheralls
- Atkins
- bache treharne
- Barnet Ratcliffe Partnership
- Barratt Chester
- Barry Newcombe Associates
- Barton Wilmore Planning
- Beresford Transport Ltd
- Beth Johnson HA
- BDP
- Bovis Homes Limited Central Region
- Bloomfield Limited
- Brigher Futures
- Broad Street Properties Limited
- Broadway Malyan
- Bromford Housing Group
- Butters John Bee
- Capital Shopping Centres Plc

- Carpenter Planning Consultants
- CB Richard Ellis
- CDS Development Services Ltd
- CH Design Europe Ltd
- Choices HA
- Chris Taylor Design Ltd
- Cliff Walsingham and Co.
- Colliers CRE
- Countryside Properties
- Country Land & Business Association
- CrownLine Developments Ltd
- CSJ Brooke Smith
- CT Planning
- Dalton Warner Davies LLP
- Daniel & Hulme
- Davenport Projects Ltd
- David L Walker Chartered Surveyors
- David Lock Associates
- David Wilson Homes North West
- Devplan UK
- dialogue
- DPDS Consulting Group
- Dransfield Properties Ltd (North West Office)
- Drivers Jonas (Manchester Office)
- DTZ Peida Consulting
- Eddisons
- EKOS Consulting (UK) Ltd
- Emery Planning Partnership
- Essex Goodman Suggitt
- Fairclough Homes Ltd
- Fisher German
- Fordham Research Ltd
- Forshaw Greaves and Partners
- Forth Estates
- Framptons
- Fraylings Holdings Ltd
- Fusion On Line Ltd
- George Wimpey North Midlands Ltd
- Gerald Eve
- GL Hearn
- GMA Planning
- Gough Planning Services
- GR Planning Consultancy Ltd
- GVA Grimley
- Hancock Town Planning
- Harris Lamb
- Helical Retail Ltd
- Henry Boot and Sons PLC
- Hepher Dixon
- Holmes Antill
- How Commerical Planning Advisors
- Hulme Upright Manning

- Humberts Leisure
- Ian Darby Partnership
- Immediate Solutions
- Independent Campaigning Advocates
- Innes England
- Inspired Developments
- James F A Moss and Partner
- John Emms Commercial
- Jones Lang LaSalle
- JPK Design
- J S Bloor Ltd
- KBF Properties
- Keepmote plc
- Kent Jones and Done
- Kerry James Planning
- Kier Regeneration
- King Sturge
- King Sturge (Birmingham)
- Knight & Sons
- Knight Frank LLP
- Landmatch Ltd
- Lands Improvement Holdings
- Lattice Property
- Louis Taylor Chartered Surveyors
- Lovell Jones
- Malcolm Judd & Partners
- Manchester Property & Development Ltd
- Marksan Ltd
- Mason Richards Planning
- Matthews & Goodman
- McDyre & Co
- Milwood Homes Ltd
- New Era HA
- NAI Fuller Peiser
- Northern Counties HA
- NJL Consulting Ltd
- P.R.D. Properties
- Paragon Planning
- Paul Dickinson & Associates
- Peacock & Smith
- Pegasus Planning Group
- Persimmon Homes Mercier
- Phillips Planning Services
- Planning Issues
- Property Intelligence Ltd
- Prima 200 Ltd
- PW Heeks
- Radleigh Homes
- Rapleys
- RD Planning and Land
- Richard Ellis St Quintin
- Riverside Housing Association

- Robert Turley Associates (London)
- Robertson Chartered Surveyors
- Roger Tym & Partners
- Rowan Peak Ltd
- Royale Estates
- RPS Group PLC
- Salisbury Jones Planning
- Salvation Army HA
- Satnam Investments Ltd
- Seddon (Stoke) Ltd
- Simpson
- Sir John Offleys Armshouses
- Smith Stuart Reynolds
- Spawforth Associates
- Steelite International plc
- St Modwen Developments Limited
- Staffs Developments Ltd
- Staffordshire LSC
- Stewart Ross Associates
- Stoneleigh Planning Partnership
- Strutt and Parker (Chester Office)
- Swithland Estates Ltd
- Symonds
- Taylor Yong
- Terence O'Rourke PLC
- TFA Architects
- Tetlow King Planning
- The Barton Willmore Planning Partnership - Midlands
- The Development Planning Partnership
- The Fairhursts Design Group
- The Mineral Planning Group
- The Planning Bureau
- The Planning Consultancy
- The Tyler-Parkes Partnership
- Touchstone Housing Association
- Turley Associates
- UK Coal Mining Ltd
- UK Land Investment Group
- Urban Vision North Staffordshire
- VFM
- Wardell Armstrong
- Wardell Armstrong LLP
- Westbury Homes (West Midlands)
- Westwood Knowles
- White Young Green Planning
- WM Saunders Partership
- William Boulton Vibro Energy Limited
- William Sutton HA
- Wilson Bowden Developments
- Wood Frampton
- Wood Goldstraw & Yorath

## **Non-statutory – Developer/Agent Consultees**

- Aggregate Industries
- Allied Insulators Ltd
- Arcotherm (UK) Limited
- Arriva Midlands North Limited
- Bassett Group Holdings Ltd
- Biffa Waste Services Ltd
- British Telecom (Head Office)
- Copeland Tours Ltd
- Don Bur (Bodies and Trailers) Ltd
- Dudson Ltd
- Entec UK Limited
- F Proctor & Sons Coaches
- First City Ltd
- Francesco Group
- Fraylings Holdings Limited
- Fraylings Holdings Limited
- Geens Chartered Accountants
- Goodwin PLC
- HSBC Bank plc
- John Tams Ltd
- Josiah Wedgwood & Sons Ltd
- Jumpred Ltd
- LaFarge Aggregates
- Lidl UK
- Michelin Tyre PLC
- Mobile Operators Association
- Moorlands Buses
- NTL UK
- Platts (Longton) Ltd
- Portmeirion Potteries (Holdings) PLC
- Project Management (Staffordshire) Ltd
- Rees Jones Solicitors
- Scraggs Coaches
- Severn Trent Water Limited
- Simpsons
- Spode
- Steelite International Plc
- Tekdata Holdings Ltd
- United Co-operatives Ltd
- Wade Ceramics Ltd
- Williamson Brothers Ltd
- Woolliscroft and Sons

Iv) the Press Notice.

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT)  
(ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2004 – REGULATION 26

NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE CORE SPATIAL STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT  
PLAN DOCUMENT: REVISED PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT  
NOTICE OF PRE-SUBMISSION PARTICIPATION

Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council have jointly prepared the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Development Plan Document: Revised Preferred Options Report for public participation.

The Core Spatial Strategy sets out a broad framework for the future development of the whole of Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme. It sets the context for the other plans that are being produced as part of the Local Development Framework.

A Preferred Options document was published for consultation in June last year. However, in order to meet Government's emerging procedural requirements and accommodate the shifting goalposts being provided through the Regional Spatial Strategy Phase 2 Revision the Core Spatial Strategy has had to be extensively re-drafted. The revision builds on all of the representations that have been submitted to date.

The North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy Revised Preferred Options Report will be subject to a six week period of public consultation commencing on Monday 18 June 2007.

Copies of the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy will be available for inspection free of charge at the following locations:

- Directorate of Regeneration, Stoke-on-Trent City Council, Civic Centre, Glebe Street, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 1RF, Monday to Thursday 8.45 – 17.00 and Friday 8.45 – 16.30 hours.
- Regeneration and Planning Services, Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, Civic Offices, Merrial Street, Newcastle, ST15 2AG, Monday to Friday 9.00 – 17.00 hours.
- Libraries within the City of Stoke-on-Trent and the Borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme.

The document may also be viewed on either of the Council's websites at [www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.stoke.gov.uk/ldf) or [www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](http://www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk)

It would be helpful if representations could be submitted electronically. The document can be downloaded from the above web sites. To read this document you will need Adobe Acrobat Reader. To download a free copy of Adobe Acrobat Reader log on to [www.adobe.com](http://www.adobe.com)

Alternatively, you can send your comments in writing to the Planning Policy Team, Directorate of Regeneration, Stoke on Trent City Council, PO Box 630, Civic Centre, Glebe Street, Stoke on Trent ST4 1RF or e-mailing to [stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk](mailto:stoke.ldf@stoke.gov.uk)

Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address when the North Staffordshire Core Spatial Strategy is later submitted to the Secretary of State for examination and of the adoption of the document.

Only those representations which are made in writing and arrive at the specified address no later than 17.00 hours on Monday 30 July 2007 will have a right to be considered.

Please contact the Planning Policy Team at Stoke-on-Trent City Council on (01782) 232302 in the event of queries.

## Appendix J – Response to Representations on the Revised Preferred Options Document (March 2007)

Revised Preferred Options Section 1 - Introduction			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
1. The preparation of a joint plan for Newcastle and Stoke is welcomed.	Urban Vision RENEW	Noted. Justification for joint plan making provided.	Paragraph 1.8 – 1.10 and new subsections on partnership working added at paragraphs 2.18 - 2.22.
2. The Core Strategy needs to make explicit where delivery will be taken forward through specific development plan documents	GOWM	Agreed. The delivery of the Core Strategy through specific development plan documents is identified in Area Spatial Strategies and Core Strategic Policies.	Paragraphs 5.66 – 5.268. Sections 6 and 7
3. The Core Strategy needs to set out how cross boundary issues are being addressed e.g. North West RSS	GOWM	Agreed. New section on cross boundary issues introduced.	Paragraph 2.18 – 2.22.
4. Several consultees request that specific potential development sites are included in the local development framework or that the detailed boundary of policy areas be amended to include their specific interest.	Atisreal Mr Aubrey Cliffe Mr J. Hollyman, Harris Lamb, Bovale Mr S. Austin, Network Rail Mr J. Spottiswood, British	The Core Spatial Strategy is not a site allocation plan and cannot include site specific proposals or detailed policy areas. These representations will be taken into account during the preparation of detailed development plan documents.	No change.



	Waterways Board Mr G. Willard, Willardwillard, (Mr D Chell/Mr D Riley) Mr R. Thorley, GVA Grimley		
5. It is felt that Biddulph should feature strongly within this document.	Odd Rode Parish Council	Biddulph does not fall within the plan area. Reference is made within the document to cross boundary issues.	Paragraph 2.18 – 2.22.
6. Some consultees support the process of plan preparation but are finding the lack of LDF progress damaging to the well-being of the area and indicative of an absence of clear direction and focus.	Mr J. Wilson, Tyler Parks Partnership, Morston Assets North Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Noted. The Local Planning Authorities are seeking to produce the LDF as speedily as possible having regard to evolving guidance regarding its contents; the changing national and regional planning context and due process of plan making to ensure that the plan is found to be 'sound'. The programme of plan making is set out in the Local Development Scheme which is subject to annual review.	No change.
7. Introduce more illustrations	Urban Vision	Agreed. More illustrations added.	For example, pages 9, 15, 31, and 35.
8. Qualified improvement over previous draft.	GOWM	Noted.	Further improvements have been made throughout the Submission Draft.
9. Care should be taken in the terminology used throughout the	English Heritage	Agreed. Glossary retained to assist the layperson.	Appendix 1.

document.			
-----------	--	--	--

Revised Preferred Options Section 2 – Planning Policy Context			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
10. Reference to educational, health and social care strategies needs to be made more explicit.	RENEW	Agreed. Addressed in the strategic aims SA2; area spatial strategies and core policies CSP 9 and 10.	Paragraph 4.7 Paragraphs 5.66 – 5.268.
11. The Core Spatial Strategy should make more explicit its intention to support government approved regeneration programmes	RENEW	Agreed. See section dealing with targeted regeneration.	Paragraphs 5.12 - 5.17
12. Linkage between Community Strategy aims and strategic aims and core policies is acceptable	GOWM	Noted	Appendix 3
13. Include summary of priority issues that the Core Spatial Strategy will address.	GOWM	Agreed. Rephrased as challenges the Core Spatial Strategy will address in Section 3, Spatial Portrait.	Paragraphs 3.45 - 3.70.
14. Concern that safer communities is a priority issue but it is not clear how this has been translated into	GOWM	Agreed. Addressed in strategic aims; SA2 and SA16; Area Spatial Strategies and core policy CSP1.	Paragraphs 4.7 and 4.21 Paragraphs 5.66 – 5.268. Paragraphs 6.3 – 6.18

the strategy, policies and implementation mechanism having regard to relevant strategies of agencies involved in delivery			
---	--	--	--

15. No reference to University Quarter	Advantage West Midlands	The University Quarter regeneration concept is a locally generated regeneration priority. It is addressed in the Area Spatial Strategy: Stoke-on-Trent Inner Urban Core Spatial Strategy.	Paragraphs 5.106 - 5.147
16. Welcome reference to WMES	Advantage West Midlands RENEW	Noted. It is not necessary to repeat regional strategies unless justified.	Paragraphs 5.34 and 5.169
17. No reference to North Staffs Regeneration Partnership	Advantage West Midlands RENEW Regeneration Zone	Establishment of the partnership post dates City Council approval of Revised Spatial Options.	Paragraphs 2.21 and 2.22
18. Welcome the links between the Core Strategy and the Community Strategy but it must be recognised that not all issues are adequately dealt within the existing suite of community strategies e.g. the historic environment.	English Heritage	Noted. This does not constrain this issue being fully addressed in the LDF Core Spatial Strategy. Addressed in the strategic aims SA14; area spatial strategies and core policies CSP1 and CSP2.	Paragraph 4.19 Paragraphs 5.66 – 5.268. Paragraphs 6.1 – 6.20
19. Make specific reference to HMR as a component part of the Communities Plan	RENEW	Noted. Clarity is provided regarding the HMR.	Appendix 4.
20. Housing targets are subject	RENEW	Agreed. The Core Spatial Strategy	Paragraphs 2.10 and 2.11

to review		takes into account the latest draft advice provided by the Regional Planning Body.	
-----------	--	--	--

21. Transportation improvements critical to delivery HMR regeneration priority areas	RENEW	Agreed. Addressed in the strategic aims SA3 and area spatial strategies.	Paragraph 4.8 Paragraphs 5.66 – 5.268.
22. Include vision, aims and objectives of the RENEW programme together with its significance and status	RENEW	Agreed.	Appendix 4
23. Refer to updated NSIEDS study currently being prepared	RENEW	Agreed. Latest material accessed through appendices.	Appendix 2
24. The NSIEDS does not address 'visiting' or 'investment' activities.	RENEW	Noted. Text has been comprehensively reviewed to ensure that these have been addressed.	Sections 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7
25. This section should deal with the implications of ageing housing stock and deindustrialisation leading to substantial brownfield land supply	RENEW	Agreed. Ageing housing stock leading to clearance and deindustrialisation in the face of intense competition is giving rise to creation of a substantial supply of potential brownfield development land. In the case of Stoke-on-Trent alone potential brownfield capacity is estimated to be equivalent to over 20,000 dwellings. It is not just a question of brownfield first and greenfield second but often a	Paragraphs 5.18 - 5.24

		question of which brownfield first?	
--	--	-------------------------------------	--



Revised Preferred Options Section 3 – North Staffordshire – A Spatial Portrait

<b>Reference No. &amp; summary of representation</b>	<b>Consultee(s)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Submission Draft</b>
26. Issues should be discussed in the text for North Staffordshire as a whole rather than separately for Stoke and Newcastle e.g. information on commuting patterns between Stoke and Newcastle; areas where economies or housing markets complement or conflict with each other.	GOWM	The Core Strategy up until now has been known as the North Staffordshire Core. Spatial Strategy but to help distinguish ourselves from the part of North Staffordshire within the Staffordshire Moorlands and to avoid confusion, the name of the Core Spatial Strategy has been renamed the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy. In addition to this more integration between Stoke and Newcastle is made within the Spatial Portrait.	Section 3.
27. Detailed information requires to be updated.	RENEW	The Spatial Portrait is a snapshot of the current situation in the plan area. This information remains in the public domain and is supplemented by information provided in Annual LDF Monitoring Report.	Section 3
28. Paragraphs 3.3 – 3.14 – seems only to represent Stoke on Trent not North	Newcastle under Lyme Civic Society	The Spatial Portrait has been revised and now merges the characteristics of both Stoke and	Section 3

Staffordshire. 29. Paragraphs 3.15 – 3.35 – Not enough distinction for Newcastle, no statistics given.		Newcastle thus providing a portrait of the plan area. Separate statistics are provided for both Stoke and Newcastle.	
30. What about more facilities for 10-18 year olds	Mr Kaill	Noted. Issue to be taken forward through the review of the sustainable community strategies and other appropriate development plan documents.	No change.
31. We strongly recommend that this section be expanded to include an overview of the historical evolution and development of the area to help underpin the policy context for its regeneration and for environmental protection and improvement.	English Heritage	Agreed. Historical evolution and development introduced into Spatial Portrait. Production of the Local Development Framework has been underpinned by production of heritage characterisation study referred to in Appendix 2.	Section 3 Appendix 2
32. In terms of quantity HMR fund and programme outweighs other public sector funding sources.	RENEW	Agreed.	No change.
33. Sports and recreation provision is important. Stoke's population takes little exercise. Newcastle's	Sport England	Agreed. The provision of sports and recreation facilities forms a key issue within strategic aim SA2 and core	Paragraph 3.52 Paragraph 4.7

population takes only slightly more than the regional average. This should be reflected in paragraph 3.8		policies CSP5	Paragraphs 6.38 – 6.45
--	--	---------------	------------------------

Revised Preferred Options Section 4 – The Vision			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
34. At paragraph 4.21 rather than focussing on balancing the natural environment and the need for development, the Core Strategy should encompass the principle that development should at the least maintain natural environmental quality and ideally deliver enhancement.	Staffordshire County Council	Agreed. See revised strategic aim SA15 and core policy CSP4.	Paragraph 4.20 Paragraph 6.29 – 6.37.
35. Key Issues should be summarised up front.	GOWM	Agreed. The key challenges are set out in Section 3 ahead of setting out the Strategic Vision and Aims and Spatial Principles.	Section 3

<p>36. The vision is not inspirational; challenging; positive; clear or sufficiently spatially distinctive. It should reflect the area as a whole including both rural and urban and all sectors of the North Staffordshire communities.</p>	<p>Urban Vision GOWM KJD Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust Ecumenical Churches City Link Advantage West Midlands Maer Hills Protection Group</p>	<p>Although there has been some measure of support for the draft vision we take these constructive criticisms on board.</p> <p>A visionary strapline is advanced based on the visioning work of the North Staffordshire Regeneration Partnership. This is then developed into a number of strategic aims.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.2</p>
<p>37. It should be give greater prominence to the history of the plan area past but be based on sustainability principles and cover the period to 2026.</p>	<p>CPRE Savills Natural England Mr Snape Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>It is accepted that transformational change is not needed for all parts of the plan area. However, the challenge in front of us is so immense that a 'business as usual' agenda will not be sufficient. This approach will make best use of scarce resources to deliver necessary change.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.12 – 5.15</p>
<p>38. The vision should contain a meaningful and achievable spatial vision that is distinctive to the area and has ambitious targets.</p>	<p>St Modwens English Heritage Mr Snaith Newcastle 50+ Forum Staffordshire Blind</p>	<p>To reflect the distinctive character and challenges that the area faces a series of integrated and bespoke spatial visions and sub area strategies are advanced to lead change where it is required, often in difficult circumstances. We are the product of our past and this provides both constraints and opportunities.</p>	<p>Section 5.</p>
<p>39. Not all areas require transformation. We should enhance existing valued assets; celebrate the areas diversity and history and</p>	<p>National Trust Regional Planning Board Stoke-on-Trent City Council</p>	<p>The pursuit of sustainable development underpins modern day</p>	

bring more resources in to tackle the areas needs.	Housing Enabling Team	planning and its implications in the plan area are set out in the Area Spatial Strategies and Core Strategic Policies.	
40. The vision should be organic and responsive to stakeholders	Urban Vision	Agreed. This is why the plan is subject to community engagement.	No further change
41. Insufficient priority has been given to 'safer communities'.	GOWM	Agreed. Safety issues incorporated into condensed Strategic Aims.	SA12 and SA16.
42. Add 'community' to the vision	Mr J. Huff	Noted. Though 'community' is not explicitly referred to in the vision 'residents' are. Communities do feature within the Vision strap lines which accompany the Area Spatial Strategies.	Section 5
43. Support vision subject to sport and recreation provision being effectively delivered as part of the LDF.	Sports England	Agreed. See revised strategic aim SA2 and core policy CSP5	Paragraph 4.7 Paragraphs 6.38 – 6.45.
44. Suggested amendment to paragraphs 4.17 and 4.21. We should strive to achieve better.	Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust	Noted. Vision has been condensed to ensure a more focussed approach.	Section 4.

<p>45. How can it be 'just' to bring in more people when there are so many problems already in existence in Stoke?</p>	<p>Councillor M. Coleman</p>	<p>Stoke has suffered from chronic net outmigration for many years and this has led to a number of related problems. The first step in our regeneration strategy is to halt that process so that people who are born and bred in the city have no need to move elsewhere to live a fulfilling life. It is only after we have secured that end and in particular providing a more prosperous economy can we begin to contemplate becoming a net importer of population. See strategic aim SA1</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.6</p>
--	------------------------------	--	----------------------

Revised Preferred Options Section 5 – Strategic Aims			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
46. Include a cross cutting strategic aim for design quality	Urban Vision RENEW	Agreed. Strategic Aim SA16 added specifically on design.	Paragraph 4.21
47. Existing Community Strategy aims and priorities are weak. Provide linkages to Newcastle Community Strategy.	Urban Vision RENEW GOWM	Agreed. The LDF must demonstrate that it is the vehicle for the delivery of the spatial aims of the Community Strategies.  These existing priorities are matters of fact. The process of redrafting the Community Strategy should have regard to the developing Core Spatial Strategy and the said strategy is sufficiently robust to accommodate future versions of the Community Strategy.	Paragraphs 2.13 – 2.17. Appendix 3 for linkages
48. There are too many priorities. Stabilising population decline (at a minimum) is the top priority. Strategic aims should be combined, strengthened and streamlined.	RENEW CPRE Savills Council for British Archaeology	Agreed. Twenty four priorities are too many. There is no need to set out Strategic Aims which replicate national/regional planning objectives and could apply anywhere. The Strategic Aims have been rationalised by the themes of people,	Section 4. Paragraphs 4.5 – 4.23.



		prosperity and place and image.	
--	--	---------------------------------	--

<p>49. Suggested amendments to Strategic Aims 17 - Create a greener North Staffordshire by maintaining and improving its network of canals, green spaces and parks to provide the landscape setting for high quality development of homes, employment and leisure opportunities; opportunities for physical activity and to foster a more sustainable way of life.</p>	<p>Sports England</p>	<p>Agreed. The strategic aims have been rationalised and the emphasis for opportunities for physical activity have been included.</p>	<p>SA2, SA3</p>
<p>50. Enhancement of the City Centre at Strategic Aim SA2 should not be at the expense of the enhancement of other centre. No alternative specified.</p>	<p>DPP for Dransfield Properties Ltd Tesco Hulme Upright Manning (Reef Limited)</p>	<p>Noted. Revised Strategic Aim includes reference to complementary town centres.</p>	<p>SA7</p>
<p>51. Reduction in private car travel should be a strategic aim.</p>	<p>Fulford Parish Council CTC (Cyclists' Touring Club) Right to Ride</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>SA3</p>
<p>52. Strategic Aim 12 does not recognise that out of town or edge of town</p>	<p>KJD</p>	<p>Whilst this may be acceptable in some circumstances a key theme throughout the Core Strategy is to</p>	<p>SA7</p>

development may result in regeneration of such areas.		develop Stoke-on-Trent City Centre and Newcastle-under-Lyme Town Centre. This is inline with the growth aspirations of the RSS.	
53. Provide a separate aim for the rural economy	West Midlands Regional Assembly, Regional Planning Board Willardwillard, Yardley Cross Development Ltd) Willardwillard, (Mr D. Chell) Willardwillard, (Contours) Willardwillard, (Mr D Chell/Mr D Riley)	Agreed.	SA11
54. Concerned at omission of historic built environment from the community strategy aims. Addition suggested.	Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust	The community strategy aims reflects the current community strategy and is a statement of fact. The omission should be addressed as part of the review of the community strategy.	SA14
55. Strategic aim 13 is important but explain further what 'the distinctive but complementary roles of the town centres' are.	Ecumenical Churches City Link	Strategic Aim 13 has now been merged into Strategic Aim 7. The roles of the centres are set out in the Strategic and Spatial Principles.	Paragraph 4.12 Paragraph 5.8.
56. Make reference to 'park and ride' in strategic aim SA15	North Staffs Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Agreed.	SA3

57. Add 'and unfit/obsolescent accommodation' to strategic aim 8	Stoke-on-Trent City Council Housing Enabling Team CPRE	Agreed. Reference included in SA4.	SA4
58. More high tech, well paid jobs are required	Councillor M. Coleman	Agreed. Diversification of the economy underpins the Strategic Aims.	SA5-9 inclusive.
59. Movement around the city needs to be improved, include bus lanes and out of town park and ride areas	Broughton Residents Association	Agreed.	Paragraphs 5.66 – 5.268.
60. Robust design policies should be included within all LDF documentation, embedding design as a priority from strategic frameworks to site specific scales. Design should be treated as a cross cutting issue.	CABE	Agreed.	SA16
61. Officers and members should champion good design.	CABE	Agreed, but not a matter for the Core Spatial Strategy.	No change.
62. Would have liked to see the Community Strategy Aims for Newcastle under Lyme as well as Stoke.	Maer Hills Protection Group	Agreed. Summary of Newcastle's Community Strategy included and linkages provided between the Core Strategy and both Newcastle and	Paragraph 2.15 Appendix 3

		Stoke's existing community strategies provided.	
63. SA 1 – take account of what?	CPRE	We are obliged to be in general conformity with Regional Spatial Strategy. Strategic Aim 1 is unnecessary and has been deleted.	Original SA1 deleted.

64. SA2 – Wouldn't "key regional centre" reflect its focus as the centre of a catchment area rather than as a portal? Isn't the reference to the North Staffordshire overall economy better placed in SA10?	CPRE	Strategic Aim 2 deleted. Content now in revised strategic aims SA5 and SA7.	SA5, SA7
65. SA5 – amend to create a more sustainable urban environment through appropriate location, design and transport linkages by promotion and control of new development.	CPRE	Noted. Improvements made to the strategic aims.	SA3, SA16 and SA17.
66. SA19 – Questions North Staffordshire's 'unique' mining heritage.	CPRE	Agreed. Using the term 'unique' has been removed from revised Strategic Aim 8 but maintained elsewhere in the document.	SA8
67. SA22 – "improve accessibility and transport linkages ..."	CPRE	Strategic Aim removed. Content merged within Strategic Aim 3.	SA3
68. No reference to climate change and exhaustion of fossil fuels.	CPRE	Agreed that this should be strengthened in the Strategic Aim 17 and addressed in core policies	Paragraph 4.22. Paragraphs 6.21 – 6.28

		CSP3.	
--	--	-------	--

<p>69. Should a more specific aim regarding the inclusion of the older people be included?</p>	<p>NUL 50+ Forum</p>	<p>The Vision to which these Strategic Aims amplify is intended to meet the needs of all sectors of the community irrespective of age. It is accepted that needs will vary at different stages in the lifecycle but little purpose would be served in having different strategic aims for each sector of society and would be contrary to the process of streamlining the Strategic Aims.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>70. Amend SA 18 to include the historic environment, archaeological remains and historic landscapes</p>	<p>Council for British Archaeology English Heritage</p>	<p>Noted. Strategic Aims have been revised to provide overall aim and not detailed description or repetition of national policy.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 6.19 – 6.20.</p>
<p>71. SA19 – should be amended to make it clear that the industrial heritage of ceramics and mining and surrounding rural area are not the only tourist attractions. Should be amended to offer encouragement to existing tourist destinations.</p>	<p>Addleshaw Goddard LLP</p>	<p>Agreed. Strategic Aims revised to include existing tourist magnets.</p>	<p>SA8</p>
<p>72. SA12 should be amended to recognise the City Centre as the principal location for</p>	<p>Drivers Jonas, Highland Hanley Ltd</p>	<p>Noted. In line with RSS the revised strategic aim acknowledges the City Centre as the sub-regional</p>	<p>SA7</p>



large scale retail, office and town centre development.		commercial centre.	
---	--	--------------------	--

<p>73. As Newcastle is recognised as performing a complementary role in the emerging RSS, the strategic aims need to reflect this to ensure the centres do not compete for inward investment.</p>	<p>Drivers Jonas, Highland Hanley Ltd</p>	<p>Noted. The revised strategic aim acknowledges Newcastle Town Centre role as complimentary to that of the City Centre. Notwithstanding this fact provision must be made to allow the centre of Newcastle to grow and evolve.</p>	<p>SA7</p>
<p>74. Recommend included a reference to green infrastructure planning in objective SA18.</p>	<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>SA13</p>
<p>75. The Core Strategy should be flexible enough to accommodate any changes arising from the revised RSS.</p>	<p>Town Planning Consultants</p>	<p>Agreed. The Core Spatial Strategy must generally accord with RSS and there is flexibility within the Area Spatial Strategies to taken into account subsequent revisions to the RSS.</p>	<p>Section 5</p>
<p>76. SA9 – to be made more inclusive in terms of the creation of quality environments if it included an aim that residential development provide local formal and natural green space.</p>	<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 6.38 – 6.45.</p>

77. SA18 - amend to include reference to archaeological sites 'registered historic parks, gardens and battlefields' and 'geodiversity'	Staffordshire County Council	Noted. Strategic aims have been revised to provide overall policy position and not detailed description or repetition of national policy.	Paragraphs 6.19 – 6.20.
78. There is no overall strategy of the City canals and we believe this to be an error and should like to see one created. Residential is not the only use of the waterside and we would like consideration also to be given to leisure activities and retailing and a limited amount of light industrial. In addition we would like to see increased facilities for boaters.	Trent and Mersey Canal Society	Canals and canal side development is an important component of integrated regeneration of the plan area and addressed in the strategic aims. Development of canal side locations will be determined on their own merits and having regard to the development plan.	Section 5
79. SA3 - implies that other areas are being labelled as non-sustainable in the long term. Suggests that the specific aim is to discourage development in rural areas.	Mr I. Snaith, Chapel Chorlton	Some areas are considered to be unsustainable locations for rural residential development – i.e. remote settlements/villages with poor access to key services, sites in the open countryside etc.	Section 4 and 5.
80. SA5 - '... more sustainable and distinctive ..'	English Heritage	Agreed. Distinctive incorporated into revised strategic aims.	SA7, SA16

81. SA19 – ‘... high quality environment in the surrounding area ...’	English Heritage	Agreed. This is not restricted to the natural environment.	SA8
---	------------------	--	-----

<p>82. With these policies we have a vision for the future and what seems to be clear guidance, but as always the difficulty arises then these policies have to be implemented at day to day levels. The only way of ensuring a successful outcome is to monitor planning control decisions on a regular basis.</p>	<p>Madeley Conservation Group</p>	<p>Agreed. The outputs of the Core Strategy will be subject to regular monitoring.</p>	<p>Section 8</p>
<p>83. SA8 - the term surplus doesn't fit here so there would need to be some other justification for the demolition of 6000 houses at a time of grave national housing shortage.</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>Although there is a national agenda for further housing development, the majority of the North Staffordshire conurbation is subject to an imbalance in the local housing market. This is reflected in a number of factors including continuing high vacancy rates and unpopular housing areas. In these particular local circumstances 'surplus' is the appropriate terminology.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>84. SA13 - Is vague and meaningless showing no understanding of the different roles of the different town centres.</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>The issues of vibrant and vital centres have been dealt with in the revised strategic aims. The roles of the centres are set out in the area spatial strategies.</p>	<p>SA7  Section 5</p>

85. The aims and priority tables on page 40-44 is vague, immeasurable and repetitive.	Joan Walley MP	Tables have been omitted. Linkage between the Community Strategies and the Core spatial Strategy is shown in appendices.	Appendix 3.
86. SA4 - should be revised to recognise that, in some cases, Greenfield sites may be more favourable than brownfield and should be therefore be considered favourably.	Home Builders Federation Tetlow King Planning, West Midlands RSL Partnership	Each case will be determined on its own merits. However, sustainable brownfield sites will take priority over sustainable greenfield sites.	Paragraphs 5.18 – 5.24.
87. SA9 - Is contrary to Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations. Considering this SA9 should be revised accordingly.	Home Builders Federation	The strategic aim has been revised. The aim provides a platform for further guidance in emerging LDF documents. The provision of community infrastructure is the subject of national planning reform.	SA2  Section 7
88. SA9 - omits reference to places of worship. I feel that it would be appropriate to include it as a strategic aim	Jehovah's Witnesses	The list is not intended to be fully inclusive and facilities such as places of worship would have to be justified on a case by case basis.	No change.
89. SA2, 3 and 7 - Better rail links are required	Mr Richardson	Agreed. Revised strategic aims refer to improvements of public transport.	SA3.
90. SA 17 - City Waterside, how will the residents of these areas cope with the	Mr Snape	We are not aware that this will be a problem.	No change.

increased use of the canals?			
91. SA22 - Does this mean the wholesale demolition of perfectly good housing to satisfy the aspirations of planners, architects and developers, all providing more road space?	Mr Snape	No.	No change.
92. At SA4 redundant farm buildings and land should be classified as brownfield land, particularly in green belt areas.	National Farmers Union	Brownfield land definition set out in Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing'.	No change.
93. At SA16 the aim of safeguarding the green belt must be balanced with the needs of the farms and rural business located within it.	National Farmers Union	Appropriate development within greenbelt is set out in PPG2 'Green Belts'.	No change.

Revised Preferred Options Section 6 – Draft Spatial Strategy Options Introduction / Options A – C

Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<p>94. Support the principle of targeted regeneration Option C</p>	<p>Urban Vision RENEW Sustrans Meir Community Group West Midlands RSL Partnership Mr Kaill Mr Huff Sports England Fulford Parish Council Stoke Vision Bagnall Parish Council Ecumenical City Churches Link North Staffs Rail Promotion Advantage West Midlands Wrinehill Parish Council Broughton Residents Association Centro</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.12 - 5.17.</p>



	<p>Maer Hills Protection Group  Mr D. Woolmer  CPRE  Lear Management  Highways Agency  Newcastle 50+ Forum  Keir Regeneration  Cycle Tourist Club  Addleshaw Goddard LLP  Highland Hanley Ltd  National Trust  Burslem Port Project  Morston Asset  Capital and Counties  Bloor Homes.  Rev. Howard  Staffordshire Blind  Natural England  Mr B. McDyre  Trent and Mersey Canal Society  Severn Trent Water  Mr Snaith  North West Regional Assembly</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Savills landmatch  English Heritage  Hulme Upright Manning  Willardwillard  Madeley Conservation Group  Joan Walley MP  Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners</p>		
<p>95. Whilst supporting the principle of targeted regeneration - dots on a plan are not sufficient, the priority areas need to be named on a plan.</p>	<p>Savills</p>	<p>The priority areas are amplified in the area spatial strategies and will be worked up to detail in various site allocation plans.</p>	<p>Section 5</p>
<p>96. Maintain villages as at present</p>	<p>Mr Huff</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>97. Support the principle of brownfield redevelopment</p>	<p>Urban Vision  Mr Huff</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.18 – 5.24.</p>
<p>98. At paragraph 6.5 expand evaluation by reference to wider regeneration strategies</p>	<p>RENEW</p>	<p>Wider regeneration strategies have been taken into account in the drafting of the Core Spatial Strategy. Paragraph 6.5 of the Revised Preferred Options related to the process of evaluation of options and as such has not been incorporated into the Submission Draft.</p>	<p>No further change.</p>

<p>99. Explore use of the more rigorous Green book options appraisal methodology</p>	<p>RENEW North Staffs Chamber of Commerce and Industry</p>	<p>There is no standard national methodology for LDF strategy appraisal. The analysis provided in the section 6 of the Preferred Option supplemented by the sustainability appraisal is sufficient to make a reasoned choice.</p>	<p>No further change</p>
--	--	---	--------------------------

<p>100. Targeted regeneration should not prejudice private sector regeneration elsewhere</p>	<p>Dransfield Properties Ltd KJD TESCO GVA Grimley St Modwens Home Builders Federation Mr Snape</p>	<p>We are operating in a finite market where development in one area can be seen as an opportunity lost in another. The Core Spatial Strategy sets out a plan led approach in the public interest and in response to the circumstances we face. The approach advocated has failed to deliver sustained strategic regeneration and a more radical solution is required based on spatial priorities.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>101. Rural Dispersal at paragraphs 6.8a, d and e are strategic disadvantages</p>	<p>RENEW</p>	<p>This option was dismissed and no longer forms part of the submission report</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>102. Rural development to the west of the conurbation and along the A53 corridor should be managed to meet local needs whilst ensuring local character is protected and enhanced</p>	<p>West Midlands Regional Assembly</p>	<p>This would be compatible with Option C. See Rural Areas Spatial Strategies.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.240 – 5.268.</p>
<p>103. Is Option A a realistic option?</p>	<p>GOWM Advantage West Midlands</p>	<p>It is accepted that this would conflict with adopted Regional Spatial Strategy as set out in paragraph 6.33.</p>	<p>No change</p>

<p>104. Suggest building a new town in the Stoke/Shropshire Corridor and use brownfield land for factories</p>	<p>Councillor Coleman</p>	<p>Identification of a New town would be a matter for the RSS Revision process. Maximising brownfield development is a key plank of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.18 - 5.24.</p>
<p>105. Uniform Conurbation Development Option B is equivalent to a policy off scenario which does not provide clarity and would reduce investment</p>	<p>RENEW</p>	<p>Option B means that development would be distributed pro rata about the conurbation so that for example future housing allocations would broadly equate to existing housing distributions. It is not a policy off scenario. The policy off scenario is a market led approach where development would take place without policy constraint in the most favoured market areas.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>106. Clarify the disadvantages of Option B at paragraph 6.18</p>	<p>RENEW</p>	<p>The difference between Option B and C is the degree of concentration of urban development. Option B would further out migration and divert scarce resources from areas of greatest need.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>107. Clarify how this option performs well in economic terms?</p>	<p>RENEW</p>	<p>The sustainability appraisal accompanying the Revised Spatial Options (page 21) scores this option positively on the basis that the availability of out of town or peripheral employment sites would be more attractive to investors with</p>	<p>No change</p>

		flexibility to accommodate proposals as and when they arise with no local strategic constraints to development.	
--	--	---	--

<p>108. Water and sewerage is not the 'key' constraint at paragraph 6.22. Policy constraint is the key consideration.</p>	<p>RENEW</p>	<p>This is a significant constraint to practical implementation. The impact on HMR policy is dealt with at paragraph 6.19, 4<sup>th</sup> sentence of the Revised Spatial Options.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.22 of the Revised Preferred Options related to the evaluation of options and as such has not been incorporated into the Submission Draft.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>109. Uniform Conurbation Development – this is the most sustainable option and places future residential development where economic growth is needed.</p>	<p>Norton in Hales Parish Council</p>	<p>Targeted regeneration is more sustainable</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.12 – 5.17.</p>
<p>110. At paragraph 6.24 Option C would increase land values, confidence and investment</p>	<p>RENEW</p>	<p>Agreed, however paragraph 6.24 of the Revised Preferred Options related to the evaluation of options and as such has not been incorporated into the Submission Draft.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>111. Suggest additional text at paragraph 6.26 to show the advantage of linking the option back to delivery of the vision and regeneration</p>	<p>Stoke Vision</p>	<p>Agreed, however Paragraph 6.26 of the Revised Preferred Options related to the evaluation of options and as such has not been incorporated into the Submission</p>	<p>No change</p>

of the urban core. 112. Reference could be made to Stoke Vision's proposals as an example		Draft. Such an approach would time limit the Core Spatial Strategy.	
113. Enhance the advantages of this option at paragraph 6.26	RENEW	Agreed, however Paragraph 6.26 of the Revised Preferred Options related to the evaluation of options and as such has not been incorporated into the Submission Draft.	No change
114. The disadvantage at paragraph 6.27 (e) would be compensated by greater security, confidence and investment	RENEW	Agreed, however Paragraph 6.27 of the Revised Preferred Options related to the evaluation of options and as such has not been incorporated into the Submission Draft.	No change
115. Paragraph 6.27 (f) is only a disadvantage if the choice of locations is too constrained	RENEW	Agreed, however Paragraph 6.27 of the Revised Preferred Options related to the evaluation of options and as such has not been incorporated into the Submission Draft.	No change
116. Welcome the principle of urban centre renaissance and designation of the primary role for the city centre with complementary	Urban Vision	Noted.	No further change.



roles for other town centres			
117. Strengthen the employment strategy by inclusion of a diagram showing 'employment corridors'	RENEW	Further locational details regarding employment are provided for in the Area Spatial Strategies.	Section 5

118. Another housing strategy should be explored comprising housing only in the urban core with a moratorium elsewhere	RENEW	A fifteen year plus moratorium on housing development outside of the urban core is not consistent with national planning policy and is not a realistic strategic option	No change
119. Para 6.27 (g) is an overstatement	RENEW	Agreed, however Paragraph 6.27 of the Revised Preferred Options related to the evaluation of options and as such has not been incorporated into the Submission Draft.	No change
120. Delete last sentence of paragraph 6.28 as being imprecise and unhelpful	RENEW	Agreed, however Paragraph 6.28 of the Revised Preferred Options related to the evaluation of options and as such has not been incorporated into the Submission Draft.	No change
121. Paragraph 6.31 as above	RENEW	As above	No change
122. Table (p.55) requires to be more sophisticated	RENEW	This table attempts to simplify all considerations for the benefit of a disparate audience. However it is not included in Submission Draft.	No change
123. Include comparison with approved regeneration strategies at paragraph 6.35	RENEW	Agreed, however Paragraph 6.35 of the Revised Preferred Options related to the evaluation of options and as such has not been	No change

		incorporated into the Submission Draft.	
--	--	---	--

<p>124. Selection of Option C should be supported by inclusion of regeneration strategies</p>	<p>GOWM</p>	<p>Agreed. These are set out in Area Spatial Strategies.</p>	<p>Section 5.</p>
<p>125. Are the strategic options set out of sufficient detail to allow meaningful community involvement</p>	<p>GOWM</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>126. Targeted Regeneration is the best strategy. To make this document sound this option must be supported by a strong evidence base, for which the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will form part of to ensure sites at lower flood risk are put forward first.</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Agreed. A Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken. This highlights areas that will need further detailed study.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.12 – 5.17.</p>

Revised Preferred Options Section 6 – Draft Spatial Strategy Options – Strategic Issue 1 – Housing Distribution

Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<p>127. There is a typing error at paragraph 6.49 which should read Option 1. Greater clarity is required regarding precise intentions and conformity with regional spatial strategy revision housing development targets</p>	<p>RENEW North Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry CPRE Savills Bloor Homes Staffs Moorlands District Councils B. McDyre Severn Trent Water GVA Grimley St Modwens Mr Snape</p>	<p>Housing development targets are set out in Area Spatial Strategies.</p>	<p>Section 5</p>
<p>128. There are not enough bungalows being built. The Council's have failed to meet resident's affordable housing wishes and provide accommodation near to centres.</p>	<p>Mr Kaill Broughton Residents Association</p>	<p>The strategic aims for housing have been refreshed in Strategic Aim 2 and 4 and the strategy seeks to maximise development at walk in centres.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 4.7 and 4.9.</p>

129. Extend Inner Urban Core to include Tunstall	Mr Huff	The boundary of the Inner Urban Core has been defined to include priority areas of major housing intervention derived from housing market analysis. Tunstall does not fall into this typology	No change
130. In terms of paragraphs 6.44 – 6.50 beware of garden grabbing	Staffordshire Historic Building Trust	Noted but this is not generally a strategic planning issue in North Staffordshire warranting departure from national planning policy	No change.
131. Must recognise that there is a need to provide affordable options for the people who live and work within the countryside	National Farmers Union	Agreed. This is addressed in the Core Spatial Strategy and Core Spatial Policies.	Section 5 Paragraph 6.46 – 6.51.
132. Support but safeguard biodiversity rich brownfield land	North Staffordshire Rail Promotion Group	Noted. Biodiversity addressed within core spatial policies.	Paragraphs 6.29 – 6.37.
133. Need to build 10,000 council homes in Stoke	Cllr Coleman	Noted. Levels of house build to be determined in the RSS Revision	No change
134. Broadly welcome the strategy, but in order to deliver sustainable communities the core strategy must seek to reverse migration by creating employment	Lear Management	Agreed. Development of the local economy is set out in the Area Spatial Strategies.	Paragraphs 5.33 – 5.44. Section 5

opportunities.			
----------------	--	--	--

<p>135. The HA would not object to distribution based on Option 2 subject to RSS. All aspects of a sustainable transport policy (set out in SA3, SA15 and SA22) are critical and should be referred to in the 'Linkages'. This aspect is also critical to other strategies and policies</p>	<p>Highways Agency</p>	<p>Noted. Strategic Aim 3 has been revised.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.8.</p>
<p>136. The Lower Milehouse Lane area of Newcastle is such an area and where regeneration should be a priority.</p>	<p>Keir Regeneration</p>	<p>Agreed. See Newcastle and Kidsgrove Urban Neighbourhood Area Spatial Strategy.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.209 – 5.239.</p>
<p>137. Option 1 allows for flexible growth within the inner and outer urban core areas, whilst offering very limited growth in rural areas. This will protect the valued rural areas and focus growth in the more sustainable locations.</p>	<p>Keir Regeneration</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>No further change</p>



<p>138. Is agreed that development in the rural areas should be limited to proven local need in order to ensure that dispersed patterns of development are not promoted, but rather to support and regenerate the existing main centres of population.</p>	<p>National Trust</p>	<p>'Need' replaced by 'requirements' – subtle difference – 'need' implies affordable housing only, 'requirements' may encompass a degree of market housing to support the viability of local service centres.</p>	<p>No further change</p>
<p>139. Support the principle of developing brownfield land in sustainable locations before greenfield sites. To continue regeneration, housing development should be prioritised to the Inner Urban Core.</p>	<p>HOW Planning (Woodford Land) White Young Green Planning, Capital &amp; Counties</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>No further change</p>

<p>140. Paragraph 6.45 is not supported. Housing in rural areas should not only be limited to local needs. It is contested that given the low rateable value of housing in North Staffordshire that there is place for promoting an appropriate level of high value good quality homes. Allowing limited housing development of open market housing within rural areas would support investment in the highest standards of sustainable design and construction.</p>	<p>Willardwillard</p>	<p>The RSS Phase 2 Revision uses the term local requirements – this tends to imply that a degree of market housing will be acceptable to support the continued vitality and viability of rural service centres and essential rural services /enterprise.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>141. More attention needs to be given to supporting the housing market renewal agenda and ensure that new jobs go side by side with the new housing.</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.8 – 1.19. Section 5</p>

Revised Preferred Options Section 6 – Draft Spatial Strategy Options – Strategic Issue 2 – The Centres Strategy

Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
142. At paragraph 6.68 too many local centres may result in loss of strategic focus	RENEW	Local centres provide the focus for convenience goods, services and community life. Their vitality and viability are an important planning principle.	Approximately 80 centres are listed at appendix 5.
143. The levels of growth set out for each centre should be set out in the core strategy and not left for later development plan documents.	GOWM	The levels of growth are set out in the area spatial strategies	Section 5
144. Public transport to the City Centre is good. Public transport to other retail outlets is poor	Mr Kaill	Access to identified centres remains a priority in revised strategic aim 7.	Para 4.12.
145. Only Hanley should be a regional centre	Mr Huff White Young Green Planning, UK & European Investments Ltd White Young Green Planning, Capital & Counties	Both the City Centre of Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle town centre are defined as a strategic centres in the adopted RSS	No change

146. Need for good cycle way and public transport between centres	Ecumenical Churches City Link	Agreed. Strategic Aim SA3.	Paragraph 4.8.
---	-------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------

147. Clarify what this means in terms of the scale and function of centres	North Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Agreed. See Area Spatial Strategies.	Section 5. Paragraph 4.12.
148. All centres should be treated equally	North Staffordshire Rail Promotion Group	The core spatial strategy presents a balanced and complementary strategy for centres in strategic aim 7 and area spatial strategies.	Section 5
149. Clarify 'Regional Centre boundary as a priority area for development' on the strategy diagram.	Lear Management	Agreed. Detailed boundary to be amplified in relevant site allocation plans.	Diagram 1

<p>150. Agree with the approach, but it must be made clear at para 6.56 that the hierarchy should not be used as a tool to hinder development in lower order centres.</p> <p>151. The centres of Stoke, Longton, and Tunstall should be encouraged to grow and improve and complement their higher order neighbouring centres, and should not be left behind, so that they support the needs of their catchments, in line with PPS6 objectives.</p> <p>152. The Centres Strategy should provide an opportunity to maintain and enhance existing town centres and improve those in areas of deprivation and subsequent need of regeneration in line with PPS6.</p>	<p>King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd Stoke Vision</p>	<p>PPS6 compliant balanced development is advocated in the strategy. All centres are encouraged to grow in accordance with Core Spatial Strategy objectives and targets set out in the relevant area spatial strategy. This is not to say, however, that growth targets should not take into consideration impacts upon the vitality and viability of a specific centre or its neighbours</p> <p>Agreed. See area spatial strategies.</p>	<p>Section 4 and 5</p> <p>Section 5</p>
---	--	---	---

<p>153. Strongly objects to the simplified hierarchy set out. The hierarchy fails to recognise the sub-regional role of the City Centre.</p> <p>154. The Savills Retail Study demonstrates greater capacity for non-food retail in the City Centre than Newcastle. This identified capacity, coupled with the ongoing recognised need to provide significant physical regeneration, should be translated into the retail hierarchy of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>155. The City Centre of Stoke should be placed at the top of the retail hierarchy as the principal location for large scale retail development. Newcastle should be ranked below as a 'complementary' Strategic Centre to reflect its role as a 'Market Town/University Town &amp; Administrative Centre'.</p> <p>156. The Council must work to ensure there is no risk that any policies contained in the</p>	<p>Highland Hanley Ltd</p>	<p>Hierarchy reflects Regional Spatial Strategy and growth aspirations set out in RSS review. See Area Spatial Strategies.</p>	<p>Section 5</p>
--	----------------------------	--	------------------

LDDs could undermine investor confidence in the City Centre and harm its vitality and viability.			
157. Clarify the term Village Services Centres but is marked as Villages on the Core Spatial Strategy Diagram.	National Trust	Villages has been used as consistent terminology in the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy.	Paragraph 5.240 – 5.268.
158. Doesn't take account of the areas further away i.e. Kidsgrove, Butt Lane, Talke and Chesterton. We are on the Cheshire Border – and people often use their facilities - will they be consulted.  159. What about linkages and development of Parkland i.e. Bathpool Park – is there a development plan	Rev. P. Howard, St Martins, Talke	Noted. Local service providers and neighbouring authorities are involved in the consultation process. See Area Spatial Strategies.  Sea Area Spatial Strategies	Section 5  Section 5
160. Add an additional tier – Local Shops and Services. These will play an important role in sustaining local residential communities.  161. Add a fourth tier:- 162. “Local Shops and services”	Mr B McDyre	Agreed.	Paragraphs 5.6 – 5.15, and in particular paragraph 5.8



<p>163. The 3 tiers are agreed but there should be additions/clarification.</p> <p>164. Baldwins Gate is a village that also has key services and facilities and infrastructure which needs additional development to continue to support them.</p>	<p>Willardwillard</p>	<p>The Rural Services Survey identified Madeley, Loggerheads and the villages of Audley Parish as having the most comprehensive provision of key services and therefore the most sustainable locations for any additional development.</p>	<p>Section 5</p>
<p>165. The 3 tiers are agreed but there should be additions/clarification.</p> <p>166. Rural Brownfield Sites. There are likely to be opportunity sites that come forward during the lifetime of the plan that represent the opportunity to redevelop large-scale rural brownfield sites for housing led rural regeneration, such opportunity sites ought to be supported.</p> <p>167. i.e. Pepper Street, Keele</p>	<p>Willardwillard</p>	<p>Noted. The Rural Areas Spatial Strategy includes provision for appropriate levels of rural development.</p> <p>The identification of specific sites is not appropriate for the Core Strategy. Sites will be identified and designated in the respective Site Allocations DPDs.</p> <p>Pepper Street is outside of any settlement boundary, is in the greenbelt, and is not part of any of the 'Rural Service Centres' as such it is unlikely that this site would be considered to be in a sustainable location.</p>	<p>Section 5</p>

<p>168. Does not give sufficient regard to the aspirations of the Burslem Masterplan.</p> <p>169. The Burslem Masterplan needs updating and any update needs to be done in a way that fits with the LDF.</p> <p>170. Burslem needs to develop as a sustainable town centre and to develop economic opportunities around the Port Vale site.</p> <p>171. We should accept that each of the 6 towns has a contributory role to play.</p>	<p>Joan Walley, MP</p>	<p>The core spatial strategy sets out the key role for each centre in the Area Spatial Strategies. In the case of Burslem this will be amplified through the Inner Urban Core Area Action Plan.</p>	<p>Section 5</p>
--	------------------------	---	------------------

<p>172. Supports recognition that the retail strategy has an important role to play in supported the principle of sustainable development. To help implement the retail strategy it is important that a hierarchy of town centres is defined.</p> <p>173. It is not the remit of the core strategy to provide individual strategies and therefore the simplification of the retail hierarchy is contrary to national policy. Option 1 should be pursued and policy CP4 and Core Strategy Diagram should be amended to reflect the structure plan hierarchy.</p>	<p>Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (CSC)</p>	<p>Noted support for hierarchical approach.</p> <p>Not accepted. This is the opportunity to review the Structure Plan hierarchy offering a more bespoke strategy based on . The strategic principles set out in the core spatial strategy will be worked up through site allocation development plan documents.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.6 - 5.11.</p> <p>Section 5</p>
---	---	---	--

Revised Preferred Options Section 6 – Draft Spatial Strategy Options – Strategic Issue 3 – Stoke-on-Trent City Centre			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<b>Option 1 – Traditional City Centre</b>			
<p>174. Clarify does Option 1 include commercial land adjacent to the new Tesco and former Unity House.</p> <p>175. The boundaries of policy areas must be clearly defined</p>	<p>KJD Drivers Jonas, Lear Management King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd</p>	<p>Option 1 includes all the area within the Potteries Way (existing and to be completed).</p> <p>Detailed policy area boundaries will be a matter for other more detailed development plan documents.</p>	No change
<p>176. Option 1 is most suitable option for the Regional Centre. Hanley should remain the key focus for retail and town centre uses.</p>	<p>Drivers Jonas, Lear Management</p>	<p>The core spatial strategy provides for the review of City Local Plan 2001 policy which in respect of the city centre identified a lesser area for the 'City Centre' at Hanley and included Festival Park and the Etruria Road Corridor within a wider 'city centre'. The approach set out in the Core Spatial Strategy represents a continuation of this planning strategy. Development outside the traditional core at Hanley will only be supported where it complements city centre</p>	No change

		regeneration.	
--	--	---------------	--

<p>177. Strongly objects to any proposed extension to the defined City Centre. It is essential the Core Strategy reflects the need to regenerate the City Centre, to enable it to operate as a thriving sub-regional centre. The development of the East/ West Precinct is an important first step and a catalyst to increasing the vitality of the City Centre.</p>	<p>Drivers Jonas, Highland Hanley Ltd</p>	<p>The importance of the East / West Precinct development is agreed. The concerns are noted but safeguards are in place to ensure that development elsewhere does not prejudice regeneration of the traditional city centre</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>178. Option 1 at paragraph 6.74 does not provide for expansion of the City Centre to regional status</p>	<p>RENEW</p>	<p>The proposal does expand the existing adopted City Centre boundary as shown on City Local Plan 2001 in a westerly direction.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>179. The City Centre's Primary Shopping Area should not be extended to include Octagon Park; Festival Park and Festival Heights</p>	<p>DPP for Dransfield Properties Ltd Councillor Coleman DPP Tesco</p>	<p>The core spatial strategy does not propose the extension of the primary shopping area as described.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>180. The extension of the Town Centre does not seem desirable. If there is excess retailing from Hanley it could be directed to</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>No change</p>

Burslem.			
----------	--	--	--

<p>181. Concerned that expansion of the city centre might dilute its vitality and threaten worthwhile buildings</p> <p>182. Option 1 too large</p> <p>183. Option 2 not supported</p> <p>184. Option 3 possibly just for offices</p>	<p>Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust</p>	<p>Stoke-on-Trent City Centre is much smaller than its peers and there is projected needs for retail growth. Policy area designation does not automatically mean loss of worthwhile buildings. Each case to be judged on its merits.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>185. CPRE suggests that the “city centre” title belongs to the Option 1 description. The surrounding area should be given another title(s) – descriptive of their setting and functions e.g. Stoke Etruria Centre, Stoke Festival Centre. The impression then correctly gained would be of a multi-centred City, but one of a wider range of facilities and settings – altogether more attractive and impressive. A further bonus of this concept is in the scope for its design expression and each quarter having its own character whilst echoing a common theme across the</p>	<p>CPRE</p>	<p>Noted. Worthwhile concept to develop in other development plan documents.</p>	<p>No change</p>



wider central area. CPRE would suggest commissioning a design study to illustrate this approach			
<b>Option 2 – Option 1 plus Octagon Park, Festival Park and Festival Heights</b>			
186. Support option 2 subject to inclusion of the Trent and Mersey canal within the boundary as a catalyst for city centre activities	British Waterways Board Trent and Mersey Canal Society	Noted. See below for definition of detailed policy areas.	No change
187. The City Centre's Primary Shopping Area should not be extended to include Octagon Park; Festival Park and Festival Heights	DPP for Dransfield Properties Ltd Councillor Coleman DPP Tesco North Staffordshire Rail Promotion Group	This is not what is proposed. The City Centre Primary Shopping Core is only one of a number of uses acceptable within the city centre. This strategic policy attempts to review existing planning policy which defines the City Centre to include these areas. Current uses at Festival Park and along Etruria Road Corridor are a matter of fact. See paragraph 6.76 of the Preferred Options which sets out the qualification	No change

<b>Option 3 – Options 1 and 2 plus land to the south of Etruria Road</b>			
188. Support Option 3 subject to limitations	RENEW Fulford Parish Council Addleshaw Goddard LLP Turley Associates (Sainsbury's Supermarket)	Noted. The terms upon which land may be released for development within this area will be controlled to protect the regeneration prospects of the traditional City Centre Core	Section 5 – Area Spatial Strategies
189. Great care required. Premature expansion of the City Centre could undermine the vitality and viability of the traditional City Centre Core	City Centre Marketing Manager	Agreed.	Section 5 – Area Spatial Strategies, in particular the City Centre of Stoke-on-Trent Area Spatial Strategy
190. Support exclusion of Option 4 land from the City Centre		Noted	No change.
191. Highway Agency only support such an approach on the basis that the option is subject to vigorous transportation modelling and that any emerging policy requires a robust assessment of the current and realistically achievable infrastructure necessary to underpin the expansion of	Highways Agency Staffordshire Blind	Principle accepted. Preliminary transport assessments have been carried out but detailed modelling is ongoing to determine detailed regeneration programmes.	No further change

the city centre. The Highways Agency need to be involved from the earliest stages.			
192. Extension of the City centre to include Festival Park and the Etruria Road Corridor is supported. The types of uses that can be development should be defined for the different parts of the City Centre.	King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd	Noted. Definition of detailed policy areas is a matter for the other development plan documents.	No change
193. It is important to include the Etruria Road corridor as it forms the principal gateway to the City Centre.  194. We would suggest that that if all of the area south of Etruria Road, up to Clough Street, was included then these uses can be accommodated with retail on the frontage of Etruria Road, set back to allow for landscaping and cycle/footpaths.	White Young Green Planning, Capital & Counties	Noted.	No change
195. We agree that Etruria Road is entirely suitable for retail uses would be	White Young Green Planning, Capital & Counties continued	Noted.	No change

<p>complementary to the city centre. The Strategy implies that there is no immediate retail need. It should be borne in mind that the Council's retail study is just a snapshot in time.</p>			
--	--	--	--

<b>Option 4 - Options 1, 2 and 3 plus land to the west of the Trent and Mersey Canal</b>			
196. Land to the West of the Trent and Mersey Canal should be brought back into employment use	Advantage West Midlands	Agreed in principle but this is not dependent upon designation as part of the City Centre	No change
197. Option 4 land has a risk of flooding	Environment Agency	Noted. Hydrogeological consideration will be material to the determination of detailed regeneration proposals for the area.	No further change
198. Whilst we support the objective of extending the traditional City Centre to provide further opportunities for retail, office and leisure areas as offered by Option 3, Option 4 provides a greater opportunity to secure such uses for the longer term to 2026. We therefore support Option 4.	Barton Wilmore, St Modwens	There is sufficient capacity within the areas of Options 1,2 and 3 to accommodate projected city centre needs and no reason to include sequentially inferior Option 4 within the designated city centre.	No change

<b>Option 5</b>			
<p>199. At paragraph 6.73 add a fifth spatial option including the Fuchs site; TESCO and the land south of Etruria Road</p>	<p>RENEW Mr Huff</p>	<p>Fuchs - Although early plan making representations indicated that we should plan for the contingency of this land becoming available for development latest discussions with the land owner suggest that this is unlikely for the foreseeable future. It is not the brief of this plan to precipitate the relocation of existing employment operations. There are no guarantees that such relocations would occur in North Staffordshire.</p> <p>TESCO already falls within Option 1</p> <p>It is accepted that consideration needs to be given to the future of the 'shatter zone' and area of vacant and scattered commercial uses south of Etruria Road.</p> <p>The existing traditional city centre within the ring road and Festival Park is a matter of fact. The priority is seen to be to reinforce the physical and functional links between the two foci along Etruria Road. Widening the City Centre boundary as suggested would divert attention from this core priority</p>	<p>No change</p>

		consideration.	
<b>Other</b>			
200. Low wage rates do not support increase in retail	Mr Kaill	Retail expenditure is projected to rise and there is capacity for retail expansion over the plan period	No change
201. Major investment is required to tackle current deficiencies in the city centre	North Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Agreed. The City Centre is a regeneration priority	Section 5 – Area Spatial Strategies
202. Equally important is that the City Centre Strategy and related spatial policies area designed with other nearby town centres in mind. We suggest that a criteria based policy in accordance with PPS6/12 should be outlined within any City Centre Strategy, to protect these and other centres.	King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd	The relationship between centres has been dealt with in the centres strategy. The Core Strategy should not duplicate national planning policy set out in PPS6 and PPS12	No change

<p>203. It is important that new development be prioritised in the city centre boundary and more specifically the primary shopping area insofar as new retail uses are proposed. Failure to prioritise the allocation of development opportunities in this way will prejudice the bringing forward of sequentially preferable sites in advance of less sequentially preferable and less sustainable sites.</p> <p>204. Only if there is insufficient land available in the traditional city centre should alternative locations be sought that could require the redefinition of the city centre boundary accordingly</p>	<p>Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (CSC)</p>	<p>Agreed. This is the approach advocated in the core spatial strategy</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>205. Option 3 but some form of rail/tram link would make options 3 and 4 more viable and provide for new activities.</p> <p>206. Please think outside of Hanley</p>	<p>Mr Richardson</p>	<p>Agreed. The strategy advocates development of better public transport links between the component parts of the city centre and Etruria Valley. The precise form of transport has to be determined.</p>	<p>No change</p>



207. This is logical. Use of the existing A500 and dual carriageway road network to service the proposed new city centre is to be lauded.	Mr Snape	As above	No change
Revised Preferred Options Section 6 – Draft Spatial Strategy Options – Strategic Issue 4 – Economic Strategy			
<b>Reference No. &amp; summary of representation</b>	<b>Consultee(s)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Submission Draft</b>
208. At paragraph 6.81 this section needs to be updated in the light of latest NSIEDS projections	RENEW	The strategic context for the Core Spatial Strategy is provided by the emerging RSS Phase 2 Revision and national policy. The North Staffs Integrated Economic Strategy provides locally generated evidence to support economic development. This information baseline is being updated as part of the Experian report which is at a draft stage and will be included in the LDF 'virtual' evidential library.	Appendix 2
209. At paragraph 6.81 employment provision should explore mixed use opportunities.	RENEW	Adopting a mixed use approach is underpinned by national planning policy and it is not necessary to repeat national guidance	No change
210. Option 1 at paragraph 6.90 is not an option	RENEW	Agreed. This option tried, unsuccessfully, to replicate the	No change

		laissez faire approach adopted to employment planning in the past where all jobs were welcomed and permission given for Class B1; B2 and B8 development.	
211. Objection to Option 3 (Mixed Use Employment Land Portfolio) as this could support speculative housing development on existing employment land	RENEW	This deals with future allocations not existing land use areas. The approach adopted appears to conflict with promotion of mixed use referred to above	No change
212. Paragraph 6.101 - there is no reference to the City Centre Business District or the principles underpinning development offices.	RENEW	Strategic office development targets are set out in the RSS Revision and the Business District is referred to in the City Centre Area Spatial Strategy.	Paragraphs 5.66 – 5.105.
213. At paragraph 6.83 there is no reference to Trentham Gardens	Mr Richardson	Agreed, however Paragraph 6.83 of the Revised Preferred Options set the context for consideration of Strategic Issue 4 and as such has not been incorporated into the Submission Draft.	References to tourism made in the Submission Draft, in particular Section 5 – Area Spatial Strategies and at SA8.
214. Include reference to the Premium Employment Site at Blythe Bridge	GOWM Mr Huff	Agreed. Thus North Staffordshire is provided with two Regional Investment Sites	Paragraph 5.38
215. Why does the City Council keep building sheds	Mr Kaill	Buildings are not provided by the City Council. The scale and	Paragraphs 6.3 – 6.18.

		<p>character of buildings is determined having regard to operator requirements, viability considerations and planning policy. Our aim is the raise the standards of design having regard to national planning policy, with Policy CSP1 setting the scene for more detailed policies in DPDs</p>	
<p>216. Welcome reference to the tourism potential of the historic environment at paragraph 6.83. Many others could be added to the list</p>	<p>Staffordshire Historic Building Trust</p>	<p>Noted. It was not the intention to provide a comprehensive list</p>	<p>No change</p>

217. Sustainability needs to be kept at the forefront of economic growth.	Ecumenical Churches City Link	Agreed. This is addressed in the Core Policies CSP1 and CSP4 inclusive.	Paragraphs 6.3 – 6.37.
218. Welcome recognition of the cultural and creative economy	Theatres Trust	Noted	No change
219. Etruria Valley should be designated as a Regional Investment Site	North Staffs Rail Promotion Group Network Rail Morston Assets	Regeneration of the Valley is a priority but is discounted for designation as set out in paragraph 6.95 of the Revised Preferred Options	No change
220. Investment important to attracting well paid jobs	Councillor M. Coleman	Agreed	No change
221. Do not like any of the options. It seems like a “free for all” rather than proposals that would be judged in accordance with Planning Policies.	Maer Hills Protection Group	Noted. Development will be determined in accordance with planning policy	No change

<p>222. CPRE believes that Preferred Option 3, would hardly vary from Option 1.</p> <p>223. The characteristics of the different employment uses listed in Option 2 are so different and incompatible as neighbours, especially in location and design terms, that separation seems inescapable. Therefore CPRE strongly favours Option 2.</p>	<p>CPRE Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Section 5 – Area Spatial Strategies</p>
<p>224. There is no overarching statement included about the general locational criteria for development. It is recommended that this is made more explicit that this Option will be developed within the context of the overall spatial strategy based upon targeted regeneration.</p>	<p>National Trust</p>	<p>There is no need to duplicate national and regional policy in this respect. Local expression is given in area spatial strategies</p>	<p>No change</p>

<p>225. This representation has been submitted to express support of the recognition of 'sui generis' employment generating uses that do not readily fit within an employment/business use class, but which are suitable uses for employment land, such as wholesale warehouse clubs (para. 7.161 and para. 7.168). We agree that this approach will help to ensure a sufficient range and choice of development is brought forward to meet local economic needs and will help to provide a wide range of quality, well paid jobs across a broad range of skills and types, thus assisting in reducing out migration, providing a better future for all residents and creating economic prosperity for the North Staffordshire area.</p>	<p>RPS (Costco Warehouse)</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>226. Support mixed use regeneration of Etruria</p>	<p>Morston Assets</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 5 – Area Spatial</p>

Valley	Trent and Mersey Canal Society Framptons (Severn Trent)		Strategies
--------	--	--	------------

<p>227. The Council has an adequate supply of employment land, and a number are in sustainable locations, which could be redevelopment for alternative uses e.g. housing. The redevelopment of these existing allocations for alternative uses within the Inner Urban Core will provide an opportunity for high level regeneration schemes to be achieved.</p>	<p>HOW Planning (Woodford Land)</p>	<p>Strategic employment development targets set out in RSS Revision. Detailed site allocation plans a matter for other development plan documents</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>228. Supports in principle the proposed RIS site at Chatterley Valley, as long as it is not developed at the expense of the Blythe Bridge site.</p> <p>229. Chatterley Valley is also unlikely to have a detrimental impact of employment sites at Biddulph.</p>	<p>Staffordshire Moorlands District Council</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>



<p>230. We would like to reiterate our desire to see a specific Canals Strategy developed and incorporated into the LDF and the NSCSS. Its primary objectives should be to ensure the protection and enhancement of the waterways and set out a policy for the development of the waterside and its facilities.</p> <p>231. Also we would like to see Burslem Port developed as soon as possible and see the creation of a major new marina (with quality housing) and our preferred location is the northern end of the Etruria Valley.</p>	<p>Trent and Mersey Canal Society</p>	<p>Support for Etruria Valley regeneration noted above.</p> <p>Integration of canals within the core strategy set out in strategic aims and area spatial strategy</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>232. Option 1 is supported as it gives freedom to the market to deliver development that is deliverable in the market place, regard must be had to the key development principle of sustainability</p> <p>233. With Option 1 developers would need to have regard</p>	<p>Hulme Upright Manning (Reef Limited)</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

to high standards of sustainable development and construction.			
--	--	--	--

<p>234. We consider that a flexible approach is required to ensure that the aim of encouraging economic growth within North Staffordshire is maximised. North Staffordshire currently has a weak economic base and employment levels are declining. Consequently, employment generating development should be encouraged to reverse this trend</p> <p>235. We would therefore favour an option that focussed on centres, but also provided the flexibility to permit other sustainable locations. None of the Options suggested appear to provide such an approach.</p>	<p>Barton Wilmore St Modwens</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Section 5 – Area Spatial Strategies</p>
---	----------------------------------	----------------	--



Core Strategic Policies

CP1 – Sustainable Development			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<b>Scope of the Policy</b>			
236. Policies should be concise; bespoke to the plan area; evidentially based; realistic and capable of delivery and should not duplicate national or regional planning policy.	GOWM	Noted. As a result the policy has been merged with CP27 to form a concise overarching strategic policy on sustainability and climate change. This approach will provide the platform for development of future planning policy and guidance within the plan area. We cannot rely on RSS policy alone. Other comments have been taken into account as indicated below.	Policy CSP3.
237. Object. Policy to be replaced by RSS policies	Savills	Sustainability underpins the modern planning agenda and therefore a local policy for the plan area is required. This will provide the platform for the development of future planning policy and guidance in the plan area.	Policy CSP3.
238. Object. In line one amend 'polices' to 'policies'.	Savills	Policy removed.	No change.

<p>239. 'Relax' is considered to be too limited in scope to describe the way people use their environment and what the policy intends to achieve. Would be better expressed if the word 'enjoy' was added to the policy.</p>	<p>Savills</p>	<p>Policy removed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>240. Agree and support the promotion of sustainable development. We welcome in particular the criteria included relating to energy efficiency. We agree that the focus should be on accessible and previously developed land. However the policy does not make it clear that there are circumstances and opportunities where sustainable development can take place in countryside/rural areas.</p>	<p>King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd</p>	<p>Policy has been removed. The approach to development in countryside/rural areas has been reviewed and is set out in the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.240 – 5.268.</p>

<p>241. The policy fails to consider the potential for sustainable development with countryside/rural areas. Proposed amendment to paragraph 3</p> <p>242. “ These locations will focus development on accessible and previously developed land in both urban and rural areas. The countryside and other green spaces should remain protected, and any new development in such areas should be strictly controlled and meet the objectives of sustainable development as set out below and in other related policies.”</p>	<p>King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd</p>	<p>Policy has been removed. The approach to development in countryside/rural areas has been reviewed and is set out in the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.240 – 5.268.</p>
<p>243. Also paragraph 5 should be amended as below. This proposed amendment is appropriate as it clarifies that all proposals should consider the criteria set out.</p> <p>244. “Accordingly proposed development in North</p>	<p>King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd</p>	<p>The approach set out in CP1 has been reviewed.</p>	<p>Policy CSP3.</p>



Staffordshire should ...”			
---------------------------	--	--	--

<p>245. Considers the policy to be overcomplicated and unclear. As it stands this policy does not place great enough emphasis upon focusing development in the City Centre. The policy has no regard to the hierarchy set out in the Centres Strategy. The policy wording has the potential to allow for major development, of any nature, to be located in any location that can demonstrate it is brownfield and/or highly accessible. This could impact upon key objectives to provide regeneration within the City Centre.</p> <p>246. Suggests that the policy be reworded as below.</p> <p>247. New development will make the best use of previously developed land and buildings and will follow a sequential approach to the sustainable location of development through the identification of Stoke-on-</p>	<p>Drivers Jonas, Highland Hanley Ltd</p>	<p>Noted. The policy has been merged with CP27 to form a concise overarching strategic policy on sustainability and climate change. The location of development and the hierarchy of centres are set out within Section 5.</p>	<p>Section 5.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------

<p>Trent City Centre and Newcastle-under-Lyme Town Centre as the main focus for new development supported by appropriate development on highly accessible brownfield sites within the rest of the Major Urban Area'</p> <p>248. Accordingly development should:</p> <p>249. Make the most efficient use of land and existing infrastructure;</p> <p>250. Conserve energy by being well located to in relation to existing employment, services and infrastructure</p> <p>251. Be within close proximity of an existing centre and accessible by public transport, walking or cycling</p> <p>252. Where possible occupy previously developed sites through conversion or re-use in preference to Greenfield sites.</p> <p>253. Conserve buildings, sites and areas of architectural or</p>			
---	--	--	--

historic importance			
254. This makes it almost impossible to successfully obtain development approval for Brownfield sites in rural locations. The policy has been phrased in order to fulfil this objective.	Chapel Chorlton	Policy has been removed. The approach to development in countryside/rural areas has been reviewed and is set out in the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy.	Paragraphs 5.240-5.268.
255. Suggest that consideration be given to clearly defining 'Village Envelopes' across the rural area and to allow limited development within these boundaries.	Chapel Chorlton	As above.	As above.
256. The Council is correct in its approach by adopting the guidance set out in RSS to inform the Core Strategy. In addressing the general principles of sustainability we acknowledge the need for the approach adopted by the Council but we would note that it is important for the Council to recognise that there are instances where there is a need for Greenfield releases in order to meet the development	Savills (Landmatch Ltd)	The current evidence demonstrates that there is no shortage of previously developed land within the plan area and specifically the City of Stoke-on-Trent. With this in mind there would need to be significant reasons to allow the release of a greenfield site for development in advance of developable brownfield sites.	Paragraph 5.18.

targets set within the RSS and that circumstances can often result in brownfield sites not coming forward.			
--	--	--	--

<p>257. Setting a limit on rural housing provision is appropriate. However it must be questioned at this stage whether the provision of only 25% of development being on rural sites can meet emerging housing projections and the growing need for house building and specialist housing and facilities for elderly people.</p> <p>258. It is considered that limited rural development ought to be allowed in and adjacent to rural villages which support key rural services.</p>	<p>Mr G. Willard, Willardwillard, Yardley Cross Development Ltd) D. Chell Contours Messrs Chell and Riley</p>	<p>The approach to development in countryside/rural areas has been reviewed and is set out in the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy.</p>	<p>Para 5.240 – 5.268.</p>
<p>259. This is a ‘catch all’ section. However, it doesn’t say whether they have to meet one or all of the criteria so almost anything could be agreed no matter how bad under this section.</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>Noted. The policy has been merged with CP27 to form a concise overarching strategic policy on sustainability and climate change. The revised policy now provides a number of clear targets for new developments.</p>	<p>CSP3.</p>
<p>260. Support this policy. However, it should be recognised that the uses and diversity of different</p>	<p>Nathaniel Lichfield &amp; Partners (CSC)</p>	<p>Noted. As above.</p>	<p>CSP3.</p>

<p>uses within sites in accessible locations should be the most appropriate for the specific site.</p>			
<p>261. Is supported in principle. Reference may be required to the Centres Strategy in order to define and focus on the most appropriate existing centres in sustainability terms.</p> <p>262. Comment on the criteria-based element of the policy, particularly criteria (f) to (m). The policy suggests that development proposals which fail all of the criteria will not be supported by the City Council, which is considered to be unreasonable.</p>	<p>Barton Wilmore St Modwens</p>	<p>The policy has been merged with CP27 to form a concise overarching strategic policy on sustainability and climate change. Hierarchy of centres set out in Spatial Portrait and Strategic and Spatial Principles.</p> <p>The revised policy sets a number of clear and achievable targets for new developments which are based on the latest best practice standards.</p>	<p>CSP3 Paragraph 3.27 and 5.6 – 5.11.</p>

<b>Residential brownfield (previously developed land) development targets</b>			
263. The brownfield residential development target for Stoke should be increased subject to delivery of key regeneration priorities.	RENEW	Agreed. The target is specified in RSS Revision Phase 2 at 90% for the conurbation.	Paragraphs 5.18 – 5.24.
264. CPRE objects in principle to any take-up of greenfield sites both for environmental and strategic (agricultural land conservation) purposes.	CPRE	Brownfield development targets to be established in RSS Revision Phase 2.	No change.

<b>Monitoring</b>			
265. More targets should be provided	RENEW	Policy has been replaced. See Monitoring Framework.	Section 8.



<b>Sub Clauses (a) to (m)</b>			
266. Sub clauses (f) to (m) should be more forceful	RENEW	Agreed in principle. Content of sub clauses (f) to (m) reflected in revised Policy CSP3.	CSP3.
267. Add 'minimise adverse impacts on the local community'	Mr J Huff	Agreed. However policy has been merged. The impact of development on the local community will be assessed against a framework provided in the Development Control Policies DPD.	No change.
268. Proposed amendment to draft CP1 to include a new sub clause after clause (e):  **) provision of infrastructure, services and facilities where new demand cannot be met by existing capacity.	Sports England	Noted. However policy has been revised. Comment now reflected in Strategic Aim 2.	SA2.
269. Amend paragraph 7.11 first bullet point:  Ensure that the new communities have easy access to schools, shops, sports and recreation facilities etc	Sports England	Agreed in principle. However, policy has merged. Comment now reflected in Strategic Aim 2.	SA2.

<p>270. Support the policy. Welcome reference to SUDS, water conservation, flood risk and these measures must be considered for all development. Suggest rewording the policy as below.</p> <p>i) include water conservation and water quality measures and ensure no adverse impact on water resources and flood risk;</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Agreed. Content now reflected in revised policies CSP1 and CSP3.</p>	<p>CSP1 and CSP3.</p>
<p>271. This policy seems to state that subject to compliance with (f) to (g) all development proposals will be supported. We cannot believe it is the LDF intention to insert these “open sesame” clauses which seems to abdicate any development control other than those in (f) to (g) and support development at any time, in any place.</p> <p>Implementing this policy would see the extinguishing of any hope for improvement of Stoke City, or the protection of amenities over the</p>	<p>CPRE</p>	<p>Policy has been merged. Location of development conditioned by Strategic Spatial Principles and relevant Area Spatial Strategy and underpinned by Core Spatial Policies.</p>	<p>Section 5 and 6.</p>

<p>sub-region. CPRE requests that this policy be reconsidered in the light of these comments. In the interim we table our strongest objections</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>272. The canal network is ‘non footloose’. By this we mean that its location and alignment is fixed, and this dictates where associated essential infrastructure and facilities can realistically be provided.</p> <p>The proposed requirement in criterion c) for development to be in close proximity of an existing centre is of concern to British Waterways as it could place unreasonably constraints on the provision of canal network facilities, going beyond national planning policy. Therefore request criterion c) to be amended as below.</p> <p>c) ‘be accessible by public transport, walking or cycling.’</p>	<p>British Waterways Board</p>	<p>Accepted. Policy has been amended and locational framework to development is set out in Strategic Spatial Principles and relevant Area Spatial Strategy.</p>	<p>Section 5.</p>
<p>273. Proposed amendment e) "conserve buildings, site and areas of architectural, historic or archaeological importance"</p>	<p>Council for British Archaeology English Heritage</p>	<p>Agreed in principle. However, policy has been merged. Comment reflect in CSP2.</p>	<p>CSP2.</p>
<p>274. Supported. Welcomes the emphasis on climate change considerations.</p>	<p>National Trust</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>CSP3.</p>

<p>275. We consider it essential that the policy ensures all development addresses climate change by including measures to reduce CO2 emissions.</p> <p>276. A reference to biodiversity should be included in CP1 para e) alongside the reference to historic environment.</p>	<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Agreed in principle. However, comments reflected in revised CSP3.</p>	<p>CSP3.</p>
<p>277. Include reference to countryside protection.</p>	<p>Staffs CC</p>	<p>Agreed in principle. However, policy has been merged.</p>	<p>Strategic Aim 15.</p>
<p>278. Agrees that development should make the most effective use of land and existing infrastructure.</p> <p>h) agrees that proposals should include SUDS features.</p> <p>Agrees that proposals should include water conservation measure and ensure no adverse impact on water resources and flood risk.</p>	<p>United Utilities</p>	<p>Noted. However, sub clauses have now been deleted as set out above.</p>	<p>CSP3.</p>

<b>Other issues</b>			
<p>279. There is no policy related to alternative energy e.g. wind farms. Some protection is given in CP7. CP21 makes no reference to provision through wind farms. Parish Council have significant concerns regarding the impact on communities.</p>	<p>Norton in Hales Parish Council</p>	<p>Revised Policy CSP3 now sets targets for alternative energy provision. Proposals for renewable energy will be judged on their own merits against guidance contained within emerging LDF documents.</p>	<p>CSP3.</p>
<p>280. We consider that land adjacent to the urban canal network offers much potential for higher density and mixed use development. We would advocate a corridor wide approach to regeneration activity along the network to build on work already done at City Waterside embracing the role of the network as a catalyst for regeneration and a vehicle for improving/transforming the urban offer.</p>	<p>British Waterways Board</p>	<p>Accepted where this is compatible with other regeneration policies. For example, such an approach would not justify canal side development within green belt where this is contrary to strategic planning policy.</p>	<p>This potential is recognised in Area Spatial Strategies.</p>

<p>281. Makes reference to the provision of local facilities in new development. However, it is equally important that deficiencies in the provision of facilities within existing residential areas are identified and addressed.</p>	<p>Malahat Properties</p>	<p>Noted. The Core Strategy supports local initiatives that may emerge. The Core Strategy has limited retrospective powers.</p>	<p>CSP3.</p>
<p>282. Generally supported. The policy ought to be revised to allow for the completion of the employment area at Holditch.</p>	<p>Mr G. Willard, Hulme Upright Manning (Reef Limited)</p>	<p>The Core Spatial Strategy does not make detailed site allocations.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

CP2 – Planning agreements or obligations			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<b>Compliance with National Regulations and Best Practice</b>			
<p>283. Should be in accordance with Government Guidance contained in Circular 05/2005. In this respect planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:</p> <p>A planning obligation must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Relevant to planning;</li> <li>(ii) Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;</li> <li>(iii) Directly related to the proposed development;</li> <li>(iv) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed</li> </ul>	Drivers Jonas Highland Hanley	Agreed although the policy needs to be sufficiently robust to accommodate changes likely to flow from current Government planning reforms	No change



(v) development; and Reasonable in all other respects.			
--	--	--	--

<b>Scope of the Policy</b>			
284. Could health facilities be included in the policy?	RENEW Meir Community Group	Agreed. The health impact of development is a material consideration and is highlighted as a key issue.	Paragraph 3.47 – 3.52.
285. Could public realm and public art be included?	RENEW	Agreed. Policy CSP10 provides scope for public realm and public art to be included.	CSP10.
286. Support particularly sub clauses (c) and (e)	Sustrans	Noted	No change
287. Can planning gain accommodate business support, training, maintenance and crime reduction/	North Staffordshire Regeneration Zone	In principle, yes, subject to site specific circumstances.	No change
288. Where redevelopment is taking place provision should not be required for education because such provision would already be made for existing residents	Tetlow King	Noted. The assessment of need will be based on site specific circumstances.	No change
289. Provision should be made for enhanced design standards to future proof	City Centre Manager	Scheme design is dealt with by other planning policies. It would not be generally appropriate to include	No change

schemes.		in a planning obligation policy	
290. Affordable housing is vital	Mr Huff	Agreed. Affordable housing provision is dealt with in policy CSP6.	No change
291. Support. Include sports and recreation facilities. Recommended calculation formula provided	Sports England	Noted. Developer contributions in relation to sport and recreation facilities is dealt with in revised Core Policy CSP5.	CSP5
292. No objection. 293. Encourage Council to use CPO powers	DTZ	Noted Policy CP34 allows for this	No change No change
294. Policy omission. Incorporate into the strategy a recognition of the need for water and waste facilities	Severn Trent	Agreed. These may be important infrastructural requirements	Paragraph 5.65.
295. Welcome reference to environmental improvements as per part f).	Environment Agency	Noted	No change
296. Support subject to amendment	CPRE	Noted	No change.
297. Support – appears to be fair and appropriate.	Savills	Noted	No change

<p>298. In principle supports this policy in the consideration of where development should assist in securing any necessary infrastructure through S106 Agreements.</p> <p>Under a) Network Rail believes this policy could be improved and more beneficial if a more specific reference was included as to what transport measures could be covered by the policy. Where is has been identified that rail patronage has increased as a direct result of new development, contributions for transport links should be sought. Recent guidance places a much greater emphasis on the significance of rail as an alternative and sustainable method of transport. Network Rail would expect this is to be reflected in any transport assessment and would request that as identified. Network Rail would welcome the commitment of the Council of pooling planning obligations from numerous developments to mitigate their combined impact upon railway in accordance with Circular 05/05,</p>	<p>Network Rail</p>	<p>Noted. Application of this strategic policy will be developed through site specific allocation plans, site specific DPDs and supplementary planning documents, as yet to be prepared. It would be premature to give the undertaken requested at this time</p>	<p>No change</p>
---	---------------------	--	------------------

paragraphs B21-24 and B33-B35.			
--------------------------------	--	--	--

CP3 – Regeneration of the Major Urban Area			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
299. The policy is unclear on the issue of phasing	RENEW	Policy has been removed. The content of the policy is now within the Strategic Spatial Principles where housing phasing is identified.	Paragraphs 5.26 -5.29.
300. How do we measure 'harm'	RENEW	Specific proposals are tested in relation to impact upon development plan objectives and policies. There is no simple formulae although we would welcome any suggestions that RENEW may have, particularly in relation to defining 'harm' to the local housing market	Paragraph 5.17.
301. Support the policy	ATISREAL Mr A Thomson – DTZ Mr P Goode – CPRE Mr M Hopkins - King Sturge (Legal & General)	Noted.	No change.
302. Retail and leisure development need to be focused on the Inner Urban	Jean Ball - City Centre Marketing Manager	Noted. Centres are not restricted to the Inner Urban Core. Hierarchy of centres set out in Spatial Portrait	Paragraph 3.27 and 5.6 – 5.11.

Core.		and Strategic and Spatial Principles.	
303. Delete Knutton and Cross Heath for unspecified reasons	John Huff – European Information Bureau	Hierarchy of centres set out in Spatial Portrait and Strategic and Spatial Principles.	Paragraph 3.27 and 5.6 – 5.11.
304. Include list of significant centres	Mr A Thomson - DTZ	Noted. Hierarchy of centres set out in Spatial Portrait and Strategic and Spatial Principles.	Paragraph 3.27 and 5.6 – 5.11. Appendix 5.
305. Include Stoke Vision regeneration proposals.	Mr A Thomson - DTZ	Notwithstanding Stoke Vision's specific interest it would be inappropriate to specify all the detailed regeneration schemes within the Core Strategy. These are matters for site allocation plans.	No change
306. Support priority given to sustainable development of Keele University and Science Park	Mr E Kelsall – Keele University	Policy has been removed. Focus on Keele University and Science Park has been retained in the Spatial Principles of targeted regeneration and economic development and relevant Area Spatial Strategies.	Paragraphs 5.15 and 5.35.
307. Object. Need to recognise that much of the regeneration will delivered through private initiatives/investment.  308. An extra paragraph should be added to acknowledge the role of private initiatives	Ms K Jukes – Savills	Disagree. Regeneration within the plan area will be primarily delivered between partnership working supported by private investment.	Paragraph 2.18.

in the regeneration process and to make it clear that private development will be welcomed.			
309. Amend the first sentence to read:  310. “ Development, other than for local needs...”	Ms K Jukes – Savills	Policy has been removed. No change required.	No change.
311. Policy CP3 should include criteria based policies which set out the framework for assessing any unforeseen proposal sites which come forward for development (see paragraph 2.12 of PPS12).	Mr M Hopkins - King Sturge (Legal & General)	Policy has been removed. The Strategic and Spatial Principles and relevant Area Spatial Strategies set out the framework for how the plan area will evolve. ‘Unforeseen’ developments will be determined against this framework and other guidance within other development plan documents that may emerge.	No change.
312. The core strategy should fully recognise the Southern Area Regeneration Framework and University Quarter regeneration projects.	Mr M Hopkins - King Sturge (Legal & General)	Policy removed. These are both identified within the Stoke-on-Trent Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy.	Paragraph 5.106.
313. BW Wishes to highlight the role of the canal network within the area as a catalyst for regeneration, stimulating investment in new housing	Mr J Spottiswood – British Waterways	Policy has been removed. The role of the canal network as a catalyst for regeneration is fully appreciated. Both water and greenspace can provide a catalyst for regeneration	Strategic Aim 13, Paragraphs 5.11 and 5.231.



<p>and mixed use development and transforming the urban offer.</p>		<p>where this is consistent with strategic spatial priorities. This theme has been developed throughout the Core Strategy.</p>	
<p>314. We consider that great care should be taken in defining the boundary of the Inner Urban Core.</p>	<p>Mr J Spottiswood – British Waterways</p>	<p>Great care has been taken having regard to needs analysis and the use of sensible planning boundaries.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>315. Housing Development in the Areas of Major Intervention should take priority over other areas as part of the Targeted Growth Strategy.</p>	<p>Mr R Megson – Kier Regeneration</p>	<p>Noted. Specific details on area phasing will be set out in respective Area Action Plans.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>316. Supports the Council's policy to guide strategic regeneration initiatives towards the urban area, but would stress the importance of taking a comprehensive and integrated approach.</p> <p>317. Amend the wording to read 'Areas of Major Intervention'.</p>	<p>Ms C McDade – Drivers Jonas (Highland Hanley)</p>	<p>Noted. Core Strategy seeks to focus development and investment towards the highest priority areas – areas identified as priority areas for intervention and regeneration and restraining development within non priority locations. However, other areas must be allowed to grow in a manner which meets local needs but which does not prejudice the sustainable regeneration of the Inner Urban Core. During the plan period, development within the Outer Urban Area should complement the growth planned for the Inner Urban Core.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>318. Middleport, Burslem and Etruria valley as area of major housing intervention</p>	<p>Mr J Wilson – Tyler Parkes (Morston Assets)</p>	<p>Noted. Detailed allocations will be taken forward in area action plans.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>319. Paragraph 7.37 – agrees that the policy on sustainable development in areas of housing intervention such as</p>	<p>Mr D Hardman – United Utilities</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.18.</p>

<p>Kidsgrove will be implemented through close working with other agencies.</p>			
<p>320. We support this approach which is consistent with the West Midlands RSS as well as government guidance. Under the General Renewal Area heading is Chesterton, which is part of our clients' landholding at Apedale Quarry. This is a prime site for residential development given its sustainable location and the opportunities that it offers to the regeneration of the Chesterton area. In addition the development of this site would offer the opportunity for environmental improvements, all of which has been promoted within the aspirations of RENEW North Staffordshire.</p>	<p>Ms R Flood, Savills (Landmatch Ltd)</p>	<p>The Core Spatial Strategy is not a site allocation plan and cannot include site specific proposals. These site representations will be taken into account during the preparation of detailed development plan documents.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>321. Welcome the reference to Chatterley Whitfield Sustainable Enterprise Park, but no details are given. Suggests an Area Action Plan for this area.</p>	<p>Ms A Smith, English Heritage</p>	<p>The Core Strategy is not intended to be overly descriptive.</p> <p>The need for Area Action Plans is based on our current evidence base and are directed to target the areas most in need. The schedule of AAPs is set out in the Local Development Scheme.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	-------------------------------------	--	-------------------

<p>322. It is contested that only allowing for local needs housing does not accord with national planning policy.</p> <p>323. There is evidence to suggest there is a need for specialist elderly housing, low cost housing and for high value housing to bring the housing stock in line with regional and national levels.</p>	<p>Mr G Willard, Willardwillard (Yardley Cross Dev Ltd) &amp; (Mr D Chell) &amp; (Contours) &amp; (Mr Chell &amp; Riley)</p>	<p>Noted. Policy has been removed. Core Strategy recognised the need for a mixture of housing.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 3.54, 5.112, 5.196, 5.215.</p>
<p>324. As stated under CP4 provision ought to be made as an exception to the general thrust of policy to residentially led redevelopment at Pepper Street, Keele.</p>	<p>Mr G Willard, Willardwillard (Mr Chell &amp; Riley)</p>	<p>The Core Spatial Strategy is not a site allocation plan and cannot include site specific proposals. These site representations will be taken into account during the preparation of detailed development plan documents.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>325. Burslem and Tunstall are sidelined here.</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>Policy has been removed. Hierarchy of centres set out in Spatial Portrait and Strategic and Spatial Principles.</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.27 and 5.6 – 5.11.</p>
<p>326. Supports the promotion of new development, other than for local needs, within the North Staffs Major urban</p>	<p>Ms S. Page, Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (CSC)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Area.			
-------	--	--	--

<p>327. The definition of the Inner Urban Core will be fundamental to the implementation of this policy and, as discussed above, we would advocate that changes be made to the boundary in order to ensure that our clients' site is appropriately recognised as a regeneration priority.</p> <p>328. The intervention and renewal areas referred to in policy CP3 are denoted on the spatial diagram as symbols rather than areas. If these designations are accompanied by pre-determined areas, then these should be identified in the core strategy and consulted upon.</p>	<p>Mr R Thorley (GVA Grimley).</p>	<p>The boundary of the Inner Urban Core has been based on up to date evidence, including the South Stoke HMRI Area Regeneration Frameworks, which RENEW have commissioned GVA Grimley to prepare. GVA Grimley's clients' site lies outside the ARF and Inner Urban Core boundary, and remains so.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
---	------------------------------------	---	-------------------

<p>329. This policy provides greater clarity and flexibility to achieve wider sustainability objectives, provide the catalyst for regeneration and avoid stifling the housing and employment development needed to create a more successful City where people wish to live and work. It recognises, as referred to a paragraph 7.33, the historical settlement pattern of Stoke is made up of a 'family of centres' which need to be focuses for growth to help regenerate communities.</p>	<p>Mr D. Hatcher, Barton Wilmore, St Modwens</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>330. Define with extent and boundaries of Areas of Major Intervention.</p>	<p>Mr Snape</p>	<p>Noted. AMIs shown on Plan 5.</p>	<p>Plan 5 (Page 61).</p>



CP4 – Vitality and viability of centres				
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft	
<p>331. Insufficient attention drawn to the history of urban development</p> <p>332. Roles too descriptive rather than prescriptive</p>	Urban Vision	<p>Add additional text to describe the evolution of North Staffs from 90+ villages, to self sustaining townships now having to serve an increasingly mobile and selective customer base.</p> <p>Explain that the purpose is to set out where we want each town to be circa 2026 i.e. V&amp;V (PPS6) plus particular function and how we intend to get there through the LDF process</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.20</p> <p>Hierarchy of centres paragraphs 3.27 – 3.37 and paragraphs 5.6 – 5.11</p>	
333. Make clear that pedestrian friendly streets with active frontages which fit with the urban grain rather than large floorspace buildings dominated by cars and vehicles	Urban Vision	Add to supporting text / design Quality Policy	Paragraph 6.4 and bullet 8 – Policy CSP1.	
334. Specify mix of uses and limits on anti-social uses.	Urban Vision	Principle accepted but specific limitations not appropriate for none site allocation plans	No Change	

<p>335. Would it be easier to designate Stoke-on-Trent City Centre as a regional centre and Newcastle as a complementary strategic centre.</p>	<p>RENEW</p>	<p>The status of Stoke-on-Trent City Centre (2nd tier) and Newcastle (4th tier) regional centres is determined by Regional Spatial Strategy. The Core Spatial Strategy cannot change this status.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
--	--------------	---	------------------

336. Table 1 should be more prescriptive	RENEW	The table identifies the strategic role for each centre and gives an indication of growth potential. It would be inappropriate to provide more specific proposals in the core strategy. This is a matter for site allocation development plan documents e.g. the City Centre AAP	Hierarchy of Centres paragraphs 3.27 – 3.37 and Roles of Centres paragraphs 5.6 – 5.11
337. How does identification of Stoke as the University Town and Administrative Centre fit with the University Quarter concept and links to Stoke-on-Trent City Centre	RENEW	This proposal is supported by the University Quarter partnership. Students look to Stoke for their convenience needs. Higher order needs e.g. clubbing is satisfied by the City Centre	Hierarchy of Centres paragraphs 3.27 – 3.37 and Roles of Centres paragraphs 5.6 – 5.11
338. Delete Newcastle centre, should only be one sub-regional centre not two	Mr J Huff, European Information Bureau	The RSS identifies both Newcastle and Stoke on Trent as 'strategic centres' in their hierarchy of centres.	No change
339. Clarify relation ship between culture, leisure and sports and creation.  340. All centres should provide for a hierarchy of facilities informed by the PPG17 Sports Strategy	Mrs M Taylor, Sport England	Agreed.  Developed through a Leisure Needs and Playing Pitch Strategies and Sport and Active Recreation Strategies. Linked to Core Spatial Strategy	Paragraphs 6.38 – 6.39  Policy CSP5 and paragraphs 6.40 -6.43
341. Include redevelopment of the Alexandra Pottery Site	Mr C Darley, DPP (Dransfield	List of schemes no longer provided within hierarchy of centres but	No change

in the list of schemes	Properties Ltd)	described in terms of areas of growth to ensure the plan does not run the risk of being immediately out of date.	
342. North Staffs Retail Study conclusions to be updated in the light of the Inspectors report and reference to the retail study projected need deleted	Mr C Darley, DPP (Dransfield Properties Ltd)	Statement of need for Tunstall and implications to be reviewed in the light of Inquiry decisions	Tunstall town centre growth potential outlined within Stoke Outer Urban Area Spatial Strategy.
343. Support general approach	Mr A Thomson, DTZ (Stoke Vision) Mr P Goode, CPRE	Noted	No Change
344. In table 1 the North Staffs Retail Study projections are based on retaining market share. Other significant centres have benefited from recent retail investment and Stoke town centre's catchment has been penetrated by competition from out of centre retail operations.  345. The approach set out in table 1, particularly reference to 4,000 sq m would inhibit the	Mr A Thomson, DTZ (Stoke Vision)	The Stoke Retail study remains the single most comprehensive assessment of retail need at present. It is accepted, however, that its approach is based on continued market share which may elevate the prospects of areas which have benefited from investment and needs to be reassessed during the passage of time and change of circumstances. The priority remains the vitality and viability of centres and helping to redress the balance which has been in favour of out of centre developments. Potential diversion of trade from other regional and	Stoke town centre growth potential outlined within Stoke Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy. Paragraph 5.131 sets out that provision for <i>at least</i> 4,000 square metres net retail floorspace should be brought forward.

transformation of centre. Alternative wording proposed.		significant centres will be an important consideration for the determination of specific in centre retail proposals. Resolution of these issues should not be dependent upon completion of site allocation plan DPDs. The proposed amendments set out in the next column embrace the proposed amendments made under this representation.	
346. Reference to 'regional centres' should be replaced with 'strategic centres' to avoid confusion with Birmingham	Mr D Thew, WMRA	Agreed	Hierarchy of Centres paragraphs 3.27 – 3.37 and Roles of Centres Paragraphs 5.6 – 5.11
347. The table does not state the role of rural service centres or needs or means of delivery.  348. Cross refer to table in the policy	Mr D Thew, WMRA	Agreed, add to supporting text	Paragraph 5.8 regarding roles of rural service centres. The need and delivery of improvements to rural service centres is now contained within the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy. Paragraph 5.253 in particular provides up-to-date information regarding the Borough's Rural Services Survey.
349. The role of Newcastle as market town and as a service and transport centre	Mr D Thew, WMRA	Newcastle is not classified as a regional centre. It is identified in the RSS as a 'strategic centre'	Newcastle Town Centre Area Spatial Strategy and Rural Areas Spatial Strategy.

for the rural area should be strengthened			
350. The character of the Spode site should be retained in any redevelopment	Mr C Wakeling, Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust	Noted. This is important but is not matter for this Core Spatial Strategy	No Change
351. We believe Newcastle should not be seen as a Regional Centre in the same way as the City Centre. It plays an important role but not as significant as Stoke.	Mr S Tibenham, DPP (Tesco)	The status is determined by Regional Spatial Strategy. The scale and nature of development is set out in RSS Revision. The Core Spatial Strategy provides clarification on the characteristics and individual roles of the City Centre and Newcastle town centre.	No Change
352. Greater emphasis should be placed on the expansion and improvement of the University Quarter  Amend “ ... important linkages to Stoke-on-Trent railway station and to the University Quarter which should be further enhanced and expanded along with adjacent areas.”	Mr M Hopkins, King Sturge (Legal & General)	The first part of the amendment is accepted. Revised text on the University Quarter is included.  The spatial extent of Stoke town centre and enhancement of adjoining areas is a matter for site allocation DPDs not the Core Strategy	Paragraphs 5.123 – 5.124.
353. Support the hierarchy as presented.	Ms J Gabilatsou, King Sturge (Claymoss)	Noted	No Change
354. Need to make the names of	Ms J Gabilatsou, King Sturge	A perennial problem which has	Paragraph 3.27 and

<p>the centres clearer. Suggests rename the City Centre to Hanley (Stoke on Trent) as listed in the RSS to avoid confusion between the City centre and Stoke.</p>	<p>(Claymoss)</p>	<p>been corporately resolved by deletion of reference to Hanley and identifying one city centre. RSS Revision also provides greater clarity by referring to Stoke-on-Trent City Centre and not Hanley.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.6 - 5.8</p>
<p>355. Repetition of comment at City centre Strategy above</p>	<p>Ms J Gabrilatsou, King Sturge (Claymoss)</p>	<p>A perennial problem which has been corporately resolved by deletion of reference to Hanley and identifying one city centre. RSS Revision also provides greater clarity by referring to Stoke-on-Trent City Centre and not Hanley.</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.27 and Paragraphs 5.6 - 5.8</p>

<p>356. Strongly objects to the simplified three tier hierarchy set out in Policy CP4. This places City Centre at the same level in the retail hierarchy as Newcastle and is a diversion from the previous hierarchy set out in the Core Strategy in April 2006.</p> <p>357. Focusing new large scale office, retail and residential development within the City Centre is key to sustaining and enhancing the sub-regional role of the City Centre. This should be recognised in Policy CP4 by placing the City Centre of Stoke-on-Trent at the top of the retail hierarchy as the principal location for large scale retail development. Newcastle-under-Lyme should be ranked below as a 'complementary' Strategic Centre to reflect its role as a 'Market Town/University Town &amp; Administrative Centre'.</p>	<p>Ms C McDade, Drivers Jonas (Highland Hanley)</p>	<p>The status is determined by Regional Spatial Strategy. The scale and nature of development is set out in RSS Revision which identifies the four tiers in the network of strategic town and city centres. The Core Spatial Strategy provides clarification on the characteristics and individual roles of the City Centre and Newcastle town centre and carries forward from RSS the level of required provision to 2026 within the Area Spatial Strategies for the City Centre and Newcastle Town Centre.</p>	<p>City Centre of Stoke-on-Trent Area Spatial Strategy and Newcastle Town Centre Area Spatial Strategy.</p>
--	---	--	---



<p>358. Table 1 'Centres' set out on page 85, in support to Policy CP4 of this draft Core Strategy clearly recognises Stoke-on-Trent City Centre's role as the 'Sub Regional Commercial Centre for North Staffordshire and South Cheshire'. It conflicts, however, with the Centres Strategy which undermines the role of Stoke-On-Trent City Centre. A failure to recognise this in the centres hierarchy will result in competition between the Newcastle-under-Lyme and the City Centre in an area where expenditure levels are not high and capacity is uncertain</p>	<p>Ms C McDade, Drivers Jonas (Highland Hanley)</p>	<p>The status is determined by Regional Spatial Strategy. The scale and nature of development is set out in RSS Revision which identifies the four tiers in the network of strategic town and city centres. The Core Spatial Strategy provides clarification on the characteristics and individual roles of the City Centre and Newcastle town centre and carries forward from RSS the level of required provision to 2026 within the Area Spatial Strategies for the City Centre and Newcastle Town Centre. By using retail development levels as an example the level of retail provision for the two centres differs by 85,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p>	<p>City Centre of Stoke-on-Trent Area Spatial Strategy and Newcastle Town Centre Area Spatial Strategy.</p>
<p>359. Needs to be amended. 360. The local urban centres are not identified on the Spatial Diagram, suggest list them in an Appendix. 361. Consistently required with the terms 'Villages' and</p>	<p>Mr A Hubbard, National Trust</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Hierarchy of Centres 3.27 – 3.37. Appendix 5 Diagram 1</p>

<p>'Village Service Centres' as used in para 6.66 (including Table 1 and the Spatial Diagram).</p>			
<p>362. Insufficient recognition given to Middleport Urban Village</p>	<p>Roger Savage, Burslem Port Project</p>	<p>Not referred to in isolation. Middleport dealt with in Area Spatial Strategy.</p>	<p>Stoke-on-Trent Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy.</p>
<p>363. Amend the designation Regional Centre to include the term 'strategic centres' to make any development complies with the requirements of PPG7 and RSS to safeguard local distinctiveness</p>	<p>Mr P Rigby</p>	<p>Take into account during review.</p>	<p>Hierarchy of Centres paragraphs 3.27 – 3.37 and Roles of Centres Paragraphs 5.6 – 5.11</p>
<p>364. Refers to an existing hierarchy of centres but makes no provision for the creation of new centres, or for development outside of these centres, in order to address deficiencies in the provision of local shopping facilities.</p>	<p>Mr G Dyson, Malahat Properties Ltd</p>	<p>Policy removed. Hierarchy and roles of centres provided. New development outside centres will be addressed in site allocation DPDs.</p>	<p>Hierarchy of Centres paragraphs 3.27 – 3.37 and Roles of Centres Paragraphs 5.6 – 5.11</p>

<p>365. We support the hierarchy of centres and particularly the inclusion of Chesterton as a Significant Urban Centre. The policy encourages measures which maintain and promote a diversity of uses in a safe and secure environment with good public transport links between centres and connecting residential areas to centre to maximise the use of centres and promote sustainability. This approach is supported and provides the opportunity for the regeneration of centres by increasing accessibility.</p>	<p>Ms R Flood, Savills (Landmatch Ltd)</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>366. Welcome the strengthened reference under Burslem Town Centre. In the main policy suggest add ‘.. and well designed environment’ to the last paragraph.</p> <p>367. CP4 - add ‘.. and well designed environment’ to the last paragraph.</p>	<p>Ms A Smith, English Heritage</p>	<p>Noted. Policy has been removed. Reference to Burslem retained in Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.114 – 5.116 and 5.125 – 5.130.</p>

368. Support the identification of Loggerheads as a rural service village.	Mr G Willard, (Yardley Cross Dev Ltd)	Noted	No Change
369. The development of organic brownfield sites within Baldwins Gate ought to be supported together with an extension to the village envelope to allow new housing in an appropriate location.	Mr G. Willard, Willardwillard, (Mr D. Chell) & (Contours)	The Rural Services Survey identified Madeley, Loggerheads and the villages of Audley Parish as having the most comprehensive provision of key services and therefore the most sustainable locations for any additional development.	Rural Areas Spatial Strategy
370. The last para promises good public transport links but there are no serious proposals for this anywhere else in the document.	Joan Walley MP	The role public transport will play in the sustainable regeneration of each of the sub-areas is now set out within each of these individual sections. This helps provide a more specific and focused delivery mechanism for targeted regeneration. In addition the spatial principles for movement and access are set out within the strategic spatial principles section this includes progressive development of strategic park and ride facilities, supporting improvements to the bus station, securing improvements to urban and rural bus services and increasing bus priority measures such as the establishment of bus priority corridors linking town	Movement and Access paragraphs 5.55 – 5.65.  Area Spatial Strategies.

		centres and regeneration areas along routes which suffer high levels of congestion and extending bus lanes.	
--	--	---	--

<p>371. Is lacking in any direction for the two distinctive town centres of Burslem and Tunstall. Urgent talks are now needed to refresh the Burslem Masterplan so its aims can be achieved and fit with this plan.</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>The strategy for Burslem town centre is set out within the Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy. Planned intervention in this area through the Housing Pathfinder has lead to the development of an Area Regeneration Framework plan this incorporates earlier work undertaken through the Burslem Masterplan. The Inner Urban Core Area Action Plan will take the principles set out in these documents at a local level and will provide a co-ordinated and more detailed delivery framework.</p> <p>The strategy for Tunstall town centre is falls within the Outer Urban Area, the strategy for this area is set out within paragraphs 5.148 – 5.178.</p> <p>In addition the NSRP Business Plan identifies the revision of the Burslem Masterplan and the need for a Tunstall town centre masterplan is under review.</p>	<p>Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy.</p>
---	-----------------------	--	--

<p>372. The Core Strategy should recognise the fact that the city centre has been in relative decline. The policy should identify a need to strengthen the city centre over the plan period as a matter of priority.</p>	<p>Ms S. Page, Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (CSC)</p>	<p>The Core Spatial Strategy provides clarification on the characteristics and role of the City Centre and carries forward from RSS Revision the level of required provision to 2026 within the City Centre of Stoke-on-Trent Area Spatial Strategy. This section now includes a specified vision for the city centre, strategic principles and means of implementation which provides a focused strategy to guide preparation of the more detailed City Centre and Etruria Road Corridor Area Action Plan.</p>	<p>City Centre of Stoke-on-Trent Area Spatial Strategy</p>
<p>373. supports the identification of the City Centre as being top of the hierarchy. Also that the policy is consistent with PPS6. Given the City Centre's existing role and its identification at the top of the hierarchy it is appropriate for the City Centre to be the focus for city centre uses and for clarification that new development in the remainder of the sub region shall fulfil a complementary</p>	<p>Ms S. Page, Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (CSC)</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No Change</p>

role rather than a competitive role.			
--------------------------------------	--	--	--



<p>374. Supports the identified ambition for the centre as being to create two retail magnets of attraction to the north and south of the primary shopping area</p>	<p>Ms S. Page, Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (CSC)</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>375. We generally support the policy, but comment as follows:</p> <p>376. The term 'local centres' within the policy or Table 1 is not defined, and is not identified on the Core Spatial Strategy Diagram, as suggested</p>	<p>Mr D. Hatcher, Barton Wilmore, St Modwens</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.6 - 5.11 Appendix 5 Diagram 1.</p>
<p>377. Housing plays an important role in regenerating centres by increasing the functionality of centres beyond shopping and office hours. We consider that it is important that a reference to housing is included within this section.</p>	<p>Ms H. Mawson, Home Builders Federation</p>	<p>The Core Spatial Strategy provides clarification on the characteristics and role of the City Centre and carries forward from RSS Revision the level of required provision to 2026 within the City Centre of Stoke-on-Trent Area Spatial Strategy. This section now includes a specified vision for the city centre which includes recognition of the opportunity to provide for a range of city centre living opportunities. This section also identifies strategic principles and means of</p>	<p>City Centre of Stoke-on-Trent Area Spatial Strategy</p>

		implementation providing a focused strategy to guide preparation of the more detailed City Centre and Etruria Road Corridor Area Action Plan.	
CP5 – Rural Housing			
<b>Reference No. &amp; summary of representation</b>	<b>Consultee(s)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Submission Draft</b>
378. Make reference to landscape character and local assessment	Staffordshire County Council – Paul Rigby	<p>Policies for requiring landscape character assessments are likely to be included in the proposed Generic Development Control Policies DPD. Landscape character assessments will also be an important consideration for the identification of sites for inclusion in the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>PPS7 suggests that landscape character designations should be phased out and replaced by detailed criteria based policies. As the CS is essentially strategic, it is deemed that inclusion of such policies would be inappropriate.</p>	The Newcastle Rural Areas Strategy, CSP1 – Design Quality, CSP2 - Historic Environment and CSP4 – Natural Assets set out the strategic approach to ensuring the highest quality development in the rural areas.
379. Refer to safeguarding the historic character of rural settlements and landscapes	English Heritage – Amanda Smith	Agreed	Para 6.10 CSP1 – Design Quality, in particular points 2 & 3 highlight the need for new development to understand

			and respect natural and built heritage in the rural area. CSP2 – Historic Environment provides safeguards and makes reference to the proposed preparation of the Conservation and Heritage Supplementary Planning Document.
380. Key issue of the Rural Renaissance Strategy is to encourage the development of multi – use centres in sustainable rural communities	Advantage West Midlands	Focusing development within the ‘rural service centres’ will effectively maximise access to essential rural services and support the continued vitality and viability of these services.	Rural Areas Spatial Strategy
381. Welcome the approach to the provision of affordable housing in rural areas – in particular agricultural workers dwellings	National Farmers Union – Sarah Faulkner	Noted	No change
382. Low level of projected rural housing is in line with RSS aim of reversing decentralisation from the MUA – but at odds with the Strategic Aim of ‘renewing the urban and rural areas’	West Midlands Regional Assembly – David Thew	Noted. However the projected level of rural housing (900 net additional dwellings to 2026) is derived from the RSS Phase 2 Revision. The focusing of this development to the identified rural service centres will achieve rural regeneration where it is most needed and most sustainable.	Rural Areas Spatial Strategy

383. Puts forward site at Pepper St Keele as an appropriate site for rural housing	Willardwillard – Gez Willard	The Core Strategy does not include site specific housing designations. Furthermore, the site identified is within the Greenbelt and is not one of the identified 'rural service centres'.	Rural Areas Spatial Strategy
384. Rural market housing ought to be allowed in addition to affordable/local needs housing. Limited development should be allowed within or on the edge of key villages	Willardwillard – Gez Willard – Contours Ltd	Rural market housing will be allowed where it meets local requirements within the centres identified as 'rural service centres' and supports vitality and viability of local services.	Rural Areas Spatial Strategy
385. How is 'close working with Parishes' achieved?	Ian Snaith	The authority works closely with Parish Councils to support the production of Parish Appraisals, Parish Plans and Parish Housing Needs Surveys.	
386. Supported – necessary and appropriate	National Trust – Alan Hubbard	Noted	The principles of this policy have been absorbed into the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy
387. Strongly support	Madeley Conservation Group – Gordon Lancaster	Noted	The principles of this policy have been absorbed into the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy.
388. Make positive reference to the vital role played by	Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust – Christopher Wakeling	Noted	The 'vision' for the Rural areas spatial strategy – Paragraph

<p>historic buildings in the rural area</p>			<p>5.241, specifically refers to the value of the rural built heritage and historic environment.</p> <p>CSP1 – Design Quality and CSP2 – Historic Environment will ensure that all new development contributes positively to an area’s natural and built, heritage and identity.</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>389. Policy should read - 'proven need for affordable housing that is not capable of being provided within village settlement boundaries'</p> <p>390. Exception sites will inevitably increase the need to travel by private transport. Policy should read - 'does not appreciably increase the need to travel by private transport'</p>	<p>Campaign to Protect Rural England – P. Goode</p>	<p>The rural exceptions policy approach included in this document conforms to the approach detailed in PPS3 – if no suitable sites within the village envelope, then adjacent sites will be considered.</p> <p>Disagree - proven need suggests that residents will most likely to be rural workers or already reside in the rural area. Therefore it will arguably reduce the need to travel.</p>	<p>Core Policy CSP6</p>
<p>391. Add clause – 'providing utility service capacity is available to serve development'</p>	<p>United Utilities – David Hardman</p>	<p>The policy is no longer included in the Core Strategy. It is a valid point. However, there is no evidence presented to raise serious concerns that the preferred option will adversely impact on capacity. The relatively low level of development proposed, and the focusing of this in the existing rural service centres, including Audley, would suggest that this should not be an issue.</p> <p>Furthermore Policy CSP3 – Sustainability and Climate Change, requires all development to incorporate high standards of water</p>	<p>Rural Areas Spatial Strategy</p>

		efficiency and energy consumption, and encourages the provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)	
--	--	---	--

392. Supports the approach to rural exception sites.	West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium – Rachel Lim	Noted	Core Policy CSP6
<p>393. Policy fails to recognise demand for housing – makes no reference to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p> <p>394. Constraining housing provision in the rural area may impact upon the economic potential of the rural area.</p> <p>395. May also result in reverse migration – rural workers having to live in the conurbation.</p> <p>396. Constraining rural market housing development may impact upon delivery of affordable housing through S106</p>	Home Builders Federation Ltd – Hanna Mawson	<p>The submission report now makes numerous references to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment as a key source of evidence for housing policies/strategies within the document.</p> <p>The level of rural housing is set in the RSS Phase 2 Revision.</p> <p>The relatively conservative targets for rural housing development are intended to support the regeneration and revitalization of the conurbation. This is in accordance with policy UR1 – Implementing Urban Renaissance – the MUAs, in the adopted RSS and further is amplified in the Targeted Regeneration section of the Core Strategy</p> <p>Focusing this development in the ‘rural service centres’ should ensure that rural enterprise will not be impeded and the continued role these centres play will be maintained and enhanced.</p>	<p>Rural Areas Spatial Strategy</p> <p>See Paragraph 5.12 onwards – Targeted Regeneration.</p> <p>Core Policy CSP6</p>



		<p>Any impact upon the needs of local workers and the delivery of affordable housing will be closely monitored. The affordable housing policy sets a threshold of 5 dwellings for S106. This should enhance the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>The use of rural exception sites (if needed) will effectively address any potential shortfalls.</p>	
--	--	--	--

CP6 – Rural Economy			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
397. Present wording very negative – implies that rural growth will be regarded as exceptional. Make reference to retention of existing businesses	Staffordshire County Council – Paul Rigby	Noted – the approach towards rural enterprise as detailed in the Rural Areas Strategy is worded far more positively.	Rural Areas Spatial Strategy
398. Unnecessary - remove	GOWM – Sarah Hunt	Noted -	The principles of this policy have been absorbed into the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy and CSP6 – Affordable Housing.
399. Encourage rural enterprise to modernise, diversify and collaborate  400. Important to identify sites for employment generating development with access to the road system	Advantage West Midlands – Mark Pearce	The Rural Areas Strategy now presents a far more positive approach towards encouraging rural enterprise  Noted – A key aim of the principle of ‘targeted regeneration’ is to maximise access to employment opportunities. This will be a key issue when identifying suitable sites.	Rural Areas Spatial Strategy  Paragraph 5.12 onwards – Targeted Regeneration

<p>401. Needs to recognise and support high levels of economic activity in rural areas. Needs to support the provision of new infrastructure essential to changing agricultural practices. Activities in section 7.61 should not be considered an exhaustive list – and should not stifle innovation.</p>	<p>National Farmers Union – Sarah Faulkner</p>	<p>Noted – the approach towards rural enterprise as detailed in the Rural Areas Strategy is worded far more positively and is in accordance with PPS7 and PPS9.</p>	<p>Rural Areas Spatial Strategy</p>
<p>402. The use of the word ‘only’ makes the policy overly restrictive. The RSS proposes a proactive approach towards stimulating rural economic activity.</p>	<p>West Midlands Regional Assembly – David Thew</p>	<p>Noted – the approach towards rural enterprise as detailed in the Rural Areas Strategy is worded far more positively and is in accordance with PPS7 and PPS9.</p>	<p>Rural Areas Spatial Strategy</p>
<p>403. Supported</p>	<p>Willardwillard – Gez Willard</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>The principles of this policy have been absorbed into the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy</p>
<p>404. Supported</p>	<p>National Trust – Alan Hubbard</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>The principles of this policy have been absorbed into the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy</p>

405. Strongly support	Madeley Conservation Group – Gordon Lancaster	Noted	The principles of this policy have been absorbed into the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy
406. Make positive reference to the vital role played by historic buildings in the rural area	Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust – Christopher Wakeling	Noted	The ‘vision’ for the Rural areas strategy – Paragraph 5.241, specifically refers to the value of the rural built heritage and historic environment.
407. Presents re-draft of para 7.59 to reflect move towards agricultural diversification through energy crops/bio fuels	Campaign to Protect Rural England – P. Goode	Noted – In so far as this does not impact upon the area’s valuable natural assets which are critical to the quality of the plan area’s character and environment.	The approach towards economic enterprise in the Rural Areas Strategy, whilst not going into this level of detail is highly supportive of agricultural diversification.  See also CSP4 – Natural Assets
408. Supports promotion of tourism and leisure in rural areas.  409. Criteria C could be prejudicial to rural regeneration as it requires all development to result in substantial environmental improvement and reduce impact on the countryside in all cases – goes beyond	British Waterways – Victoria Johnson	Noted. This policy has been absorbed into the Rural Areas Strategy which takes a far more positive stance on rural enterprise, but without compromising natural assets and environmental quality.	Rural Areas Spatial Strategy

national planning policy.			
<p>410. Remove the word 'local'</p> <p>411. Policy is unduly restrictive as it does not allow development of</p> <p>412. previously undeveloped land</p>	King Sturge – Joanna Gabilatsou	The approach taken towards prioritising development on previously developed land is entirely in line with national and regional planning policy and international, national and regional sustainability objectives.	The principles of this policy have been absorbed into the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy

CP7 – Countryside Protection			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
413. Welcomed – should include a continued commitment to landscape character area approach	Staffordshire County Council – Paul Rigby	<p>Policies for requiring landscape character assessments are likely to be included in the proposed Generic Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>Landscape character assessments will also be an important consideration for the identification of sites for inclusion in the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>PPS7 suggests that landscape character designations should be phased out and replaced by detailed criteria based policies. As the CS is essentially strategic, it is deemed that inclusion of such policies would be inappropriate</p>	The Newcastle Rural Areas Strategy, CSP1 – Design Quality, CSP2 - Historic Environment and CSP4 – Natural Assets set out the strategic approach to ensuring the highest quality development in the rural areas and the protection of local landscapes and biodiversity.
414. Unnecessary - remove	GOWM – Sarah Hunt	Noted.	CSP4 – Natural Assets – hopefully presents a more 'locally distinctive' strategic policy which hopefully GOWM will find more acceptable.
415. Policy is quite negatively	Advantage West Midlands	The Rural Areas Strategy and CSP4	CSP4 – Natural Assets

phrased – ‘...will <u>only</u> ,,,,’		– Natural Assets present a far more positive approach to ensuring that new development minimizes any impacts upon the plan area’s natural assets	Rural Areas Spatial Strategy
416. Wording does not adequately incorporate biodiversity conservation interests in keeping with PPS9 – suggest alternative wording g) ‘Protect and enhance biodiversity and geological features of conservation interest.....’	Natural England – Robert Duff	Comments from GOWM stated that this policy simply repeated national policy and was therefore superfluous and should be removed from the document.  In light of these comments, the revised policy presents a more strategic ‘locally distinctive approach’.  Any detailed, criteria based policy will be included in the Generic DC Policies DPD	CSP4 – Natural Assets
417. Make reference to Staffs County Council’s historic landscape characterisation project	English Heritage – Amanda Smith	Given the decision to delete this policy, a specific reference to this project is not considered necessary. It may, however provide important evidence for policies in the Generic DC DPD and for site selection in the Site Allocations DPD.	No change
418. Broadly supportive – should recognise that agricultural businesses have the most scope for the sensitive	National Farmers Union – Sarah Faulkner	Noted	No change

management of semi natural habitat			
419. Supported	National Trust – Alan Hubbard	Noted	The principles of this policy have been absorbed into the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy – and CSP4 Natural Assets.



420. Support	Madeley Conservation Group – Gordon Lancaster	Noted	The principles of this policy have been absorbed into the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy – and CSP4 Natural Assets.
421. Make positive reference to the vital role played by historic buildings in the rural area	Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust – Christopher Wakeling	Note	The ‘vision’ for the Rural areas spatial strategy specifically refers to the value of the rural built heritage and historic environment
422. The policy should recognise the countryside as a valuable resource for recreation and sport Certain sports activities can only take place in the countryside and should be encouraged in the right locations	Sport England – Maggie Taylor	The ‘vision’ that precedes the Rural Areas Strategy recognises the important role the rural area plays as a destination for leisure activities.	Para 5.241
423. Replace ‘manage’ with ‘maintain’ 424. Make specific reference to ‘ancient woodland’	Woodland Trust – Justin Milward	‘Ancient woodland’ is classed as ‘Sites of Biological Importance’ (SBI) and therefore is afforded protection through CSP4 the Natural Assets policy	Reference to ancient woodlands in Spatial Portrait – para 3.41 Protection of SBIs in CSP4 Natural Assets

<p>425. Policy needs to define the term 'tranquillity' If it is not defined then it simply becomes a value judgement</p>	<p>British Waterways – Victoria Johnson</p>	<p>Comments from GOWM stated that this policy simply repeated national policy and was therefore superfluous and should be removed from the document.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the revised policy presents a more strategic 'locally distinctive approach'.</p> <p>Any detailed, criteria based policy will be included in the Generic DC Policies DPD</p> <p>This may address issues such as tranquillity</p>	<p>CSP4 – Natural Assets</p>
<p>426. Amend f) – delete 'significantly' add 'archaeological remains' and 'historic buildings'</p>	<p>Council for British Archaeology - Mike Hodder</p>	<p>Comments from GOWM stated that this policy simply repeated national policy and was therefore superfluous and should be removed from the document.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the revised policy presents a more strategic 'locally distinctive approach'.</p> <p>Any detailed, criteria based policy will be included in the Generic DC Policies DPD</p>	<p>CSP4 – Natural Assets</p>

<p>427. Add 'maintain' to h)</p> <p>428. The policy criteria do not support economic opportunities in the countryside – only countryside protection. Need to reflect PPS7 more closely in this regard.</p> <p>429. Either define 'non-renewable' resources or delete from 7.70</p>	<p>King Sturge – Joanna Gabrilatsou</p>	<p>The original policy was not intended to be read in isolation. CP6 set out policy regarding the rural economy.</p> <p>Both CP6 and CP7 have been absorbed into the Rural Areas Strategy and CSP4 Natural Assets.</p>	<p>CSP4 – Natural Assets</p> <p>Rural Areas Spatial Strategy.</p>
--	---	--	---

CP8 – Green Belt			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
430. Unnecessary -remove	GOWM – Sarah Hunt	Noted	The issue of the Greenbelt is dealt with in the broad strategy and the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy
431. Support no decrease of greenbelt – should aspire to increase	City Centre Marketing – Jean Ball	Noted.	No change
432. Puts forward site at Pepper St Keele as an appropriate site for rural housing	Willardwillard – Gez Willard	The Core Strategy does not include site specific housing designations. Furthermore, the site identified is within the Greenbelt and is not one of the identified ‘rural service centres’	Rural Areas Spatial Strategy
433. Object to changes made to this policy – which allow for proposed amendments to the Green Belt in other DPDs. No case has been presented as to why this would be necessary to meet the development needs of North Staffordshire	Atisreal/Dyson Industries – Claire Harron	The RSS Phase 2 Revision pp96 states – ‘Should there be insufficient sites on previously developed land of sufficient size, quality and location.....some greenfield development for employment purposes may be necessary’	See Portfolio of Employment Land - para 5.36 – 5.50.

<p>434. Within the plan period it is likely that the University and Science Park will have to consider on-going and additional development proposals that will not be able to be accommodated with the current development envelope. Therefore further development would require amendment of the current greenbelt boundary.</p>	<p>Keele University – Simon Morris</p>	<p>The Core Strategy recognises the importance of Keele to the continued prosperity and vitality of the plan area</p> <p>The Core Strategy should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate further expansion of the University and Science Park as and when it is needed.</p> <p>Although the amount of land take up can vary significantly from year to year, we currently we have approximately a 16 – 17 supply of employment land. Therefore it is not considered appropriate at this stage to support/promote major incursions into the Greenbelt.</p> <p>However, if and when a proposal comes forward it would be possible to be considered where all other preferable alternatives have been considered (see paragraph 5.45).</p> <p>Detailed proposals or Masterplans could be accommodated within future DPDs or any future revision of the Core Strategy</p>	<p>Para 5.12 onwards - Targeted Regeneration,</p> <p>Para 5.18 onwards – Priority to brownfield sites</p> <p>Para 5.33 onwards - Economic Development,</p> <p>Para 5.240 onwards - Rural Areas Spatial Strategy</p>
---	--	--	---

CP9 – Housing land supply			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
435. RENEW recognise this is an interim position pending clarification of RSS Revision Preferred Option Proposals	RENEW	Agreed. Drafted in line with RSS and able to accommodate reasonable modifications in the future.	Paragraph 5.25
436. Provision should be based on latest assessments and policy provide for specific affordable housing needs	Ms Rachel Lim, Tetlow King Planning (West Midlands RSL Partnership)	Agreed. Policy targets will be determined by RSS Revision. We are likely to be required to specify overall affordable provision for Stoke and Newcastle drawing on sub regional housing assessment work	Policy CSP6
437. Indication given of levels of sports facilities required and the importance of completing the sports assessment	Mrs M. Taylor, Sports England	Noted. Priority has been given to completion of the technical work.	Policy CSP5
438. Newcastle needs to provide for more high quality housing and the levels set out in Option B i.e. 7,500 dwellings should be increased.	E. Kelsall, Keele University	The council will work closely with developers to ensure that housing provision throughout the plan period meets the needs of all sections of the community. There is significant potential for providing high quality housing on previously developed	Targeted Regeneration  Newcastle and Kidsgrove Urban Neighbourhoods Area Spatial Strategy

		land within the conurbation	
--	--	-----------------------------	--

<p>439. Support the role of refurbishment.</p>	<p>Dr C. Wakeling, Staffordshire Historic Building Trust Mrs M. Yates, Housing Enabling Team</p>	<p>Agreed where appropriate</p>	<p>Policy CSP2</p>
<p>440. Refers to demolition of housing stock and replaced on a like for like basis, however this will depend on the sustainability of the location for development. Some existing stock may be in areas of flood risk and may not be suitable.</p>	<p>Ms L. Hackwood, Environment Agency</p>	<p>Undertaken Level 1 Flood risk assessments that would highlight areas that need further investigated.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.15</p>



<p>441. The proviso must be introduced here that these figures are derived from national household numbers, government policy regarding building rates, apportionment of national statistics at regional level to Districts. It is to be assumed that some changes will result dependent upon the outcome of the Regional Spatial Strategy. The figure of 22,200 can't therefore only be a working hypothesis.</p> <p>442. CPRE recommends that this position should be made clear in Policy CP9 reflecting the considerations overleaf in 7.92, 7.93 and 7.94.</p> <p>443. We commend the Authority's cautious approach, but fear that the final figure may involve some considerable increase in numbers, perhaps requiring substantial</p>	<p>Mr P. Goode, CPRE</p>	<p>Noted. Drafted in line with RSS and able to accommodate reasonable modifications in the future.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.25</p>
---	--------------------------	--	-----------------------

amendments to current strategies and programmes of implementation.			
--	--	--	--

<p>444. Object – it is considered that a cautious approach is not the one to take at the start of the LDF period. The Council should opt for the 'Managed Growth' strategy which fits better with the objectives of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>445. The Core Strategy should be flexible enough to cope in light of the changes to RSS.</p>	<p>Ms K. Jukes, Savills</p>	<p>This is not a cautious strategy. It is a transformational strategy. Policy to be deleted and replaced by RSS revision</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.25</p>
<p>446. The figures of 15,000 dwellings could well change with the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy.</p>	<p>Mr J. Spottiswood, British Waterways Board</p>	<p>Agreed. Draft looked at implications of the range of options currently on the table</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.25</p>
<p>447. Generally support but be more bold for Burslem Port</p>	<p>Mr R. Savage, Burslem Port Project</p>	<p>Noted. Included within 5.105</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>448. Question the level of housing distribution proposed. Further explanation needs to be given.</p> <p>449. Also an explanation is required of the housing distribution in tables 2a and</p>	<p>Mr D. Bridgwood, Wardell Armstrong (Bloor Homes)</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 5 Strategic Spatial Principles</p>

2b.			
-----	--	--	--

<p>450. The cautious approach is supported until further clarity on the net figures being used in the RSS. The right balance of supply and demand is crucial</p>	<p>Margaret Yates, Stoke Housing Enabling Team</p>	<p>Noted. Drafted in line with RSS and able to accommodate reasonable modifications in the future.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.25</p>
<p>451. The increase in the plan period and therefore the target for the number of dwellings to be constructed by 2026 is welcomed and is considered to provide a realistic target which is in accordance with both National and Regional policy.</p> <p>452. Paragraph 7.92 acknowledges that the amount of housing to be built will be set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision and will be influenced by factors such as birth and death rates, the number of houses needing to be built for those which have been demolished and reduce the level of vacant properties. This acknowledgement is welcomed and provides the</p>	<p>Ms R. Flood, Savills (Landmatch Ltd)</p>	<p>Agreed. Drafted in line with RSS and able to accommodate reasonable modifications in the future.</p>	<p>No change</p>

<p>opportunity for further work to be done to establish the means by which demand is met.</p>			
<p>453. Housing figures will be need to be adjusted in line with emerging RSS.</p>	<p>Mr G. Willard, Willardwillard, (Yardley Cross Development Ltd) &amp; (Mr D. Chell) &amp; (Contours) &amp; (Mr D Chell/Mr D Riley)</p>	<p>Agreed. Drafted in line with RSS and able to accommodate reasonable modifications in the future.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.25</p>
<p>454. There is no justification in planning or policy terms for such wasteful and wanton destruction of homes let alone any economic or sustainability justification. It seems that this framework is just accepting this policy. There is real question mark here and elsewhere about what the point of this document is</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>The Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder programme has been endorsed by the Secretary of State and funding approved on the basis of an agreed strategy. The Core Spatial Strategy sets out indicative levels of demolition based on the latest available information and to assess replacement requirements. These are not prescriptive and each case needs to be determined on its merits.</p>	<p>Appendix 4 and paragraph 5.28 and 5.29</p>
<p>455. As discussed earlier, it is suggested that this policy should make provision for a minimum of 28,500 new dwellings.</p>	<p>Mr R. Thorley, GVA Grimley</p>	<p>Drafted in line with current RSS.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.25</p>

<p>456. It is unclear what the preferred option for housing supply is, due to the evolving West Midlands RSS. Since the Spatial Options consultation, the RPB has subsequently consulted on a further 'reference figure' at an event on the 6 of June, which is above Option 3 outlined within the Spatial Options document. If this figure, which provides an indicative 'direction of travel', were pursued within the Preferred Option RSS, the Core Strategy will need to be revised again in order to reflect the increase. The HBF advises the Local Planning Authority to take forward the higher figure in light of this new information.</p>	<p>Ms H. Mawson, Home Builders Federation</p>	<p>Drafted in line with RSS and able to accommodate reasonable modifications in the future.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.25</p>
---	---	---	-----------------------

CP10 – Housing distribution			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
457. Policy CP10 For Stoke, table 2a indicates that the entire housing requirement will be met through existing commitments and by new development within the inner urban core, renewal areas or town centres. There is no housing provision for the remainder of the City. We are concerned that this approach places a lot of pressure on the delivery of development in specific areas and from existing commitments. This could be considered to represent an inflexible approach and one which could see the authority fail to deliver it's housing targets if development dos not come forward as anticipated. In light of this and given the	Mr R. Thorley, GVA Grimley	<p>Development focussed within the City Centre, Inner Urban Core and priority areas within the Outer Urban Areas is wholly consistent with the RSS and supportive of Housing Market Renewal objectives in terms of targeting new housing development.</p> <p>Provision is made for housing elsewhere and development progress will be monitored and if necessary revised in the event that strategic housing targets fail to be delivered.</p>	Section 5 Strategic Spatial Principles



<p>national policy emphasis on delivery, we would encourage a housing distribution that is less prescriptive.</p>			
<p>458. Policy CP10 Firstly, the overall level of housing land supply should reflect comments made in relation to Policy CP9 above. Subject to increasing the level of overall housing supply to at least 28,500, we would support the approach of increasing the proportion of housing to be found within the OUA, as shown in Diagram 2.</p> <p>459. As a result of the above comments, we object to the statement made at paragraph 7.106, as it is considered that insufficient capacity has been provided for within the OUA and therefore further housing supply within this area is required to be identified.</p>	<p>Mr D. Hatcher, Barton Wilmore, St Modwens</p>	<p>The Core Spatial Strategy makes provision to accommodate RSS Phase 2 revision housing development targets and the area spatial strategies are sufficiently robust to accommodate additional development in the event that this may be required.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>460. Policy CP10 Whilst supporting the principle,</p>	<p>Ms Rachel Lim, Tetlow King Planning, West Midlands RSL</p>	<p>Policy provides for 950 dwellings in the rural area. Additional provision</p>	<p>No change</p>

rural housing should not be ruled out where there is overriding need or benefit to be gained	Partnership	would have to prove compelling need on a site by site basis.	
461. Policy CP10 Clarify that this includes for private sector mixed use housing within mixed use town centre schemes	Mr A. Thompson, DTZ, Stoke Vision	Agreed need for clarification	Paragraphs 5.8 – 5.18
462. Policy CP10 Consideration should be given to the release of Green Belt land to accommodate high quality housing development	E. Kelsall, Keele University	The Regional Spatial Strategy Phase Two Revision states that no urban extensions to the conurbation are likely to be needed in the period up to 2026.  Furthermore, the RSS states that authorities should ensure that all suitable and sustainable brownfield land is released for housing prior to the release of any greenfield land.	Targeted Regeneration  All Area Spatial Strategies
463. Policy CP10 New housing to be in the urban core	M Yates, HET	Cannot preclude house building elsewhere	No change
464. Policy CP10 The housing policies should consider the impact of growth in rural settlements, particularly those on the fringe of North Staffordshire.	Mrs M. Edwards, Norton in Hales Parish Council	Dealt with under Rural Areas Spatial Strategy	Paragraph 5.240 – 5.268.

<p>465. Policy CP10 Concur with the general principles set out in Policy CP10.</p> <p>466. We do think however that, bearing in mind the importance for the urban fabric of housing distribution the need will arise for CP10 to be somewhat extended ultimately to embrace the difference considerations involved.</p>	<p>Mr P. Goode, CPRE</p>	<p>Noted Matter to be reviewed following RSS Revision</p>	<p>Section 5 Strategic Spatial Principles</p>
---	--------------------------	---	---

<p>467. Policy CP10 Object – revise the numbers in accordance with the Managed Growth strategy to better reflect the regeneration aims of the Council.</p>	<p>Ms K. Jukes, Savills</p>	<p>Policy to be deleted and replaced by RSS revision</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.25</p>
<p>468. Policy CP10 Table 2a on page 112 should be adjusted to take into account losses that will occur in addition to planned demolition.</p>	<p>Ms K. Jukes, Savills</p>	<p>Targets include for demolitions. To be revised in the light of RSS Revision</p>	<p>Amend table Section 5.25</p>
<p>469. Policy CP10 We are concerned that the proposed distribution as set out in Table 2a does not appear to allow scope for sustainable urban previously developed sites adjacent to the canal network to come forward which lie outside the Inner Urban Core and other areas listed in Table 2a beyond existing commitments.</p>	<p>Mr J. Spottiswood, British Waterways Board</p>	<p>This representation is made in the context of BWB promoting a development site on the edge of the Inner Urban Core at Whieldon Road.</p> <p>Provision is made for development outside of the priority areas, where this does not prejudice the regeneration of the Inner Urban Core and City Centre</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.165</p>

<p>470. Policy CP10 continued A key challenge is therefore to ensure delivery of housing requirements. In this regard, the approach to housing delivery should include measures to address any shortfall that might arise as result of the proposals in Table 2a. PPS3 requires local authorities to demonstrate that existing commitments are deliverable via robust assessment before including them within housing land supply calculations.</p>	<p>Mr J. Spottiswood, British Waterways Board</p>	<p>Current housing land bank is PPS3 compliant</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>471. Policy CP10 It is considered that a greater emphasis needs to be put on prioritising regeneration in the areas of major intervention over those in the urban remainder and rural areas, so that new housing in the AMI can be delivered in areas it is most needed.</p>	<p>Mr R. Megson, Kier Regeneration</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

<p>472. Policy CP10 Supported on the basis that the development in rural areas is to meet purely local need as demonstrated through an appropriate assessment. It is suggested that it would be beneficial for this aspect to be identified in the Policy itself.</p>	<p>Mr A. Hubbard, National Trust</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Rural Areas Spatial Strategy</p>
<p>473. Policy CP10 Support</p>	<p>Mr R. Savage, Burslem Port Project</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>474. Policy CP107.111 – agrees that the policy will be implemented through close working with other agencies.</p>	<p>Mr D. Hardman, United Utilities</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>475. Policy CP10 important that the thrust of new housing is in the urban core.</p>	<p>Margaret Yates, Stoke Housing Enabling Team</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>No change</p>

<p>476. Policy CP10 Our previous comments on this policy remain (as below).</p> <p>477. We understand the reasoning behind the figures but we consider that it is unhelpful to refer to the terms 'minimum' and 'maximum' when the precise levels of development in each of these areas cannot be appraised at this stage.</p> <p>478. We consider that identification of the targets alone is sufficient and would enable a degree of latitude when sites come forward for development in the future. We therefore object to the inclusion of the terms 'minimum' and 'maximum'.</p>	<p>Ms R. Flood, Savills (Landmatch Ltd)</p>	<p>The Core Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise residential development within the Inner Urban Core and minimum targets are established. The term 'maximum' has been deleted from the remainder of the City and a target established.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.71, 5.126 and 5.156</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>479. Policy CP10 Housing figures will be need to be adjusted in line with emerging RSS.</p> <p>480. It is also contested that allowing only 25% of housing in rural parts of N-u-L is out of step with rural/urban distribution levels application elsewhere in the country.</p> <p>481. As the Council is keen to promote housing around Newcastle but no evidence has been produced that sufficient land exist to meet the minimum housing targets in the urban area. Accordingly and in the absence of the same limit for Rural housing the maximum targets ought to be increased.</p>	<p>Mr G. Willard, Willardwillard, Yardley Cross Development Ltd) Site Proposal, Newcastle</p>	<p>Development targets for rural housing are derived from the RSS Phase 2 Revision.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to make comparisons with other parts of the country. The plan area has its own distinctive characteristics and challenges. A key aim of the RSS is to support the regeneration of the MUA, this will require a degree of restraint outside of the MUA. This is reflected in the rural/urban split in the revised RSS</p> <p>The borough council is currently carrying out a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment; this will provide accurate evidence of the development capacity within the borough's urban areas.</p> <p>The housing figures are derived from the RSS Phase 2 Revision. The RSS states: - 'No urban extensions to the conurbation are likely to be needed in the period up to 2026'</p>	<p>No change</p>
--	---	--	------------------



<p>482. Policy CP10 With these policies we have a vision for the future and what seems to be clear guidance, but as always the difficulty arises then these policies have to be implemented at day to day levels. The only way of ensuring a successful outcome is to monitor Planning Control decisions on a regular basis.</p>	<p>Mr G. Lancaster, Madeley Conservation Group</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>483. Policy CP10 All targets should be expressed as a minimum. The Council, rather than preventing housing delivery, should be actively looking to ensure it maintains a supply of land and retains developer interest, if it is to minimise the inherent delays that go with needing to implement a 'step change' and increase housing land availability</p>	<p>Ms H. Mawson, Home Builders Federation</p>	<p>The Core Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise residential development within the Inner Urban Core and minimum targets are established. The term 'maximum' has been deleted from the remainder of the City and a target established.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.71, 5.126 and 5.156</p>

CP11 – Phasing of housing developments			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<p>484. Policy CP11 Further work is required on phasing</p> <p>485. Could phasing be carried out in three year time bands to accord with HMR funding regimes</p>	RENEW	<p>Revised</p> <p>See above. Five year time frames accord with PPS3 requirements. What happens if HMR funding disappears? In any event phasing is likely to be specified in RSS Revision.</p>	<p>Section 5 Strategic Spatial Principles</p> <p>No change</p>
<p>486. Policy CP11 continued</p> <p>487. Could Newcastle development be directed towards Stoke?</p> <p>488. More detailed monitoring required</p>	RENEW	<p>As separate planning authorities, each will be required to have their own housing development targets. The potential for some unsustainable development potential in Newcastle to be preferentially accommodated on sustainable capacity within Stoke.</p> <p>Remains</p>	No further change
489. Policy CP11 Comments from CP10 apply as well. We think it will be found that the construction targets for	Mr P. Goode, CPRE	Noted Matter to be reviewed following RSS Revision	No change

later years for the plan period will increase rather than reduce.			
---	--	--	--

<p>490. Policy CP11 Object – The figures need to be adjusted to better support the regeneration initiatives of the Council. Suggests increasing the housing completion numbers at the beginning of the period as to kick start the regeneration process.</p> <p>491. If the Council is unsure of the figures required then evidence should be collated to inform the policy and sure the phasing is appropriate for its purpose.</p>	<p>Ms K. Jukes, Savills</p>	<p>Policy to be amended to reflect RSS Revision and phasing. Savills only comment on the Stoke element</p>	<p>Amend. Housing Phasing paragraph 5.26 – 5.29.</p>
<p>492. Policy CP11 No objection, the figures are likely to need adjustment</p>	<p>Mr G. Willard, Willardwillard, Yardley Cross Development Ltd) Site Proposal, Newcastle</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Revised. Housing Phasing paragraph 5.26 – 5.29.</p>

<p>493. Policy CP11 Again, the overall level of housing land supply should reflect comments made in relation to Policy CP9 above.</p> <p>494. The phasing of the housing target perversely slows down the redevelopment of sub-standard housing stock, which is considered inappropriate and hinders regeneration objectives. Subject to our comments in relation to Policy CP9 and Policy CP10 above, we would suggest that the additional housing numbers should be weighted towards the early phases of the Plan period.</p>	<p>Mr D. Hatcher, Barton Wilmore, St Modwens</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Housing Phasing paragraph 5.26 – 5.29.</p>
---	--	--------------	---

CP12 – New residential development requirements			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
495. Policy CP12 Support sub clause (c) although reference should be made to affordable housing policy	Ms Rachel Lim, Tetlow King Planning, West Midlands RSL Partnership	Affordable housing requirements addressed in CSP6.	CSP6
496. Policy CP12 Overall objective is supported, but the detail is considered to be weak in its drafting. The wording in Criterion g) should be tightened to account with the sequential approach and policy requirements as set out in PPS3. Para 7.125 does not accord with PPS3 and will fail the test of soundness unless special justification can be established.	Ms K. Jukes, Savills	Policy has been removed. Where residential development will be located and the justifications is now revised within the Strategic Spatial Principles and relevant Area Spatial Strategies.	Section 5
497. Policy CP12 This policy does not accord with other policies, in particular Strategic Aims and CP1.	Ms K. Jukes, Savills	Policy has been removed. Where residential development will be located and the justifications is now revised within the Strategic Spatial Principles and relevant Area Spatial	Section 5

		Strategies	
498. Policy CP12 Criterion c is likely to require more justification through a specific DC policy.	Ms K. Jukes, Savills	Agreed. Strategic approach to be developed in other DPDs	No change

<p>499. Policy CP12 Criterion e) - replace the word 'increase' by 'improved'.</p>	<p>Ms K. Jukes, Savills</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Reworded Strategic Aim 2</p>
<p>500. Policy CP12 This policy needs to be amended or a new policy included that deals with the dramatic increase in the elderly population and fact that existing housing stock is largely unsuitable for meeting their needs.</p> <p>501. Para 7.125 – is out of step with regional and national planning policy and does not accord with the principles of sustainability development as it simply diverts pressure to less sustainable locations.</p>	<p>Mr G. Willard, Willardwillard, Yardley Cross Development Ltd) Site Proposal, Newcastle</p>	<p>Mixed housing developed to meet needs of all community.</p>	<p>Strategic Aim 4</p>
<p>502. Policy CP12 The recognition of the role of new residential developments in supporting regeneration, retaining population and helping economic objectives is</p>	<p>Mr D. Hatcher, Barton Wilmore, St Modwens</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>No change</p>



supported.			
------------	--	--	--

<p>503. Policy CP12 Small homes should be linked with excellent sound insulation, garden, storage space and car parking.</p>	<p>Mr G. Lancaster, Madeley Conservation Group</p>	<p>Noted. Revised policy produced on design quality.</p>	<p>CSP 1</p>
<p>504. Policy CP12 This policy stipulates in g) 'that residential development will be located on previously developed land which can reasonably be regarded as requiring redevelopment in preference to greenfield land'. We consider that preference should be for development on 'sustainable' site, giving priority to brownfield, however, recognising that there may be some sustainable greenfield sites which may be favourable for development.</p>	<p>Ms H. Mawson, Home Builders Federation</p>	<p>Priority to brownfield sites retained</p>	<p>Section 5.18 – 4.24</p>
<p>505. Policy CP12 Welcome housing development support for existing urban centres</p>	<p>Urban Vision (Design Review Panel) – Mick Downs</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>

506. Policy CP12 The case should be made for a limited number of low density housing sites	Urban Vision (Design Review Panel) – Mick Downs	Consider inserting a new density policy. Give a clearer indication of the range of densities that may be acceptable	Section 5.14
--	---	---	--------------

507. Policy CP12 Housing new build must accord with, and not demonstrably harm, the HMR strategy for the conurbation.	RENEW	Agreed	Paragraph 5.17
508. Whilst RENEW acknowledges that by study that North Staffordshire performs as a single housing market, at the local level the market interactions can be complex		Agreed	No further change
509. RENEW support CP 12 (G)		Noted.	
510. Policy CP12 (New residential development requirements) Unnecessary	RENEW	Agreed	CP12 removed. Included within Section 5
511. Policy CP12 Support	Atisreal – Ms Claire Harron for Dyson Industries	Noted	No change
512. Policy CP12 Include for sports and recreation at sub clause (e)	Mrs M. Taylor, Sports England	Agreed in principle	Strategic Aim 2
513. Policy CP12 Support	Mr A. Thompson, DTZ, Stoke Vision	Noted	No change
514. Policy CP12 New urban housing only to be provided where there is convenient	Dr C. Wakeling, Staffordshire Historic Building Trust	Accessibility by sustainable transport modes will be a key determinant of the acceptability of	Strategic Aim 3

<p>access to public transport and safe public routes</p>		<p>housing proposals. Having regard to GOWM comments it may not be helpful to add an item already covered in national policy</p>	
<p>515. Policy CP12 Add promotion of the use of sustainable building code. Policy CP12 is there potential to add something specific here in relation to sustainable development and in particular promoting the use of the Sustainable Building Code?</p>	<p>M Yates HET</p>	<p>Review. Can this best be achieved elsewhere? Loathe restricting progressive development of standards, otherwise the plan will rapidly date</p>	<p>CSP3</p>
<p>516. Policy CP12 Suggested that the policy itself should be prefaced by para 7.128 – but including “the right amount ...”</p> <p>517. We would wish to see included here the underlying policy of “creating housing of a quality to attract residents and to progressively upgrade the whole urban environment”. This has seemed to us to be the crux of the whole planning system and the lead must be given to the</p>	<p>Mr P. Goode, CPRE</p>	<p>Policy has been removed. Where residential development will be located and the justifications is now revised within the Strategic Spatial Principles and relevant Area Spatial Strategies</p>	<p>Section 5</p>

Council's to prospective developers and their architects who cannot be expected to deduce this need without guidance.			
---	--	--	--

<p>518. Policy CP12 It is considered that a greater emphasis needs to be put on prioritising regeneration in the areas of major intervention over those in the urban remainder and rural areas, so that new housing in the AMI can be delivered in areas it is most needed.</p>	<p>Mr R. Megson, Kier Regeneration</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.12 – 5.17.</p>
<p>519. Policy CP12 Para 7.124 - I suggest that while NuL is a separate authority, there is a value premium on residential property in NuL that may not be apparent to the quoted 'outsider'.</p> <p>520. Para 7.128 – too many flats being built. Need more family homes and executive housing.</p>	<p>Mr R. Redgewell, Newcastle under Lyme Civic Society</p>	<p>The concept of a single North Staffordshire housing market is very useful for the formulation of planning/housing/regeneration strategies. However this does not mean that significant variations and local distinctions within this market are not recognised. The individual 'area strategies' in the submission document reflect and address these differences.</p> <p>The type of development will be dependent upon the most up to date local evidence e.g. – the Strategic Housing Market Assessment</p>	<p>Section 5</p>
<p>521. Policy CP12e agrees that residential development will demonstrate that existing community facilities, key</p>	<p>Mr D. Hardman, United Utilities</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>SA2</p>

<p>services and infrastructure have the capacity to absorb the additional demand arising from the development.</p>			
<p>522. Policy CP12 Criterion g) – whilst we support the alternation of the wording and the introduction of the term ‘in preference’, we would note that it is important for the Council to recognise that there are instances where there is the need for Greenfield releases in order to meet the development targets set within the RSS.</p>	<p>Ms R. Flood, Savills (Landmatch Ltd)</p>	<p>Noted. Brownfield (and thus Greenfield) development targets are set out in RSS Phase 2 revision</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.19</p>
<p>523. Policy CP12 we recommend that criterion (f) should also be extended to promote high quality design which respects the character of the area. An essential information base for the implementation of the policy is the programme of intensive and extensive characterisation surveys. We hence recommend that the supporting text makes</p>	<p>Ms A. Smith, English Heritage</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>CSP1 and CSP2</p>



<p>direct reference to the survey work and its practical application in the context of delivering new residential areas and informing the refurbishment of the existing stock. We also consider that the general thrust of paragraph 7.125 might better fit with a focus on safeguarding historic suburban areas often characterised by large garden plots.</p>			
---	--	--	--

CP13 – Affordable housing			
<b>Reference No. &amp; summary of representation</b>	<b>Consultee(s)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Submission Draft</b>
524. Policy CP 13 Welcome clear and consistent approach to affordable provision based on solid evidential base	Ms Rachel Lim, Tetlow King Planning, West Midlands RSL Partnership	Noted	No change

CP14 – Gypsy and traveller sites			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
525. Policy CP14 The submission Strategy should include the results of the G&TTA	Government Office for the West Midlands Sara Hunt	Agreed	Included within CSP7
526. Policy CP14 It should specify where site allocations will be made	Government Office for the West Midlands Sara Hunt	In the case of Stoke specific allocations, if required will be identified in either of the three AAPs or the Site Portfolio DPD	Noted will be in future Site Allocations
527. Policy CP14 Para 7.145 – should include a statement to the effect that ‘semi-mobile static homes are not to be sited, other than for use of the site warden’. If the intention is to allow semi-permanent, mobile homes then the policy should state this fact.	Mr R. Redgewell, Newcastle under Lyme Civic Society	Noted	No change
528. Policy CP14 clarify policy with regard to the term “Council”.	Mr P. Rigby, Staffs CC	Take into account during review	No Change

529. Policy CP14 paragraph 7.44 include a reference to each component of the historic environment.	Mr P. Rigby, Staffs CC	Take into account during review	No change
--	------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------

530. Policy CP14 Existing powers should be used vigorously and promptly to control illegal camping and waste of public	Mr G. Lancaster, Madeley Conservation Group	Enforcement not subject to CSS	No change
531. Policy CP14 Welcome recognition of need to address G&T needs	Stephen Staines, Friends Families and Travellers	Noted	Included in CSP7 – paragraph 6.53
532. Policy CP14 The submitted CS needs to be more specific regarding the needs for Stoke and Newcastle. Advice is offered regarding material considerations and information sources.	Stephen Staines, Friends Families and Travellers	Agreed. North Staffs GTAA will clarify requirements for Stoke and Newcastle. Updated assessment to be provided in the CS	Included in CSP7 – paragraph 6.55
533. Policy CP14 Include reference to RSS Revision Phase 3, interim measures, delivery mechanisms and timetables	Stephen Staines, Friends Families and Travellers	Agreed	Included within CSP7 – paragraph 6.54
534. Policy CP14 Concerned that LDF programme will not deliver sites within the required timeframe. Suggest separate DPD on G&T	Stephen Staines, Friends Families and Travellers	LDFs to be produced in accordance with due process. Core Strategy takes primacy. Unlikely to be able to produce separate DPD any earlier. North Staffs GTAA to include for	No change – paragraph 6.57

		delivery	
535. Policy CP14 LA / RSL G&T provision is part of affordable housing	Stephen Staines, Friends Families and Travellers	Acknowledge in affordable housing policy	No change
536. Policy CP14 Potential sources of provision: self managed sites; S106 funded; Council or RSL provision; Public sector land provision; shared ownership	Stephen Staines, Friends Families and Travellers	Explore realistic potential in North Staffs. This should form part of the North Staffs GTAA assessment and delivery programme	Included in GTAA
537. Policy CP14 Support criteria based policy but definition of reasonable access will need to be clarified. Revision to heritage considerations required	Stephen Staines, Friends Families and Travellers	Noted and agreed within revised policy.	CSP7
538. Policy CP14 Work with travellers group to identify sites	Mr D. Lingwood, Ecumenical Churches City Link	Noted. Allocations will be dealt through site allocation DPDs.	No change.
539. Policy CP14 The policy should reflect the guidance in 7.142 that Gypsy and Traveller sites within the Green Belt are normally inappropriate.	Mr P. Goode, CPRE	The policy should not duplicate national policy	No change

<p>540. Policy CP14 Amended to include reference to heritage features in addition to conservation and archaeological importance. (as below)</p> <p>541. The site should not adversely affect areas of nature conservation importance, designated heritage features or their settings, or areas of archaeological importance'.</p>	<p>Mr A. Hubbard, National Trust</p>	<p>Review</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>542. Policy CP14 paragraph 7.44 include a reference to each component of the historic environment.</p>	<p>Mr P. Rigby, Staffs CC</p>	<p>Take into account during review</p>	<p>No change</p>

CP15 – Economic opportunities			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<p>543. This says nothing about retention of existing businesses/clusters of activity.</p> <p>544. Nothing is said about accommodation of employment activities displaced by HMR activity.</p> <p>545. Expand upon the principles underpinning office policies CP15; CP16 and CP20.</p>	Renew	<p>This policy has been reclassified as the Spatial Principles of Economic Development. As set out within the Portfolio of Employment Land Section both authorities will be conducting comprehensive assessments of their existing supply of land available for economic development through employment land reviews, in line with RSS Revision. The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of future provision and will indicate which areas of existing businesses/clusters of activity will be retained. As with the accommodation of employment activities displaced by the HMR strategy sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs, figures to come out of RSS Phase 2 Revision do not take into account RIS sites or business activities displaced by the housing</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>See Economic Development Section (Strategic Spatial Principles) (Paragraphs 5.33 - 5.51)</p>

		<p>renewal process.</p> <p>This section outlines the RSS Phase 2 Revision targets for office floorspace (Paragraph 5.50)</p>	
546. Provide new space for manufacturing pack and innovative technologies	Renew	<p>Government guidance is moving away from the designation of sites for single or restricted use classes. The Core Strategy is intended to last for a long period of time and it would be unduly prescriptive to specify the requirements of a specific economic development trend. Better to deal with the issue generically unless a specific need is identified at a local level through evidence gathering for Area Action Plans and site specific DPDs.</p>	No Change
547. Support subject to proposed textual improvement	Mr A Thomson, DTZ, Stoke Vision	<p>Noted. Textural improvements referring to the significant urban centres and the regeneration opportunities they present particularly in terms of mixed use, the investment they can attract and the resulting diversification of the local economy accommodated within the Spatial Principles of Economic Development (Bullet point 2) and Area Spatial Strategies for the City Centre and Inner Urban</p>	<p>Spatial Principles of Economic Development (Bullet point 2) and Area Spatial Strategies for the City Centre and Inner Urban Core.</p>



		Core.	
--	--	-------	--

<p>548. Support inclusion of Keele University and Science Park within the Policy.</p> <p>549. Suggest deletion of 'within the bounds of existing planning permissions'. These only accommodate needs up to 2017. Further expansion to be dealt with under comments re: CP8 above</p>	<p>E. Kelsall, Keele University</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Delete 'within the bounds of existing planning permissions' Spatial Principles of Economic Development (Paragraph 5.35)</p>
<p>550. Support</p>	<p>Ms R. Freeman, Theatres Trust</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>551. CPRE would expect that within this policy would be included the attraction of new industry/business by the environmental transformation of the city and its image, and the part to be played in this by the standards expected of new development.</p>	<p>Mr P. Goods, CPRE</p>	<p>Agreed dealt with in new policy CSP1 – Design quality</p>	<p>CSP1: Design Quality</p>
<p>552. Welcomes the inclusion of e) and the recognition at paragraph 7.237.</p>	<p>Mr J. Spottiswood, British Waterways Board</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

<p>553. Fails to encourage new employment development that embraces green construction methods and moves towards carbon free developments.</p> <p>'h) use of green construction methods and where appropriate the introduction of renewable energy resources.'</p>	<p>Ms J. Gabrilatsou, King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd</p>	<p>Agreed, dealt with in policy CSP3: Sustainability and Climate Change. Includes specific mention of green construction methods and use of renewable energy</p>	<p>CSP3: Sustainability and Climate Change</p>
<p>554. It is essential that the Council's Core Strategy reflects the need to regenerate Stoke-on-Trent City Centre. Recognition for Stoke-on-Trent City Centre as the main focus for mixed use regeneration is welcomed. However, the role of Newcastle-under-Lyme in providing complementary development should be recognised to ensure that the centres do not compete against each other.</p>	<p>Ms C. McDade, Drivers Jonas, Highland Hanley Ltd</p>	<p>The status is determined by Regional Spatial Strategy. The scale and nature of development is set out in RSS Revision which identifies the four tiers in the network of strategic town and city centres. The Core Spatial Strategy provides clarification on the characteristics and individual roles of the City Centre and Newcastle town centre and carries forward from RSS the level of required provision to 2026 within the Area Spatial Strategies for the City Centre and Newcastle Town Centre.</p>	<p>City Centre of Stoke-on-Trent Area Spatial Strategy and Newcastle Town Centre Area Spatial Strategy.</p>
<p>555. Too restrictive</p>	<p>Mr R. Savage, Burslem Port Project</p>	<p>See RSS. This is a matter of scale</p>	<p>No Change</p>

<p>556. welcome the overall thrust of criterion e).</p>	<p>Ms A. Smith, English Heritage</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>557. This ought to be revised to incorporate and allow for the potential for existing large and under-used employment sites to be redeveloped for higher level employment uses such as offices. Alternative suggested below.</p> <p>558. CP15 a) ‘Diversification and modernisation of centres and existing under-used employment sites for new businesses ...’</p> <p>559. CP15 b) ‘Other sites that come forward and would be of significant economic benefit will also be supported where they offer higher grade jobs, re-use vacant urban land and lie within or adjacent to existing large scale employment uses.’</p>	<p>Mr G. Willard, Hulme Upright Manning (Reef Limited) – Site Proposal, Newcastle</p>	<p>As set out within the Economic Development section of the Strategic Spatial Principles both authorities will be conducting comprehensive assessments of their existing supply of land available for economic development through employment plan reviews, this will include looking at existing and under-used sites. The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of the future provision. The RSS Phase 2 Revision states that these targets should ideally be met through maximising the potential for recycling previously developed land. Sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

<p>560. No mention of ceramics. Also, what about Chatterley Whitfield, a priority for Stoke on Trent.</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>The Spatial Portrait section has been split into various sections including economy (paragraphs 3.7 – 3.12) this now specifically refers to ceramics.</p> <p>Chatterley Whitfield is identified on Core Spatial Strategy Diagram (Diagram 1) as – Chatterley Whitfield Sustainable Enterprise Park; Identified on Stoke Outer Urban Area Spatial Strategy Plan 6; and referred to as forming part of the Outer Urban Area Strategy.</p>	<p>Spatial Portrait - Paragraph 3.8</p> <p>Core Spatial Strategy Diagram (Diagram 1); Stoke Outer Urban Area Spatial Strategy Plan 6; Stoke Outer Urban Area Spatial Strategy paragraph 5.149.</p>
<p>561. supports the underlying objective of seeking to reverse the spiral of economic decline. Also supports identification of the City Centre should be the main focus for mixed use regeneration.</p>	<p>Ms S. Page, Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (CSC)</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No Change</p>

<p>562. The Policy's aim of encouraging economic growth within North Staffordshire is fully supported. The 'Reasoned Justification' recognises that North Staffordshire currently has a weak economic base and employment levels are declining. Consequently, employment generating development should be encouraged to reverse this trend.</p> <p>563. Given that economic regeneration is a significant objective that needs to be addressed in order to reverse economic decline, the policy should include support for applications for employment development in sustainable locations.</p>	<p>Mr D. Hatcher, Barton Wilmore, St Modwens</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Overarching Core Spatial Policy on Sustainability and Climate Change (CSP3) also the strategy as a whole is based on establishing that the Inner Urban Core and city and town centres are the most sustainable locations thus the strategy places a strategic emphasises on encouraging development in these locations. Site specific development plan documents and Area Action Plans will follow this approach.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
--	--	---	------------------

CP16 – Meeting employment needs			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<p>564. Encourage expansion within established employment areas</p> <p>565. Promote supply chain development</p>	Renew	As set out within the Economic Development section of the Strategic Spatial Principles both authorities will be conducting comprehensive employment land reviews, in line with RSS Revision. The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of future provision and will indicate, where appropriate, where and how existing and established employment areas can be expanded / enhanced and improved. Sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs	No change
<p>566. Support inclusion of Keele University and Science Park within the Policy.</p> <p>567. Recommend time period extends to 2026</p> <p>568. Suggest deletion of 'within the bounds of existing planning permissions'.</p>	E. Kelsall, Keele University	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>RSS Revision time horizon Review and roll forward</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Paragraph 5.40</p> <p>Delete 'within the bounds of existing planning permissions' Spatial Principles of Economic</p>

<p>These only accommodate needs up to 2017. Further expansion to be dealt with under comments re: CP8 above</p>		<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Development (Paragraph 5.35)</p>
<p>569. Is it envisaged that brownfield sites allocated for employment uses would need suitable assembly, remediation and cosmetic presentation, and what procedures and agencies are anticipated to be needed? Has the planning process a part to play?</p> <p>570. CPRE regards conservation of land as a major principle in the light of future circumstances, even having regard to the fact that most employment land will be brownfield. Is it appropriate to highlight this strategic imperative and typical strategy for managing the problem.</p>	<p>Mr P. Goode, CPRE</p>	<p>Addressed in CP18</p> <p>Dealt with in CP26</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No Change</p>



<p>571. To avoid uncertainty b) could be amended as below.</p> <p>572. CP16 b) 'Promotion of office development sites capable of accommodating modern occupier requirements at an appropriate scale within the City Centre, Newcastle-under-Lyme town centres and other town centres or existing employment areas which have vacant or underused land'</p>	<p>Mr G. Willard, Hulme Upright Manning (Reef Limited) – Site Proposal, Newcastle</p>	<p>As set out within the Economic Development section of the Strategic Spatial Principles both authorities will be conducting comprehensive assessments of their existing supply of land available for economic development through employment plan reviews, this will include looking at existing and under-used sites. The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of the future provision. The RSS Phase 2 Revision states that these targets should ideally be met through maximising the potential for recycling previously developed land. Sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs</p>	<p>No Change</p>
--	---	---	------------------

<p>573. Policy CP16 requires at least 190 hectares of employment land to be made available between 2005 and 2021 to achieve sustainable development and economic growth – the plan timeframe is now to 2026 and this should be amended accordingly, along with a proportionate increase in employment land within Stoke.</p> <p>574. As the target is a minimum, the Policy should also seek to encourage windfall employment development in sustainable locations. When determining which sites should be allocated to meet the employment target, there should not be an over-reliance on existing Development Plan allocations that have not come forward, despite being allocated since 1993. A reassessment of existing allocations, together with vacant or derelict sites</p>	<p>Mr D. Hatcher, Barton Wilmore, St Modwens</p>	<p>Agreed. The RSS Phase 2 Revision now sets out specific targets for the provision of employment land for the period 2006 – 2026.</p> <p>There are currently no ‘existing Development Plan Allocations’ As of September 2007 the City Plan (1993) is no longer in force only those policies which have been agreed to be ‘saved’ form part of the existing development plan, this does not include site allocations. As set out within the Economic Development section of the Strategic Spatial Principles both authorities will be conducting comprehensive assessments of their existing supply of land available for economic development through employment plan reviews, this will include looking again at all existing sites and historic allocations. The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of the future provision. The RSS Phase 2 Revision states that these targets should ideally be met through maximising the potential for recycling previously developed land.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.40</p> <p>Portfolio of Land paragraphs 5.36 – 5.49</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>formerly in employment use, should be also undertaken to determine whether they continue to be attractive for employment purposes.</p> <p>575. Finally, we object to the restrictions sought by paragraph 7.161 and Table, seeking to limit the types of employment use by amount, in order to allocate employment land broadly across all business use classes. We consider that this would place an unacceptable restriction on employment development, removing the flexibility of land to meet the demands of commerce and industry</p>		<p>Sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs.</p> <p>The projecting employment land needs table has been revised as a result of comments made and to provide the basis for the employment land review in accordance with government guidance</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.41</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------

CP17 – Strategic Employment sites			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
576. The submission document should include the commitment that if an RLS appropriate site or sites come forward that meets the Regional Logistics Site criteria , then this will be considerate for RLS designation	Mr D. Thew, West Midlands Regional Assembly	There are currently no suitable brownfield candidates for Major Investment Sites (MIS) or Regional Logistics Site (RLS) designation within the plan area having regard to all material considerations. However, this will be kept under review in the event that a suitable windfall opportunity arise.	Paragraph 5.49 – 5.50.
577. It is premature to say no Regional Logistic Site will be allocated	Mr M. Pearce/ Ms S. Holder, Advantage West Midlands	Having regard to site allocation criteria there is no site available for such a designation at present. The best contender is the rail linked Chatterley Valley area which AWM welcome designation as a regional investment site. However additional wording has now been inserted as a result of comments made to state that the situation will be kept under review in the event that a suitable windfall opportunity arises.	Paragraph 5.49 – 5.50.

<p>578. CPRE has reservations concerning the timing of Chatterley Valley and would wish its released to be reserved to the later stages of the plan to avoid prejudicing development or re-development of more central locations.</p>	<p>Mr P. Goode, CPRE</p>	<p>Chatterley Valley has the benefit of planning permission and is actively being marketed.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>579. Regarding RLS, CPRE believes that incipient changes to the whole transport system following the run-down of oil availability makes the concept of RLS challengeable. We are also concerned at such sites' extravagant use of land with low employment density.</p>		<p>Noted. The consideration of such allocations is an RSS requirement.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

<p>580. The Core Strategy document needs to produce more evidence and a stronger justification as to why a RLS could not be provided.</p> <p>581. North Staffordshire is identified as a priority location for a RLS in the current and emerging RSS. Even if there are no existing brownfield sites available, the policy does not preclude the use of greenfield sites. Although Chatterley Valley is a large employment site with a logistics element there is still a requirement to provide an RLS. The Core Strategy does not indicate whether any cross boundary discussions have been held with adjoining authorities to consider the issue of logistics and whether there are any available sites close to North Staffordshire.</p> <p>582. The Regional Logistics Study identifies North Staffordshire as a 'good</p>	<p>Mr T. Williams, Regional Assembly</p>	<p>Noted. Description of MIS and RLS site requirements are explained. Having regard to all the material considerations and site allocation criteria there is no site available for such a designation at present.</p> <p>The best contender for a RLS is the rail linked Chatterley Valley area which AWM welcome designation as a regional investment site.</p> <p>Allocating 50 hectares of greenfield development, as suggested, is considered to be contrary to the spatial principles of the Core Spatial Strategy in particular the emphasis placed on sustainable regeneration e.g. the Inner Urban Core.</p> <p>Additional wording has now been inserted as a result of comments made to state that the situation will be kept under review in the event that a suitable windfall opportunity arises.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.46 – 5.50.</p>
---	--	---	--------------------------------

<p>location' for a future RLS with its main constraint being its location between areas of market demand.</p> <p>583. In general, there is insufficient evidence to support the conclusions which are reached on RLS and further justification will be needed. If, following further consideration, the conclusions in the Core Strategy remain the same then the submission DPD should include a commitment that should an appropriate site(s) come forward that meets the RLS criteria, then this should be considered for RLS designation</p>			
--	--	--	--

CP18 – Land take up			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<p>584. This should identify employment land provision to meet needs.</p> <p>585. This should set out the positive assistance being put in place</p>	RENEW	<p>Site specific allocations should not be addressed within Core Spatial Strategies as these are dealt with in site allocation DPDs. As set out within the Economic Development section of the Strategic Spatial Principles both authorities will be conducting comprehensive assessments of their existing supply of land available for economic development through employment plan reviews, The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of the future provision.</p> <p>Aligning to the strategic priorities of the Core Spatial Strategy the North Staffordshire Regeneration Partnership Business Plan outlines the funding streams available for the delivery of these priority projects</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.</p> <p>See Economic Development section of the Strategic Spatial Principles (Paragraphs 5.33 – 5.49)</p>
586. Support	Mr M. Pearce/ Ms S. Holder, Advantage West Midlands	Noted. Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the	No change.



		Government Office.	
587. Supported	Mr P. Goode, CPRE	Noted. Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.	No change.
588. Support	Mr R. Savage, Burslem Port Project	Noted Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.	No change.
589. supported	Mr G. Willard, Hulme Upright Manning (Reef Limited) – Site Proposal, Newcastle	Noted Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.	No change.
590. This section could also mention the wildlife importance of some brownfield sites	Joan Walley MP	Noted however Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.  Issue raised accommodated within new Policy CSP4: Natural Assets, which aims to ensure that the value of previously developed land as a source of biodiversity is recognised and appropriate measures are taken to reduce the negative impact of development upon this resource.	CSP4: Natural Assets

CP19 – Industrial areas			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
591. This policy needs strengthening	RENEW	As a result of comments received and the emerging RSS Revision policies (PA6, 6A and 6B) this policy has been deleted and amalgamated into the economic development section. It is considered that the evaluation of individual development sites will be the subject of comprehensive employment land reviews, in line with RSS Revision. The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of the future provision. Sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs	Policy Deleted
592. Support but clarify what are 'larger' areas and 'appropriate' areas	Mr M. Pearce/ Ms S. Holder, Advantage West Midlands	As a result of comments received and the emerging RSS Revision policies (PA6, 6A and 6B) this policy has been deleted and amalgamated into the economic development section. It is considered that the evaluation of individual development sites will be the subject of comprehensive employment land reviews, in line with RSS Revision.	Policy Deleted

		The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of the future provision. Sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs	
593. Supported	Mr P. Goode, CPRE	Noted	Policy Deleted as a result of other representations received.
594. Object – there is no justification for this policy. Should be deleted	Ms K. Jukes, Savills	Agreed As a result of comments received and the emerging RSS Revision policies (PA6, 6A and 6B) this policy has been deleted and amalgamated into the economic development section. It is considered that the evaluation of individual development sites will be the subject of comprehensive employment land reviews, in line with RSS Revision. The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of the future provision. The RSS Phase 2 Revision states that these targets should ideally be met through maximising the potential for recycling previously developed land. Sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs	Policy Deleted

<p>595. This policy is too negative. The policy places the burden on the prospective developer to demonstrate that the proposal would not be detrimental to the economic prospects of North Staffordshire. The policy could be simply altered by changing the emphasis so that the loss of employment land will be permitted unless it is proven to be harmful.</p>	<p>Mr S. Tibenham, DPP, Tesco</p>	<p>Sympathetic with the principle and will be taken into account if the policy is retained</p> <p>As a result of comments received and the emerging RSS Revision policies (PA6, 6A and 6B) this policy has been deleted and amalgamated into the economic development section. It is considered that the evaluation of individual development sites will be the subject of comprehensive employment land reviews, in line with RSS Revision. The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of the future provision. The RSS Phase 2 Revision states that these targets should ideally be met through maximising the potential for recycling previously developed land. Sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs</p>	<p>Policy Deleted as a result of other representations received.</p>
<p>596. Application of this policy should not prejudice bringing forward low grade employment sites found along the canal network for other more beneficial uses</p>	<p>Mr J. Spottiswood, British Waterways Board</p>	<p>Noted. Individual sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs as set out within the Area Spatial Strategies.</p>	<p>Policy Deleted as a result of other representations received.</p>

--	--	--	--

<p>597. The Policy should make allowance for the potential of larger areas of industrial land being redeveloped for major mixed-use proposals, which can help to regenerate areas in a sustainable way, securing employment as well as new housing, leisure and other uses as supported by paragraphs 38 and 44 of PPS3.</p>	<p>Mr D. Hatcher, Barton Wilmore, St Modwens</p>	<p>Noted. Individual sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs as set out within the Area Spatial Strategies.</p>	<p>Policy Deleted as a result of other representations received.</p>
--	--	---	--

CP20 – Office development			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
598. Support. The commentary could include reference to the role that office development can play in the mixed use regeneration of regional and town centres.	Mr A. Thompson, DTZ, Stoke Vision	Noted. The Spatial Principles of Economic Development include reference to encouraging mixed use regeneration incorporating new office led schemes.	As a result of comments received and the emerging RSS Revision policies (PA11, PA12B, PA13A and PA13B) this policy has been deleted and amalgamated into the economic development section.
599. Support	Mr M. Pearce/ Ms S. Holder, Advantage West Midlands	Noted	Policy Deleted as a result of other representations received.
600. Supported	Mr P. Goode, CPRE	Noted	Policy Deleted as a result of other representations received.
601. Too restrictive	Mr R. Savage, Burslem Port Project	The status is determined by Regional Spatial Strategy. The scale and nature of development is set out in RSS Revision.	As a result of comments received and the emerging RSS Revision policies (PA11, PA12B, PA13A and PA13B) this policy has been deleted and amalgamated into the economic development

			section.
--	--	--	----------



<p>602. Needs to be changed by the inclusion of the allowance for office development within the following 'existing employment area that have vacant or underused land'.</p> <p>603. CP20 – include 'existing employment area that have vacant or underused land'.</p>	<p>Mr G. Willard, Hulme Upright Manning (Reef Limited) – Site Proposal, Newcastle</p>	<p>As set out within the Economic Development section of the Strategic Spatial Principles both authorities will be conducting comprehensive assessments of their existing supply of land available for economic development through employment plan reviews, this will include looking at existing and under-used sites. The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of the future provision. Sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs.</p>	<p>As a result of comments received and the emerging RSS Revision policies (PA11, PA12B, PA13A and PA13B) this policy has been deleted and amalgamated into the economic development section.</p>
<p>604. The fourth paragraph proposes developments outside the central areas should be within 500m walking distance of a bus or railway station. Given only one bus station in Stoke on Trent and the need to increase local railway services it is difficult to see how this policy could be delivered.</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>Noted. The original aim of the policy was to try to ensure that new development is built in sustainable locations. Policies PA11, PA12B, PA13A and PA13B of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision provide clear regional policies in terms of office locations. The Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, this. Policy CP20 has been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable office locations are amalgamated into the economic development section. In addition . office sites will</p>	<p>As a result of comments received and the emerging RSS Revision policies (PA11, PA12B, PA13A and PA13B) this policy has been deleted and amalgamated into the economic development section. Paragraph 5.35</p>

		be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs.	
--	--	---	--

<p>605. This Policy is considered to be overly prescriptive regarding the location of new office development and provides no flexibility, particularly in a location where manufacturing jobs are declining. The policy as it stands appears to conflict with the regeneration objectives of the RSS and other policies within this document.</p> <p>606. Provision should be made for office development outside the identified centres, providing it is within sustainable locations. The Core Strategy recognises that a diverse portfolio of employment sites is required to meet the needs of investors, and this Policy should not be overly restrictive, where such development proposals can achieve key economic regeneration objectives</p>	<p>Mr D. Hatcher, Barton Wilmore, St Modwens</p>	<p>Noted. The original aim of the policy was to try to ensure that new development is built in sustainable locations. Policies PA11, PA12B, PA13A and PA13B of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision provide clear regional policies in terms of office locations. The Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, this. Policy CP20 has been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable office locations are amalgamated into the economic development section. In addition, as set out within the Economic Development section of the Strategic Spatial Principles both authorities will be conducting comprehensive assessments of their existing supply of land available for economic development through employment plan reviews. The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of the future provision including office locations. Sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs.</p>	<p>As a result of comments received and the emerging RSS Revision policies (PA11, PA12B, PA13A and PA13B) this policy has been deleted and amalgamated into the economic development section. Paragraph 5.35</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>607. Industrial employment would be preferred.</p>	<p>Mr Snape</p>	<p>As set out within the Economic Development section of the Strategic Spatial Principles both authorities will be conducting comprehensive assessments of their existing supply of land available for economic development through employment plan reviews. The outcome of these reviews will provide the evidence base for determining the nature of the future provision for all types of employment provision. Sites will be identified through appropriate site allocation DPDs.</p>	<p>As a result of comments received and the emerging RSS Revision policies (PA11, PA12B, PA13A and PA13B) this policy has been deleted and amalgamated into the economic development section. Paragraph 5.35</p>
---	-----------------	---	--

CP21 – Strategic and district centres			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
608. Unnecessary	GOWM	Noted. The original aim of the policy was to try to ensure that new development is built in sustainable locations. Policies within the Prosperity for All Chapter of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision now provide clear regional policies in terms of retail, office and leisure developments. It is agreed that the Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, regional or national planning policy. Policy CP21 has therefore been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable development are amalgamated into the strategic and spatial principles section of the CSS and within the area spatial strategies. As stated within these sections site allocation will be made within appropriate DPDs.	Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.

<p>609. Support. More clarity required re: sequential testing</p>	<p>Mrs Jean Bull, Stoke-on-Trent City Council, City Centre Marketing Manager</p>	<p>Noted. Sequential testing could be a suitable candidate for an SPD in due course. PPS6 provides adequate advice with regard to this issue and should not be repeated within local policies, in addition retail policies contained with RSS Revision which forms part of the development plan provide additional clarity in terms of the sequential test (Policies PA11, PA12A, PA12B and PA13). As a result of representations received including from the Government Office Policy CP21 has been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable development are amalgamated into the strategic and spatial principles section of the CSS and within the area spatial strategies. As stated within these sections site allocation will be made within appropriate DPDs.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.</p>
---	--	--	---

610. Support	Mr A. Thompson, DTZ, Stoke Vision	Noted	Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.
611. Support	Mr D. Lingwood, Ecumenical Churches City Link	Noted	Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.
612. Support	Ms R. Freeman, Theatres Trust	Noted	Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.
613. Support	Mr M. Pearce/ Ms S. Holder, Advantage West Midlands	Noted	Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.
614. welcome the addition to this policy.	Ms L. Hackwood, Environment Agency	Noted	Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.
615. Supported	Mr P. Goode, CPRE	Noted	Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.

<p>616. This policy is confusing as it seems to suggest the sequential approach to site selection will be applied to proposals within the centres of City Centre and Newcastle. This is not in accordance with PPS6.</p>	<p>Mr S. Tibenham, DPP, Tesco</p>	<p>Proximity to the primary shopping streets is the key determinant of in centre, edge of centre or out of centre status. For example the Tesco development is within the city centre but was classified by the Inspector as edge of/ out of centre.</p> <p>The original aim of the policy was to try to ensure that new development is built in sustainable locations. Policies within the Prosperity for All Chapter of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision now provide clear regional policies in terms of retail, office and leisure developments. It is agreed that the Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, regional or national planning policy. Policy CP21 has therefore been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable development are amalgamated into the strategic and spatial principles section of the CSS and within the area spatial strategies. As stated within these sections site allocation will be made within appropriate DPDs.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.</p>
--	-----------------------------------	--	---



<p>617. We would highlight that certain shopping trips will require the use of a car, the issue should be to provide a range of transport options to developments so those without a car are not overly disadvantaged and have access to essential facilities.</p>	<p>Mr S. Tibenham, DPP, Tesco  21b</p>	<p>Noted however policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office. Issues around transport options are dealt with within the Movement and Access section of the Strategic and Spatial Principles section of the document and dealt with on a sub-area level within the various Area Spatial Strategies.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office. See Movement and Access section of the Strategic and Spatial Principles section</p>
<p>618. Proposed amendment 619. d) "...will not adversely affect the natural or historic environment"</p>	<p>Mr M. Hodder, Council for British Archaeology</p>	<p>Noted however policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.  Issues concerning the historic environment and natural assets are covered within revised Core Spatial Strategy policies CP2 and CP4 which are all encompassing thematic policies.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office. See Core Spatial Strategy policies CP2 and CP4</p>

<p>620. Is entirely unclear in its reference to Strategic and District Centres.</p> <p>621. Policy CP21 refers to Strategic and District Centres. However, unlike the existing policy title to Policy CP21, the supporting text, policy and reasoned justification only make reference to the Strategic Centres. No reference is made to the District Centres within Policy CP21.</p> <p>622. It would therefore appear that there is a gap within the Centre policies, given that Policy CP21 makes reference to the Strategic/Regional centres but it does not make any reference to the District/Significant Urban Centres and that a separate policy, Policy CP23 exists for Local Centres.</p> <p>623. We therefore propose two options for this policy:</p> <p>A. Policy CP21</p>	<p>Ms J. Gabrilatsou, King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd</p>	<p>Noted. The original aim of the policy was to try to ensure that new development is built in sustainable locations and that whilst the policy aim was to address all centres it is always a matter of scale.</p> <p>Policies within the Prosperity for All Chapter of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision now provide clearer regional policies in terms of retail, office and leisure developments. It is agreed that the Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, regional or national planning policy. Policy CP21 has therefore been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable development are amalgamated into the strategic and spatial principles section of the CSS and within the area spatial strategies. As stated within these sections site allocation will be made within appropriate DPDs.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office.</p>
---	--	--	---

<p>includes the 'District Centres' within its Policy and reasoned justification in line with the policy title; OR</p> <p>624. B. The title is changed to 'Strategic Centres' only. This would mean that a new policy, Policy CP21A would have to be proposed which refers to District Centres/Significant Urban Centres.</p>			
<p>625. Too restrictive</p>	<p>Mr R. Savage, Burslem Port Project</p>	<p>The status is determined by Regional Spatial Strategy, policies within the Prosperity for All Chapter of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision provide regional policies in terms of retail, office and leisure developments. The scale and nature of development is set out in RSS Revision.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office</p>
<p>626. Sequential approach to town centre planning</p>	<p>Mr J. Wilson, Tyler Parks Partnership, Morston Assets</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office</p>
<p>627. support inclusion of e).</p>	<p>Ms A. Smith, English Heritage</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from</p>

			the Government Office
--	--	--	-----------------------

<p>628. Does not accord with national planning policy.</p> <p>629. Therefore proposals for retail, office and leisure developments within the centres of Stoke-on-Trent City Centre and Newcastle-under-Lyme town centre will not have to be assessed in accordance with a sequential approach to site approach, as per PPS6.</p>	<p>Mr W. Kumar, Turley Associates (Sainsbury's Supermarket)</p>	<p>Noted. It is agreed that the Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, regional or national planning policy. Policy CP21 has therefore been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable development are amalgamated into the strategic and spatial principles section of the CSS and within the area spatial strategies. As stated within these sections site allocation will be made within appropriate DPDs.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office</p>
<p>630. Appears to have little specific meaning.</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>Noted. It is agreed that the Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, regional or national planning policy. Policy CP21 has therefore been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable development are amalgamated into the strategic and spatial principles section of the CSS and within the area spatial strategies. As stated within these sections site allocation will be made within appropriate DPDs.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office</p>

<p>631. Unlike Policy CP19 of the Preferred Options Report April 2006, this policy now appears to only relate to the City Centre and Newcastle town centre. It also appears to duplicate unnecessarily, the approach to be adopted by Policy CP20. We repeat here our objections to Policy CP20</p>	<p>Mr D. Hatcher, Barton Wilmore, St Modwens</p>	<p>Noted. It is agreed that the Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, regional or national planning policy. Policy CP21 has therefore been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable development are amalgamated into the strategic and spatial principles section of the CSS and within the area spatial strategies. As stated within these sections site allocation will be made within appropriate DPDs.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received from the Government Office</p>
---	--	--	--

CP22 – Edge-of-centre and out-of-centre developments			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
632. The policy needs to be strong and clear to prevent abuse	Mrs Jean Bull, Stoke-on-Trent City Council, City Centre Marketing Manager	Noted	Policy deleted as a result of representations received
633. Support	Mr M. Pearce/ Ms S. Holder, Advantage West Midlands	Noted	Policy deleted as a result of representations received
634. welcome the addition to this policy.	Ms L. Hackwood, Environment Agency	Noted	Policy deleted as a result of representations received
635. Supported	Mr P. Goode, CPRE	Noted	Policy deleted as a result of representations received
636. Based on the comments made above in relation to Policy CP21, it is difficult to comment fully on Policy CP22 without clarity that there is a policy basis within the Core Strategy document which protects District Centres/Significant Urban Centres. Once the policy basis for the  637. District Centres is established it will be clearer	Ms J. Gabrilatsou, King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd	Noted. The original aim of the policy was to try to ensure that new development is built in sustainable locations and has regard to the sequential approach to site selection. Policies within the Prosperity for All Chapter of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision now provide clear regional policies in terms of retail, office and leisure developments. It is agreed that the Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, national	Policy deleted as a result of representations received

<p>to establish that the appropriate criteria within Policy CP22 are appropriate.</p> <p>638. First Para and Para 7.221 - refers to Policy CP5 – should be Policy CP4.</p> <p>639. With PPS6 in mind, we propose that the purposes of clarity that the first para is amended to read as follows.</p> <p>640. Para 3 - amend as below.</p> <p>641. Para 1 - 'If no suitable sites or buildings are available within a specific Regional or Significant Urban Centre having considered scale and flexibility in formats, within the appropriate catchment area, sequentially, the hierarchy of centres as set out in core Policy CP4 will be considered. Only then, if there are no other appropriate Regional or Significant Urban Centre sites, then any edge-of-centre sites should be considered in relation to those centres. If no edge-of-centre sites are available</p>		<p>(PPS6) or regional planning policy. Policy CP22 has therefore been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable development are amalgamated into the strategic and spatial principles section of the CSS and within the area spatial strategies. Paragraphs 5.6 – 5.15 set out the hierarchy of centres and outlines the strategic principle of targeted regeneration which seeks to focus development and investment towards highest priority areas – the city and town centres and those areas identified as priority areas for intervention and regeneration and restraining development within non priority locations.</p>	
---	--	---	--



<p>thereafter, then should out-of-centre sites, in locations that are accessible by a choice of transport modes, be considered.'</p> <p>642. Para 3 - 'All developments outside regional and significant urban centres should demonstrate need for the proposal....'</p>			
<p>643. In response to Policy CP22 we would reiterate the importance of assessing schemes in accordance with the policy framework provided by PPS6. We consider that Policy CP22 should include a requirement for proposals to meet the PPS6 tests on qualitative and quantitative need, location and scale.</p> <p>644. It is also crucial that the Council ensures no policies come forward that could undermine the successful delivery of the East West Centre. This scheme is crucial in achieving the renaissance of the City Centre and attracting</p>	<p>Ms C. McDade, Drivers Jonas, Highland Hanley Ltd</p>	<p>Local Policy cannot duplicate PPS6. The City Centre and Etruria Road Corridor Area Action Plan (AAP) provide area specific policies which will be in line within the City Centre Area Spatial Strategy as set out within the Core Spatial Strategy (Paragraphs 5.65 – 5.104). The AAP will also provide site specific guidance and policy support for in-centre development particularly concerning the East/West centre.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received</p>

significant new opportunities and inward investment.			
645. Too restrictive	Mr R. Savage, Burslem Port Project	The status is determined by Regional Spatial Strategy, policies within the Prosperity for All Chapter of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision provide regional policies in terms of retail, office and leisure developments. The scale and nature of development is set out in RSS Revision.	Policy deleted as a result of representations received

<p>646. Does not accord with national planning policy.</p> <p>647. PPS6 states that the Sequential Approach should be applied in selecting appropriate sites for allocation within the centres where identified need is to be met. The sequential approach requires that locations are considered in the following order: centre, edge-of-centre and out-of-centre.</p>	<p>Mr W. Kumar, Turley Associates (Sainsbury's Supermarket)</p>	<p>Noted. The original aim of the policy was to try to ensure that new development is built in sustainable locations and has regard to the sequential approach to site selection. Policies within the Prosperity for All Chapter of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision now provide clear regional policies in terms of retail, office and leisure developments. It is agreed that the Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, national (PPS6) or regional planning policy. Policy CP22 has therefore been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable development are amalgamated into the strategic and spatial principles section of the CSS and within the area spatial strategies. Paragraphs 5.6 – 5.15 set out the hierarchy of centres and outlines the strategic principle of targeted regeneration which seeks to focus development and investment towards highest priority areas – the city and town centres and those areas identified as priority areas for intervention and regeneration and restraining development within non priority</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received</p>
---	---	--	---

		locations.	
--	--	------------	--

<p>648. Is welcome, but hopefully not too late in the day given that the City Council has been promoting these developments for the last 20 years but again it offers little protection as it allow for developers to make a case.</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received</p>
<p>649. additional criterion should be added relating to the scale of development.</p>	<p>Ms S. Page, Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (CSC)</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received</p>

<p>650. This, together with Policy CP20 and CP21 should be combined within one policy on the Sequential approach, as previously provided for by Policy CP19 of the Preferred Options Report April 2006. The current policy framework is considered to be confusing and inconsistent.</p>	<p>Mr D. Hatcher, Barton Wilmore, St Modwens</p>	<p>Noted. The original aim of the policy was to try to ensure that new development is built in sustainable locations and has regard to the sequential approach to site selection. Policies within the Prosperity for All Chapter of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision now provide clear regional policies in terms of retail, office and leisure developments. It is agreed that the Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, national (PPS6) or regional planning policy. Policy CP22 has therefore been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable development are amalgamated into the strategic and spatial principles section of the CSS and within the area spatial strategies. Paragraphs 5.6 – 5.15 set out the hierarchy of centres and outlines the strategic principle of targeted regeneration which seeks to focus development and investment towards highest priority areas – the city and town centres and those areas identified as priority areas for intervention and regeneration and restraining development within non priority</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received</p>
--	--	--	---

		locations.	
--	--	------------	--

CP23 – Local centres			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
651. Supported	Mr P. Goode, CPRE	Noted	Policy deleted as a result of representations received
652. Supported but needs to ensure consistent terminology relating to village service centres.	Mr A. Hubbard, National Trust	Noted. The Hierarchy of Centres Section of the Strategic Spatial Principles Chapter of the Core Spatial Strategy provides a clear explanation of the hierarchy and the respective roles of the different centres. This provides more clarity in terms of Local Urban Centres, Rural Service Centres and Villages and cross references these on the Core Spatial Strategy Diagram (Diagram 1) and Appendix 4.	Policy deleted as a result of representations received
653. Too restrictive	Mr R. Savage, Burslem Port Project	The status is determined by Regional Spatial Strategy, policies within the Prosperity for All Chapter of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision provide regional policies in terms of retail, office and leisure developments. The scale and nature of development is set out in RSS Revision.	Policy deleted as a result of representations received



<p>654. The policies should provide that new neighbourhood retail facilities will be permitted in areas of existing localised deficiency provided they will not undermine the vitality and viability of any existing designated centre.</p>	<p>Mr G. Dyson, Malahat Properties Ltd</p>	<p>The original aim of the policy was to try to ensure that new development is built in sustainable locations and has regard to the sequential approach to site selection. Policies within the Prosperity for All Chapter of the Regional Spatial Strategy Revision now provide clear regional policies in terms of retail, office and leisure developments. It is agreed that the Core Spatial Strategy should add detail to, but not repeat, national (PPS6) or regional planning policy. Policy CP22 has therefore been deleted and the spatial principles of ensuring sustainable development are amalgamated into the strategic and spatial principles section of the CSS and within the area spatial strategies. Paragraphs 5.6 – 5.15 set out the hierarchy of centres and outlines the strategic principle of targeted regeneration which seeks to focus development and investment towards highest priority areas – the city and town centres and those areas identified as priority areas for intervention and regeneration and restraining development within non priority</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received</p>
---	--	---	---

		locations.	
--	--	------------	--

<p>655. how would this be enforced?</p>	<p>Mr G. Lancaster, Madeley Conservation Group</p>	<p>Noted. The policy has been deleted and the Hierarchy of Centres Section of the Strategic Spatial Principles Chapter of the Core Spatial Strategy provides a clearer explanation of the hierarchy and the respective roles of the different centres. Paragraphs 5.6 – 5.15 set out the hierarchy of centres and outlines the strategic principle of targeted regeneration which seeks to focus development and investment towards highest priority areas – the city and town centres and those areas identified as priority areas for intervention and regeneration and restraining development within non priority locations. This strategic framework then provides the basis for the area spatial strategies. Rather than setting out a rigid ‘development control’ type policy within the Core Strategy this strategic document now provides the strategy for more detailed policies and proposals which will be set out within Area Action Plans and Development control policies which will be enforceable on a site by site basis.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received</p>
---	--	---	---

<p>656. Is an attempt to define what should be in local centre here. It is not clear what the point of this is – either the list should be comprehensive or there should be no list.</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>Noted. Rather than setting out a rigid ‘development control’ policy within the Core Strategy which provides a comprehensive list of what should be in a local centre this strategic document now provides the strategy for more detailed policies and proposals which will be set out within Area Action Plans and Development control policies.</p>	<p>Policy deleted as a result of representations received</p>
--	-----------------------	---	---

CP24 – Leisure, culture and tourism			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
657. No mention is made of the creative industries	Mrs Jean Bull, Stoke-on-Trent City Council, City Centre Marketing Manager	Agreed. Oversight to be rectified.	Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received. Suggested amendment taken into account within the Spatial Principles of Targeted Regeneration Section (paragraph 5.15) within Strategic Spatial Principles Chapter.
658. All aspects of sports (indoor and outdoor) to be dealt with in Policy CP28 and linked to needs assessment and strategy.	Mrs M. Taylor, Sports England	Agreed. See response to Policy CP28.	Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received. CSP5 – Open Space/Sport/Recreation
659. Supported subject to additional commentary regarding the role of town centres and the distinctive pottery industry legacy.	Mr A. Thompson, DTZ, Stoke Vision	Reference to the cities distinctive pottery industry legacy is made both within the spatial portrait section (including paragraph 3.63) and Policy CSP2 – Historic environment.	Policy deleted as a result of representations received
660. Policy CP 21 typing error	Dr C. Wakeling, Staffordshire Historic Building Trust	Noted	Policy deleted
661. Additional point suggested	Dr C. Wakeling, Staffordshire	Agreed suggested amendment	Policy CP24 deleted as a

<p>regarding the need to enhance and provide a sustainable future for any historic buildings, spaces or monuments that are affected by development</p>	<p>Historic Building Trust</p>	<p>taken into account within Policy CSP2 – Historic Environment</p>	<p>result of representations received. Suggested amendment taken into account within Policy CSP2 – Historic Environment</p>
<p>662. Disappointed there is no reference to churches and tourism potential</p>	<p>Mr D. Lingwood, Ecumenical Churches City Link</p>	<p>Policy CSP2 – Historic Environment provides a policy base to seek to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of historic buildings, this would include encouraging re-use of such buildings for tourism for example. Paragraph 6.20 outlines the ways in which this can be achieved. In addition, the Strategic Principles of Economic Development raises the importance of tourism stating that North Staffordshire’s unique heritage and its cultural distinctiveness will be promoted to strengthen its viability as a tourist destination.</p> <p>In addition to this approach the Area Spatial Strategies consider in more detail how specific areas can be regenerated. Area Action Plans and site specific development plan documents will address on a site by site basis how specific uses can be encouraged and sites can be</p>	<p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received. Policy CSP2 – Historic Environment</p> <p>Spatial Principle of Economic Development (Paragraph 5.35).</p>

		developed.	
663. The policy should not inhibit farm diversification	Mr R. Head, Betley, Bewerly and Wrinehill Parish Council	The revised Core Spatial Strategy now incorporates Area Spatial Strategies including a Rural Areas Spatial Strategy. The vision for this area includes recognition of the importance of the vitality of rural business and enterprise.	Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received. Rural Areas Spatial Strategy (Paragraphs 5.240 – 5.268)

<p>664. Agreed. Perhaps a little premature to envisage that the qualities of Stoke's renaissance and its outstanding architectural features and buildings compositions could immediately contribute to the area's tourist attractions.</p>	<p>Mr P. Goode, CPRE</p>	<p>Noted. More detail will be provided within the Inner Urban Core Area Action Plan with regard to Stoke-upon-Trent.</p>	<p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received.</p>
<p>665. Welcome recognition of the importance of the canal network for tourism and culture. Welcome criterion (b). Suggest that the policy be strengthened to include:</p> <p>666. 'Leisure, cultural and tourism development which supports the existing canal network</p> <p>667. will also be encouraged'.</p>	<p>Mr J. Spottiswood, British Waterways Board</p>	<p>The revised wording and layout of the Core Spatial Strategy re-emphasises the importance of the Sub-Area strategies. As set out in the Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy and Outer Urban Area Spatial Strategy the vision for these areas includes support to develop canal enhancements.</p>	<p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received.</p> <p>Stoke-on-Trent Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Stoke-on-Trent Outer Urban Area Spatial Strategy</p>



<p>668. Support this policy, particularly in the recognition of the importance of tourism in the North Staffordshire economy.</p> <p>669. Strongly support criterion b and d.</p> <p>670. Page 158 – amend the policy number to read CP24 not CP21.</p> <p>671. Criterion a – amend the word distinct to ‘distinguish’.</p>	<p>Ms J. Gabrilatsou, King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd</p>	<p>Agreed. The Strategic Principles of Economic Development raises the importance of this issue stating that North Staffordshire’s unique heritage and its cultural distinctiveness will be promoted to strengthen its viability as a tourist destination.</p> <p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received.</p>	<p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received.</p> <p>See Spatial Principle of Economic Development.</p>
<p>672. The development of leisure, cultural and tourism facilities is key to sustaining and enhancing the sub-regional role of the City Centre. This should be recognised in Policy CP24 by placing greater emphasis on the City Centre of Stoke-on-Trent as the principal focus for large scale leisure, cultural and tourism facilities in accordance with the Centres Strategy.</p>	<p>Ms C. McDade, Drivers Jonas, Highland Hanley Ltd</p>	<p>The revised wording and layout of the Core Spatial Strategy re-emphasises the importance of the Sub-Area strategies including the City Centre. Paragraph 5.86 refers to leisure and entertainment uses. Further detailed policies relating specifically to the City Centre including emphasis on leisure, cultural and tourism uses will be brought forward within the City Centre and Etruria Road Corridor Area Action Plan.</p>	<p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received.</p>

673. Incorrect policy number.	Mr A. Hubbard, National Trust	Noted	Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received.
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------	--

<p>674. City Centre is not a location for leisure or tourism. Burslem Port has leisure potential</p>	<p>Mr R. Savage, Burslem Port Project</p>	<p>Disagree. The Core Spatial Strategy sets out the Area Spatial Strategy framework for the City Centre and for the Inner Urban Core (which covers the Burslem Port area). The City Centre, as set out within the Regional Spatial Strategy, has a primary role at a sub-regional level to promote a broad spectrum of uses, attractions and facilities, encompassing commercial development, shopping, leisure and cultural attractions among other uses and should be the preferred location for uses which attract large number of people. The city as a whole can also provide at an appropriate scale other tourism destinations which provide a different and varied offer to compliment the city centre. As set out in the Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy the vision for this area includes the provision for increased vitality and vibrancy of Burslem; to enhance the centre's attraction to visitors and residents alike and to develop canal enhancements.</p>	<p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received.</p> <p>Stoke-on-Trent Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy.</p>
--	---	--	---

<p>675. we strongly recommend that CP24 -a) refers to ‘natural and historic assets’ and d) to the natural and historic environment.</p>	<p>Ms A. Smith, English Heritage</p>	<p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received. Policies CSP2 – Historic Environment and CSP4 – Natural Assets provide detailed policy guidance for these specific issues.</p>	<p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received. Policy CSP2 – Historic Environment CSP4 – Natural Assets</p>
<p>676. to be renumbered to CP24. Supportive of this policy particularly criterion b). This policy should clarify in relation to point f) what it considers to be relevant major and all significant applications that will be required to contribute to the promotion of arts, culture and tourism.</p>	<p>Ms S. Page, Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (CSC)</p>	<p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of other representations received. The revised wording and layout of the Core Spatial Strategy re-emphasises the importance of the Sub-Area strategies. As part of the implementation of these sub-area strategies Area Action Plans and other site allocation development plan documents will be brought forward. As part of the delivery mechanism for these, it is envisaged that site proformas will be produced which will address this issue on a site specific basis.</p>	<p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received.</p>
<p>677. There is no reference to the canal in the policy itself. It is suggested that the policy should be amended in order that development which promotes and enhances the canal network, particularly in areas where this will facilitate greater links</p>	<p>Mr R. Thorley, GVA Grimley</p>	<p>The revised wording and layout of the Core Spatial Strategy re-emphasises the importance of the Sub-Area strategies. As set out in the Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy and Outer Urban Area Spatial Strategy the vision for these areas includes support to develop</p>	<p>Policy CP24 deleted as a result of representations received. Stoke-on-Trent Inner Urban Core Area Spatial Strategy Stoke-on-Trent Outer Urban Area Spatial Strategy</p>

between the canal and the main centres, will be supported.		canal enhancements.	
--	--	---------------------	--

CP25 – Historic Environment			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
678. Welcome approach 679. Make clear the contribution of the historic environment to sustainable development, its role in economic regeneration and its cultural, educational and social benefits	Urban Vision	Agreed. Policy has been refined. Suggested content is featured elsewhere in document to avoid a prescriptive and repetitive policy.	Paragraph 5.33 - 5.35. All Area Spatial Strategies
680. Original heritage characterisation study superseded	Urban Vision	List of background technical studies which underpin the Core Spatial Strategy preparation are in appendices.	Appendix 2
681. Supported subject to reference being made to investigation and recording of buildings and sites	Mr A. Thompson, DTZ, Stoke Vision	Agreed in principle but avoidance of adverse impact is the first port of call. More detailed advice on investigation and recording will be provided in respective Development Control Policies DPD.	No change.
682. Reference should be made to the North Staffs Heritage Characterisation Study dealing with the whole of	RENEW	List of background technical studies which underpin the Core Strategy preparation are in appendices.	Appendix 2

the conurbation			
-----------------	--	--	--

<p>683. Welcomes the general direction of this area of policy, but regards the draft as insubstantial and lacking conviction.</p>	<p>Dr C. Wakeling, Staffordshire Historic Building Trust</p>	<p>Noted. Policy has been revised. The policy is intend not to replicate national or regional planning guidance.</p>	<p>CSP2.</p>
<p>684. Policy CP25 para 7.245. The paragraph does not adequately reflect the richness of built heritage interest in North Staffordshire. Local listing policies should be reviewed or introduced within the context of the LDF. Alternative paragraph suggested.</p>	<p>Dr C. Wakeling, Staffordshire Historic Building Trust</p>	<p>Noted. The policy has been rationalised as not to repeat national or regional guidance. The policy does not intend to provide a detailed inventory of the historical character of the plan area but a policy thrust for future LDF documents. Listing is a matter for English Heritage.</p>	<p>As above</p>



<p>685. Policy CP25 supporting text Additional paragraph 1 proposed for inclusion Historic buildings and spaces have sometimes been regarded as liabilities. It is clear, however, that they can give added value and distinctiveness to regeneration and development schemes. The revitalisation of prominent listed buildings can be the catalyst for the transformation of town centres, and in the refurbishment of terraced houses it is often the retention of such details as windows, doors, tiles or fireplaces that realises enduring value.'</p>	<p>Dr C. Wakeling, Staffordshire Historic Building Trust</p>	<p>Noted. The policy has been rationalised as not to repeat national or regional guidance. The policy does not intended to provide a detailed inventory of the historical character of the plan area but a policy thrust for future LDF documents.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>686. Policy CP25 supporting Additional paragraph 2 proposed for inclusion</p> <p>687. Wherever possible local authorities, agencies and local voluntary groups should seek to improve the information and understanding of the historic</p>	<p>Dr C. Wakeling, Staffordshire Historic Building Trust</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>As above</p>

<p>environment. This might include the promotion of local leaflets, open heritage days, interpretation panels, local walks and guide books'.</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>688. Amend Policy CP25 as set out below</p> <p>All development should respect North Staffordshire's historic environment and consider its protection, conservation / regeneration and enhancement as appropriate including seek to promote its conservation and sustainability. Among the historic features to be considered are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Listed buildings and their settings;</li> <li>b) Conservation areas;</li> <li>c) Sites of archaeological interest;</li> <li>d) Parks, gardens and battlefields of special historic interest;</li> <li>e) Buildings and structures of local architectural or historic interest identified on Stoke's and Newcastle's local lists.</li> </ul> <p>Conservation area appraisals will be undertaken as part of future plan making.</p> <p>Local lists will be reviewed and kept</p>	<p>Dr C. Wakeling, Staffordshire Historic Building Trust</p>	<p>As above.</p>	
---	--	------------------	--

up to date and encouragement will be given to revising the statutory lists of designated buildings and sites.			
---	--	--	--

<p>689. Policy CP25 paragraph 7.247</p> <p>Amend paragraph 7.247 as set out below:</p> <p>North Staffordshire’s historic environment is a finite and non-renewable resource and requires requiring careful management, and the first presumption is that this asset should be conserved and enhanced and that arrangements should be made for its sustainable future through a conservation plan. Where direct preservation conservation of the resource is not proposed, development will be judged against factors appropriate to the nature of that resource as set out in Government guidance. In all cases where development is permitted, arrangements must be in place for an investigation the investigation e.g. a heritage characterisation study has been recently undertaken for the Inner Urban Core, recording and publication of the evidence, as well as recording information for the archive as required by the Museum’s service. of the historic</p>			<p>As above</p>
---	--	--	-----------------

<p>asset. For instance, an archaeological ‘watching brief’ will often be appropriate on sites where buried evidence might be disturbed, and characterisation studies can be valuable means of appraising the historic and architectural significance of areas in which redevelopment is proposed. It is expected that all evidence and recording information from such investigations will be published and/or deposited with the appropriate public archive.”</p>			
<p>690. Add cemeteries</p>	<p>Mrs E. Holland, North Staffs Rail Promotion Group</p>	<p>The policy has been rationalised as not to repeat national or regional guidance. The policy does not intend to provide a detailed inventory of the historical character of the plan area but a policy thrust for future LDF documents.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>691. Agreed. Conserving the setting, or creating a new and sympathetic one should also be stressed.</p>	<p>CPRE</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>692. Need linkages to SA5 and SA16.</p>	<p>Council for British Archaeology</p>	<p>Strategic Aims have been rationalised and linked under themes.</p>	<p>Section 4.</p>

693. Amend 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence "All development should protect and enhance North Staffordshire's historic environment, including...."	Council for British Archaeology	Noted. Revised policy includes 'enhance'.	CSP2.
--	---------------------------------	---	-------

<p>694. Welcomed but it is considered that the detailed wording is not in accordance with national planning advice. It is requested that the detailed working is amended. (as below). <i>All development should respect North Staffordshire's historic environment and consider its protection (including the settings of designated features), conversion/regeneration and enhancement...</i></p>	<p>National Trust</p>	<p>The policy has been rationalised as not to repeat national or regional guidance. The policy does not intend to provide a detailed inventory of the historical character of the plan area but a policy thrust for future LDF documents.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>695. Proposed conservation area appraisals should consider the availability of traditional building materials. Evidence needs to be gathered to identify local stone and maybe even clay resources that would be needed for restoration work.</p>	<p>Staffs CC</p>	<p>The Core Strategy does not define Conservation Area boundaries, and is not the appropriate vehicle to do so. There is separate legislation for this. However, Conservation Areas will be identified in relevant AAPs and identified accordingly on the LDF Proposals Map.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>696. Amend the policy to take into consideration RSS Policy QE5. The policy should be strengthened to provide greater protection in particular to Registered</p>	<p>Staffs CC</p>	<p>Noted. Historic Parks and Gardens are addressed in Strategic Aims 13 and 14, and Policy CSP2, in respect of green spaces and historic heritage. These provide the strategic framework for more</p>	<p>Strategic Aims 13 and 14, and Policy CSP2.</p>



Historic Parks and Gardens and should also make specific reference to Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other sites of archaeological interest.		detailed policies in other Development Plan Documents.	
697. Although we strongly welcome and support the inclusion of a dedicated policy on the historic environment, we consider that the policy and supporting text should be expanded on and must better reflect the distinct issues, opportunities and policy responses relevant to the area's historic environment.	English Heritage	The policy has been rationalised so as not to repeat national or regional guidance. The policy does not intend to provide a detailed inventory of the historical character of the plan area but a policy thrust for future LDF documents.	No change.
698. It could be strengthened by lending positive support to those developments that provide the opportunity to secure significant enhancement or improvement.	Mr R. Thorley, GVA Grimley	Agreed. Positive impacts of enhancement and improvements are detailed throughout the Core Spatial Strategy.	Paragraph 5.33 - 5.35. All Area Spatial Strategies.
699. Support	Burslem Port Project	Noted.	No change.



CP26 – Natural Assets			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
700. Make reference to the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act which came into effect in March 2006.	RENEW	This is only one of a number of relevant pieces of primary and secondary legislation. Identification of specific legislation would make the document time bound and raises the issue of what should be included and what should be left out.	No change.
701. Unnecessary.	GOWM	If we follow the line suggested by Government and delete the whole of the policy then we would lose the facility to produce SPDs on natural heritage/assets.	CSP4.
702. Support approach subject to specific reference being made to conserving and enhancing ancient woodland.	The Woodland Trust	Noted. The policy provides spatial guidance on natural assets and is not a description/audit of existing provision.	CSP4.
703. Welcome the rewording of this policy.	Environment Agency	Noted. Policy has been amended.	CSP4.



irreplaceable natural assets will not be accepted. Development will provide a net gain to natural assets and mitigate and fully compensate for loss of replaceable natural assets”.			
707. Also add “Development proposals will avoid fragmentation or severance of habitats and will contribute where possible to strengthening the ecological networks that sustain biodiversity”.	Staffs CC	Agreed. Text added.	Paragraph 6.32.
708. Agrees that objectives should protect and where possible, enhance water quality.	United Utilities	Noted.	No change.
709. Many of the policies seek to attract new enterprises and professional people to the area. Thus the retention of improvement of the landscape around North Staffs has a positive economic value	Madeley Conservation Group	Noted.	No change.
710. Supported	CPRE, National Trust	Noted	No change.



CP27 – Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<b>Scope of the Policy</b>			
711. Support provided if it encourages more sustainable life styles	Sustrans	Noted. Policy has been merged with CP1 to form CSP3 'Sustainability and Climate Change'.	No change.
712. Needs a high profile	Stoke-on-Trent City Council, City Centre Manager	Agreed.	No change.
713. Support	Mr C Hemersley, Severn Trent Water Mr Hubbard, National Trust Mr R. Savage, Burslem Port Project	Noted.	No change.
714. Agreed. We have a suspicion that this policy may prove adequate in the face of the fundamental changes involved and suggest that a report should be commissioned examining the problem and	Mr P. Goode, CPRE	Noted. Revised policy CSP3 is flexible as it supports local initiatives that may emerge.	No change.

solution specific to North Staffordshire.			
--	--	--	--



715. Ms H. Mawson, Home Builders Federation	<p>The HBF consider that the policy is inflexible and is unable to deal with changing circumstances and is therefore not sound.</p> <p>Furthermore, the HBF believes that the policy framework should focus more effort to encourage reduced carbon emissions from the second hand housing stock, new non-residential development and existing non-residential building stock.</p>	Policy has been merged with CP1 to form CSP3. The policy is flexible in the fact that it will support any local initiatives that may emerge. The policy includes non-residential building.	No change.
716. Support the policy, but is it as far reaching and ambitious as it could be.	Mr R. Duff, Natural England	Noted. Realistic policy is required. The requirements are based on up-to-date best practice standards.	No change.
717. Strongly agree with the development of and welcome this policy, particularly point c.	Ms J. Gabrilatsou, King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd	Noted. Requirements retained in merged policy CSP3 with the exception that the policy threshold is now 1000 sq m for non residential developments.	CSP3.
718. PPS12 requires LDS to include a policy on climate change and its effects	Mr P. Rigby, Staffs CC	Noted. Merged policy retains climate change focus.	CSP3.

<b>Setting the Targets</b>			
719. Is 10% renewable energy sufficiently ambitious?	RENEW	Targets are realistic and achievable and are based on up-to-date best practice standards.	Paragraph 6.27.
720. Note that the targets set are those of the RSS but in the West Midlands Regional Energy Strategy they are lower. The figures set are 5% to 2010 and 10% to 2020, within the West Midlands. This information should be recognised with the reasoned justification.	Ms J. Gabrilatsou, King Sturge, Claymoss Properties Ltd	Noted. The targets are based on RSS targets which are considered to be satisfactory.	No change.
721. It would be useful to include in the policy a statement that supports appropriate proposals for the generation of renewable energy in acceptable locations.	Mr R. Duff, Natural England	Proposals for renewable energy will be determined on their own merits against development control considerations provided within the Development Control Policies DPD.	No change.
722. The HBF consider that it is essential to ensure energy efficiency is maximised before considering renewable energy. Energy efficiency measures alone	Ms H. Mawson, Home Builders Federation	Agreed. Revised Policy CSP3 now provides energy efficiency targets.	CSP3.

can reduce CO2 emissions and therefore it may not be necessary to explore renewable energy options			
723. Are not large scale renewable energy sources much more efficient?	Mr G. Lancaster, Madeley Conservation Group	Noted. However, the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that a larger proportion of developments contribute to reducing the impacts of climate change by 'sharing' the burden. and reducing the overall impact. The problem is national/international but can be addressed locally.	No change.
724. Paragraph 7.265 should update EcoHomes 'good' standards	RENEW	EcoHomes has been replaced by the Code for Sustainable Homes. This is reflected in the policy.	No change.
725. Para 7.263 – agrees with safeguarding of development from flood risk and the production of an SFRA. 726. d) and e) – agrees that climate change will be addressed by reducing the risk for flooding and SUDS features. 727. Para 7.265 – agrees with the drive to implement 'Eco	Mr D. Hardman, United Utilities	Reference to flood risk 5.15.  Requirement for SUDS features in revised policy.  EcoHomes has been replaced by the Code for Sustainable Homes. This is reflected in the revised	CSP3.

homes' standards to preserve natural resources including potable water.		policy.	
728. Targets should be set for the recycled content of new build	RENEW	Noted. No explicit targets set but subsection 3 of the policy seeks the use of recycled materials.	No change.

<p>729. Support approach but would wish to see reference to the opportunities and challenges for the natural environment and biodiversity</p> <p>730. Amend Policy CP27 by addition of the following sub clause:</p> <p>f) Developing habitat systems which are resilient to climate change in accordance with latest best practice</p>	<p>Mr J. Millward, The Woodland Trust</p>	<p>Agreed. Subsection include.</p>	<p>CSP3 subsection 6.</p>
---	---	------------------------------------	---------------------------

CP28 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<p>731. Agreed – but CPRE sees inadequate emphasis on the formation/protection of an overall landscape network.</p> <p>732. We would like to see the vision defined towards which developers could work and contribute. As a comment we regard this document as an excellent statutory declaration, but lacking somewhat in its ability to illustrate its implications and enrol public enthusiasm.</p>	CPRE	<p>Revised Policy CSP4 seeks the protection of the quality and quantity of the plan area's natural assets, including the overall landscape.</p> <p>Revised Section 4 intends to provide a clearer and concise picture of how the plan area will evolve.</p>	Section 4.
<p>733. Doesn't take account of the areas further away i.e. Kidsgrove, Butt Lane, Talke and Chesterton. We are on the Cheshire Border – and people often use their facilities - will they be consulted.</p>	Rev. P. Howard, St Martins, Talke	<p>The Core Strategy deals with the plan area as shown on Plan 2. Adjoining authorities have been consulted.</p> <p>Core Strategy is not necessarily site</p>	No change.

734. What about linkages and development of Parkland i.e. Bathpool Park – is there a development plan.		specific and is not intend to be a management plan for sports/leisure facilities.	
--	--	---	--

<p>735. The introductory text refers to the need to improve biodiversity but the policy text does not reflect this. In order to help address ANGST standards, incorporation of reference to protection and enhancement of biodiversity in parks and open spaces would be welcomed.</p>	<p>Staffs CC</p>	<p>Reference to protection and enhancement of biodiversity is focused within CSP4 'Natural Assets'. Standards for open space provision and leisure/recreation facilities will be based on information contained in the North Staffs Green Space Strategy and respective playing pitch/physical activity strategies.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>736. External flood lighting should be very strictly controlled.</p>	<p>Mr Snape</p>	<p>Proposals for flood lighting (which require planning permission) will be determined against guidance contained within PPG17 and the emerging Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>737. It is important to ensure that the Core Strategy is underpinned by up to date PPG17 audits and an approve strategy for sport. Only then can the policy really seek to deliver what is needed in North Staffordshire in a robust way that meets the test of soundness.</p>	<p>Sport England</p>	<p>Agreed. Assessments and audits are being produced which will allow both authorities to identify specific needs and  quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities. The assessments/audits will form the starting point for establishing an effective strategy for open space, sport and recreation at the local level and provide for effective planning policies in emerging LDF</p>	<p>CSP5.</p>



		documents. Details of the relevant assessment/audits and strategies are contained in the supporting text of Policy CSP5.	
738. This policy needs to be strengthened in relation to local standards and needs assessment	RENEW	See above.	See above.
739. Support	Burslem Port Project Madeley Conservation Group Sustrans	Noted	No change.

CP29 – Green space network			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
740. Clarify the case for separate CP28 and 29 policies	RENEW	Agreed. Overlap between the policies. Policies now merged to form CSP5.	CSP5.
741. Support. Extend greenway concept to streets to encourage slower travel	Sustrans	For the Core Strategy the Strategic Green Space Linkages (green corridors) as referred to in CSP4 and shown on the various maps are spatial and illustrative. Green Space Linkages and the greenway concept will be explored in more detail through relevant AAPs.	No change
742. Unnecessary	GOWM	Policy removed and content merged into CSP4 and CSP5.	No change.
743. The greenspace should be opened up to view from arterial roads	Stoke-on-Trent City Council, City Centre Marketing Manager	Noted. Action Plans will be formed from the findings of the North Staffs Green Space Strategy to inform actions for each site. The future of sites will be explored in more detail through relevant AAPs.	No change.
744. Broadly support but would suggest that the concept of accessible woodland be	The Woodland Trust	Noted. Accessibility to facilities is a key element within the Core Strategy but it is considered that no	CSP4 and CSP5.

integrated into the approach.		explicit reference to accessible woodlands is required.	
-------------------------------	--	---	--

<p>745. The importance of the canals is not limited to its green role. It is 'blue' rather than 'green' infrastructure. The canal network is a multi functional asset for leisure, recreation and tourism; drainage; catalyst for regeneration; sustainable transport; freight transport; heritage and ecological resource. It can make a wider contribution to regeneration as set out in reps to CP3.</p>	<p>British Waterways</p>	<p>Noted. Importance of canals contribution to regeneration is set out within the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>SA13 Paragraphs 3.24 – 3.25.</p>
<p>746. Support</p>	<p>National Trust Burslem Port Project Natural England Madeley Conservation Group</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

CP30 – Design and the Built Environment			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<b>Do we need a strategic design policy?</b>			
747. There are too many regulatory policies. Policies should be locally distinctive, delivery focused and spatial. Policy CP30 is unnecessary	GOWM	There is no national prescription regarding the policy content of LDF documentation save that policies should not duplicate national or regional policy. The policy content of the Core Spatial Strategy should be a matter for local determination; a response to what the communities of plan area think is the appropriate body of strategic policy to take forward our sub region. Whilst it would be undoubtedly easiest to follow the GOWM guidance to strike out the policies they perceive to be unnecessary, each case has to be considered in turn. Quality of the recent built environment in North Staffordshire can at best be described as mediocre. The sub regional regeneration strategy seeks to introduce a design uplift. National policy has not been sufficient to deliver a step change. The purpose of this policy is to set out a rigorous	Policy CSP1

		approach to the design process.	
--	--	---------------------------------	--

<p>748. There are too many regulatory policies. Policies should be locally distinctive, delivery focused and spatial. Policy CP30 is unnecessary</p>	<p>GOWM</p>	<p>This will provide the platform upon which to deliver higher standards of design quality both through development plan documents and supplementary planning documents. Deletion of this policy would remove the basis upon which supplementary planning documents can be produced</p>	<p>Policy CSP1</p>
<p>749. The Core Spatial Strategy should include adequate wording or hooks within the policies that enable you to develop and use other design tools and mechanisms.</p>	<p>CABE</p>	<p>Policy CSP1 provides the platform upon which detailed design policy and supplementary guidance can be provided. Mechanisms to implement the policy are outlined in paragraph 6.17.</p>	<p>Policy CSP1 and paragraph 6.17.</p>
<p>750. Supports the objective of the policy and incorporation of the sustainability agenda. It is important that the supporting text identifies that implementation of these strategic objectives need to be refined within other LDF documents so that they can be area specific</p>	<p>Nathaniel Lichfield Madeley Conservation Group United Utilities</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy has been refined. Implementation of the policy is outlined in the supporting paragraphs.</p>	<p>Policy CSP1</p>

<b>How do we raise the quality of design?</b>			
751. Whilst welcoming improvements to the draft core strategy, all major projects must demonstrate high design quality	Urban Vision Environment Agency	Agreed. Raising the quality of design is a cross cutting theme and seen as a key challenge for the plan area. It forms an important strategic aim of the plan. A spatially distinctive strategic policy is provided which will provide the springboard for more detailed policy guidance and advice.	Strategic Aim 16 Policy CSP1
752. Design should reflect understanding of local context, character and aspirations.	CABE	Agreed.	Strategic Aim 16 Policy CSP1
753. Agreed. CPRE congratulates the authority in having approached closer to an understanding of the principles of civic design than most comparable documents. It now rests with developers and their designers to understand and embrace these principles – it may be a long struggle.  754. We still see an essential	CPRE	Noted.	Strategic Aim 16 Policy CSP1



aspect of urban design as that of its component parts all contributing to an overall unity.			
---	--	--	--

<b>How do we raise the quality of design?</b>			
755. We contemplate the lead in defining this unifying quality as being within the role of the LPA. No other body can have this responsibility or authority of an elected Council	CPRE	To achieve the aim of the Core Strategy will require partnership working throughout the development industry and cannot be solely delivered by the LPA.	Paragraph 2.18.

<b>Scope of the Strategic Design Policy</b>			
756. Landscaping to contribute to the design not to be an afterthought	Urban Vision	Agreed. More detailed design guidance will be brought forward in the emerging Design SPD.	No change.
757. Eco-design to be embraced	Urban Vision	Agreed. Revised Policy CSP3 sets requirements for sustainable design.	Policy CSP3.
758. Introduce skylines as a consideration	Urban Vision	New development should enhance the positive characteristics of its surroundings. Detailed skyline policies to be developed through development control policies and design SPD.	No change.
759. Clarify the purpose of	Urban Vision	Text inserted to explain the status of	Paragraph 6.17 bullet point 2.

Design and Access Statements		design and access statements.	
760. Principle welcomed but relate to recognised design quality frameworks	RENEW	Mechanisms to implement the policy are outlined in paragraph 6.17.	Paragraph 6.17
761. Replace 'generic' design guidance with 'North Staffordshire' design guidance	RENEW	The plan area deals with the borough and city, not the whole of the geographic area of North Staffordshire.	No change
762. Object on the basis that greater flexibility is required because not all Policy CP30 consideration may be relevant to all development. 763. 'All development will demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of its layout, resource efficiency, form and contribution to the character of the area (where appropriate)'	Dyson DTZ	Disagree, however the policy has been redrafted. Our aim is to improve the quality of the built environment in the plan area. This policy is deliberately intended to raise the bar.	Policy CSP1
764. Incorporate 'Active design' concepts	Sports England	As above although functional improvement remains an important guiding principle.	Policy CSP1
765. Replace 'will demonstrate' by 'seek to achieve'	DTZ	Policy has been revised. However our aim is to improve the quality of the built environment in the plan area. This policy is deliberately	Policy CSP1

		intended to raise the bar. The proposed alternative does not stretch the development industry.	
766. Need include an 'intelligent design mindset' in developments.	Councillor Coleman	Agreed hence the need for a rigorous design process.	Policy CSP1.

<p>767. Refer to the joint Department of Transport and English Heritage document entitled 'Streets for all: West Midlands' 2005. This policy currently identifies form and massing as important considerations but the only criteria for materials is their sustainable nature and architectural qualities. It is suggested that choice of materials appropriate to local character is also specified</p>	<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>The local vernacular is included. Detailed national design guidance is a matter for the supplementary planning guidance.</p>	<p>Policy CSP1.</p>
<p>768. The HBF would also like the Core Strategy to recognise that the Federation in conjunction with CABI have produced the 'Building for Life' guide. This guide is intended to assist house builders, housing associations, architects and planners achieve good quality design in housing.</p>	<p>Home Builders Federation</p>	<p>Noted. Detailed national design guidance is a matter for the supplementary planning guidance.</p>	<p>No change</p>

CP31 – Transport and Accessibility			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
769. Policy CP31b Is there a need to create linkages to other than the City Centre	RENEW	The proposed corridors tie in with investment priorities of the LTP, reflect existing high frequency bus corridors, and provide a comprehensive city-wide network of priority routes	Policy deleted. Now referred to in Area Spatial Strategies and shown indicatively on Plan 5. Potential routes listed at 5.137.
770. Policy CP31a Keep options open for light rapid transit	Regeneration Zone	Agreed	Policy deleted. Referred to in paragraph 5.64
771. Policy CP31a No parking should be free	City Centre Marketing Manager	Noted. Policy did not suggest this.	Policy deleted. Rationalisation of car parking referred to at paragraph 5.9
772. Policy CP31a Park and ride should be at the edge of the city not the city centre and targeted at commuters rather than shoppers	City Centre Marketing Manager		Policy deleted. Development of strategic park and ride falls under SP3. Areas of search are discussed under each Area Spatial Strategy.
773. Support. Employment and office space should also provide showers/changing facilities.	Sports England	Noted	Policy deleted. To be considered under future development control policies

774. Policy CP31c Delete reference to the Stoke Inner Relief Road	DTZ, Stoke Vision	This road scheme remains a requirement for the town centre and is not outdated	Policy deleted. Now referred to at paragraph 5.131
---	-------------------	--	--

775. Policies CP31b and c How will sustainable transport links be provided in the rural area	West Midlands Regional Assembly	Existing links will be retained as resources allow.	Focus of development in rural areas to be in key rural service centres, already served by public transport
776. CP31b, Diagram 4 Concern regarding the impact of the bus priority route on the REC building	Racial Equality Council	Diagram shows the principle of routes rather than specific alignments. Details will be considered as part of individual Area Action Plans – in this case the Inner Urban Core AAP	Policy deleted. Now referred to Area Spatial Strategies and shown indicatively on Plan 5. Potential routes listed at 5.137.
777. Policy CP31 More reference needs to be made to the use of rail passenger and freight transport	North Staffs Rail Promotion Group	Sympathetic in principle. Site specific details will be considered as part of individual Area Action Plans.	Policy deleted. Development of rail use falls under SP3 and supporting paragraph 5.61.
778. Policy CP31c Add a section on the development and use of railways and reopening stations	North Staffs Rail Promotion Group	Sympathetic in principle	Policy deleted. Development of rail use falls under SP3 and supporting paragraph 5.61
779. Policy CP31a Should not the introductory sentence include “sustainability” a) there appears to be lacking an overall strategic thesis in how much a door-to-door network by sustainable transport is to be achieved. This seems a fundamental tool and part of a	CPRE	Noted. Transport initiatives will be developed through the LTP process.	Policy deleted. Multiple references made to transport throughout including SP3 and in Area Spatial Strategies.



<p>core spatial strategy.</p> <p>b) does this mean “Working with commercial operators ..”</p> <p>c) this policy seems opaque. What is meant?</p>			
<p>780. Policy CP31b It must be assumed that this policy has been justified by a rigorous O&amp;D survey, linking key town centres does not seem a obvious choice. How has demand for such routes been assessed in the absence of an overall sustainable traffic network mentioned in our response to CP31a.</p> <p>781. Assuming a needs-based survey justifies such routes CPRE supports the concept of “trunk” bus corridors.</p>	CPRE	Noted. Transport initiatives will be developed through the LTP process.	Policy deleted. Multiple references made to transport throughout including SP3 and in Area Spatial Strategies.
<p>782. Policy CP31c a), b), c) – is the term “Area of Search” not redundant if it is proposed to develop the proposals? Is the policy to “develop the idea” or proceed with physical development?</p>	CPRE	Noted. Transport initiatives will be developed through the LTP process.	Policy deleted. Multiple references made to transport throughout including SP3 and in Area Spatial Strategies.

<p>783. CPRE supports the Park and Ride concept as long as it does not actually promote the drive element and lead to increases in car traffic in preference of taking the bus all the way.</p> <p>f) is this for a new or improved existing bus station?</p> <p>g) and 7.37 – CPRE is doubtful of the efficacy of extending cycleways into residential areas. We advocate that residential areas should be speed restricted to provide safe neighbourhoods so that cycling is safe overall. Reserved cycleways should then only be necessary where cycling and other traffic conflicts.</p> <p>h) – o) – CPRE would query the basic justification for these individual proposals against the background of any study of the traffic circulation pattern and its sustainable model spilt in the likely changed circumstances of the latter years of the plan period.</p>			
--	--	--	--

784. HA welcomes the inclusion of transport and accessibility	Highways Agency	Noted	Policy deleted
785. Point k) and l) - Network Rail is in support of this policy.	Network Rail	Noted	Policy deleted
786. Policy CP31c Support criterion (g) and paragraph 7.338	British Waterways Board	Noted	Policy deleted

<p>787. Policy CP31a Needs to be amended to refer to the measures needed to reduce the impact of traffic and to make walking and cycling a pleasanter, safer and more convenient to the car, e.g.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) reducing lower speed limits</li> <li>2) giving greater priority to pedestrians over motorists.</li> </ol> <p>788. The core strategy recognises that there needs to be a shift to more sustainable forms of transport and a culture change that encourages walking and cycling. However it does not have measures that seem likely to significantly boost walking and cycling levels. The measures that it does have will be helpful e.g. travel plans (CP31 a f) and investment in cycling networks and green corridors. My suggested changes to core policy 31a (i.e. reducing speed limits</p>	<p>CTC (Cyclists' Touring Club) Right to Ride</p>	<p>Noted. Transport initiatives will be developed through the LTP process.</p>	<p>Policy deleted</p>
--	---	--	-----------------------

<p>and giving greater priority to pedestrians) would help to achieve the vision of a more "..attractive, safe, healthy and better place ..." by reducing the impact (i.e.. danger, noise and intimidatory effect) of traffic and also help meet sustainable travel aims by boosting walking and cycling without causing undue delays to traffic.</p>			
<p>789. No mention of the highway works which will be associated with the redevelopment of the East West Centre.</p> <p>790. Para 7.335 should be expanded to identify John Street car park as the agreed site for the relocated bus station.</p> <p>791. Para 7.339 – 7.340 – Highway improvements should have a separate sub heading in main policy and off site highway works associated with the East/West development</p>	<p>Highland Hanley Ltd</p>	<p>Noted. Details will be considered as part of individual Area Action Plans – in this case the Inner Urban Core AAP. Site specific requirements will be considered as part of site allocations / assessments or through planning application process.</p>	<p>Policy deleted</p>

could be added within an expanded section 7.340.			
--	--	--	--

<p>792. Policy CP31c We do not understand the “Area of Search” terminology.</p> <p>We need more information in order to comment on 7.338 g) canal enhancements; 7.341-3 h) Etruria Valley Link; and 7.348 k) Burslem South East Access Road.</p> <p>793. Para 7.360. We think these ideas are generally well balanced but feel that more detail needs to be developed for Middleport and as part of the Burslem Port proposals.</p>	<p>Burslem Port Project</p>	<p>Noted. Details will be considered as part of individual Area Action Plans – in this case the Inner Urban Core AAP.</p>	<p>Policy deleted</p>
<p>794. Policy CP31b</p> <p>795. Policy 31b Bus Corridors for Etruria Valley</p>	<p>Tyler Parks Partnership, Morston Assets</p>	<p>Noted. Details will be considered as part of individual Area Action Plans – in this case the Inner Urban Core AAP.</p>	<p>Policy deleted. Now referred to in Area Spatial Strategies and shown indicatively on Plan 5. Potential routes listed at 5.137.</p>
<p>796. Policy CP31c</p> <p>797. Policy 31c Etruria Valley Park and Ride and link roads</p>	<p>Tyler Parks Partnership, Morston Assets</p>	<p>Noted. Details will be considered as part of individual Area Action Plans – in this case the Inner Urban Core AAP.</p>	<p>Policy deleted. Now referred to in Area Spatial Strategies and shown indicatively on Plan 5. Potential routes listed at 5.137.</p>
<p>798. This policy is supported and should consider that section of the rail network that provides a link to the Cauldon Quarries. Facilities</p>	<p>Staffs CC</p>	<p>Take into account during review</p>	<p>Policy deleted</p>

for handling aggregate minerals to be used within the City should be safeguarded.			
799. Policy CP31a While we recognise the need for development to reduce the need to travel and maximise sustainable measures, we would note that there is a need to ensure that any infrastructure provision is compliant with national guidance	Savills (Landmatch Ltd)	Noted	Policy deleted
800. Policy CP31a need to reduce congestion in the short term. As seems to be recognised (para 7.328) bus and cycles lanes can impact significantly on traffic flow and congestion, and must be planned carefully and monitored.	Madeley Conservation Group	Noted	Policy deleted
801. These are vitally important. They are mentioned or implied but they not taken into account in routine Planning Control decisions	Madeley Conservation Group	Noted	Policy deleted



<p>802. The proposals listed on page 186 appear to lead to further increases in traffic and further disadvantaged bus users who will be caught up in the lengthening queues of traffic to the exclusion of all else.</p> <p>803. Although the plan recognises the bus lanes there are no proposals to increase them.</p> <p>804. There must now be urgent proposals for developing light rail or indeed rail services. Cannot afford to miss out on the latest £15 billion being invested in light rail by the Rail Authority</p>	<p>Joan Walley MP</p>	<p>Noted. Transport initiatives will be developed through the LTP process. Details will be considered as part of individual Area Action Plans.</p>	<p>Policy deleted. Now referred to in Area Spatial Strategies and shown indicatively on Plan 5. Potential routes listed at 5.137.</p>
---	-----------------------	--	---

CP 32 – Mineral resources			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<b>Scope of the Policy</b>			
770. needs to be strengthened to identify the priority minerals issues and how they will be addressed, all in accordance with emerging best practice	GOWM Staffs CC	Agreed	Paragraphs 6.60 – 6.62
771. MPS1 requires that mineral safeguarding areas (Etruria Marl) are defined and the approach for defining these safeguarding areas should be included in the Core Strategy. The policy should also show the broad location of mineral workings	Staffs CC WMRA	Agreed	Policy CSP8
772. What is the target for aggregate recycling	Staffs CC	To be addressed in the Staffordshire & Stoke-on-Trent Waste Core Spatial Strategy	Paragraph 6.60 refers.
773. Design policies should consider the implementation of site waste management	Staffs CC	Ed please check sustainable design/climate change policy	Policy CSP3, in particular subsection 3.

<p>plans and measures to increase recycled content in building stock (refer to the Secure and Sustainable Buildings Act 2004).</p>			
<p>774. Mineral working is the ultimate non-sustainable activity – it has a finite life. It might be expected that this policy would have reference to reinstatement and reclamation of any such site as an essential part of the sustainability principle.</p>	<p>CPRE</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.62 makes it clear that development proposals emerging in the future will be guided by national and regional policy. This wording gives an appropriate level of flexibility for a Core Spatial Strategy, ensuring that prevailing requirements will be taken into account.</p>

CP33 – Waste Management			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<b>How Best to Develop Waste Core Spatial Policies</b>			
775. This policy area must be reviewed to make it more spatial and delivery focused	West Midlands Regional Assembly	Government are advising that Core Strategies are expected to have a higher level of spatial detail that originally envisaged. It is indicated that the core strategy will need to identify “broad locations” and/or “strategic sties” for future waste management facilities.	Production of waste core spatial policies as part of this Core Spatial Strategy have been abandoned in favour of production of a joint Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Waste Core Spatial Strategy.
776. The Core Strategy should set out policies and proposals for waste management in line with the RSS apportionment and ensure sufficient opportunities for the provision of waste management facilities in appropriate locations including for waste disposal (landfill).	Staffordshire County Council Severn Trent Water	This has required a reappraisal of plan making arrangements for the waste core spatial strategy. Production of waste core spatial policies as part of this Core Spatial Strategy have been abandoned in favour of production of a joint Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Waste Core Spatial Strategy. The new document will deal with secondary aggregates.	See above.

777. Is Stoke in any position to contribute to the waste disposal/treatment problems of West Midlands or adjoining regions?	CPRE		See above.
<b>Other Detailed Comments</b>			
778. Litter bins should provide holes for different waste streams to encourage recycling	Stoke-on-Trent City Council, City Centre Manager	Whilst the proposal has merits such detail would be inappropriate for a core spatial strategy.	See above.
779. If compliance with the waste hierarchy forms part of the policy, it should be, succinctly, explained what this is for the benefit of the lay reader, i.e. a sentence derived from 7.370	CPRE	To be taken into consideration in preparation of the Waste Core Spatial Strategy	See above.
780. Relocate Middleport Waste Transfer Station	Burslem Port Project	A matter for the Inner Urban Core Area Action Plan	See above.

CP34 - Integrated Approach to Delivery			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<b>Scope of the Policy</b>			
781. Principle supported for all aspects of regeneration	RENEW Mr Savage, Burslem Port Project	Agreed	Support noted.
782. Partnership working should include improving the quality of the natural and built environment	Staffordshire County Council	Agreed	Policies CSP3 and CSP4.

Section 8 – Monitoring Framework			
Reference No. & summary of representation	Consultee(s)	Response	Submission Draft
<b>Adequacy of the Draft Monitoring Framework</b>			
783. Welcome provision of details on implementation and monitoring but more needs to be done	GOWM	Monitoring Framework updated to reflect revised format of the Core Strategy Submission document. Links to Strategic Aims and Core Strategic Policies shown. New National Indicators incorporated. Targets shown where appropriate to a Core Strategy Document. Direction of travel indicated for contextual indicators.	Section 8
784. Adequate	Mr M. Manley, Fulford Parish Council Mr Snape	Noted	No change.
785. Although a majority of the information sources needed for monitoring are held in the public sector, private sector information and surveys could also be	Ms J. Cook, North Staffs Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Public sector sources used as they are more likely to be available long term allowing analysis over time. Use of publicly available information also allows independent verification by third parties. Private surveys / information potentially subject to	Section 8

usefully be explored.		copyright restrictions and issues of data quality.	
786. Depend on the definitions given to the Policies.	G. Stock, Drivers Jonas, Lear Management	Noted	No change.
787. There must be clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring in order to be sound.	Mr Duff, Natural England	Noted	No change.
788. It will be very important to monitor and manage the housing numbers and locations to ensure the agreed strategic approach to supporting the centres is delivered.	City of Stoke-on-Trent Housing Enabling Team	Broad allocations now included in the Core Strategy. Housing trajectory gives clear targets.	Section 8
789. Requires clarification and strengthening.	Mr A. Smith, English Heritage	Monitoring Framework updated to reflect revised format of the Core Strategy Submission document. Links to Strategic Aims and Core Strategic Policies shown. New National Indicators incorporated. Targets shown where appropriate to a Core Strategy Document. Direction of travel indicated for contextual indicators.	Section 8
790. The Burslem Masterplan	Joan Walley MP	The Burslem masterplan will be	No change.



needs to be convergent with this plan		reviewed as part of the Inner Urban Core Area Action Plan, prepared in broad conformity with the Core Spatial Strategy and including an appropriate monitoring regime.	
---------------------------------------	--	--	--

<b>Clarification of Proposed Monitoring Targets</b>			
791. Clear targets, assumption and milestones to be incorporated in the submission document	GOWM	Targets shown where appropriate to a Core Strategy Document. Direction of travel indicated for contextual indicators.	No change.
792. What are the targets for housing monitoring?	Urban Vision	Broad allocations now included in the Core Strategy. Housing trajectory gives clear targets.	Section 5
793. What are the targets for in centre office development?	Urban Vision	Targets are now included in the Core Strategy	Section 5
794. Indicator 25 should be altered to provide greater clarity and be consistent with No 24 – reference should be made to public transport rather than sustainable transport.	Mr R. Jaffier, Highways Agency	Reference to sustainable transport is the correct one as access to facilities can be on foot or by bicycle instead of simply by public transport. Preference would be to use sustainable transport for both indicators but this would not reflect the (incorrect) national definition	Section 8
795. Define 'In Home Surveys'. Do they have input from public/communities?	Mr Richardson	Reference to in-house surveys means surveys carried out by the City / Borough Council as part of their statutory functions and	Section 8

		other activities rather than nationally collected statistics. Reference has been changed to Annual Monitoring Report as this is where the data will be made available.	
<b>Topic Areas Omitted from the Draft Monitoring Framework</b>			
796. Introduce design qualitative indicators for monitoring	Urban Vision	Indicator now included	Section 8
797. Monitor levels of walking and cycling	Sustrans	There is a wide range of monitoring data outside of the Core Strategy, including a raft of LTP indicators and the new National Indicators. These can be drawn upon as necessary without the need to repeat them in the Core Strategy	Section 8
798. Additional indices may include; 799. City centre ranking in GOAD 800. % retail floor space in specified areas	Stoke-on-Trent City Council, City Centre Manager	Indicator now included	Section 8
801. Residents group housing survey to be undertaken every three years	J. Huff, European Information Bureau	Noted	No change.
802. Review against census 2011	J. Huff, European Information Bureau	Noted	No change.

803. Item 46+ to be agreed with the voluntary sector	J. Huff, European Information Bureau	New National Indicators incorporated and additional indicators included. There is a wide range of monitoring data outside of the Core Strategy, including the new National Indicators. These can be drawn upon as necessary without the need to repeat them in the Core Strategy	Section 8
804. Suggested measure – the money invested in community facilities	M. Taylor, Sports England	New National Indicators incorporated and additional indicators included. There is a wide range of monitoring data outside of the Core Strategy, including the new National Indicators. These can be drawn upon as necessary without the need to repeat them in the Core Strategy.	Section 8
805. Where are the social indicators? Suggestion made	M. Taylor, Sports England	New National Indicators incorporated and additional indicators included. There is a wide range of monitoring data outside of the Core Strategy, including the new National Indicators. These can be drawn upon as necessary without the need to repeat them in the Core Strategy.	Section 8

<p>806. Access to quality sports facilities or life expectancy could be useful indicators</p>	<p>M. Taylor, Sports England</p>	<p>New National Indicators incorporated and additional indicators included. There is a wide range of monitoring data outside of the Core Strategy, including the new National Indicators. These can be drawn upon as necessary without the need to repeat them in the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Section 8</p>
---	----------------------------------	--	------------------

<p>807. Car parking standards to take account of local circumstances and need. Restrictive car parking policies notwithstanding green travel plans is a constraint on the business operations at Keele</p>	<p>Mr E. Kelsall, Keele University</p>	<p>Not included in the Core Strategy – parking standards will most likely be included in the proposed Generic Development Policies DPD.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>808. How do we include for the public perception on performance</p>	<p>Cllr M. Coleman</p>	<p>Performance of the City / Borough Council is measured through LAA process using the new set of National Indicators and the selected local sub-set of indicators.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>809. "Listed buildings, conservation areas and archaeological remains" and another monitoring point should be "number of archaeological remains affected by development proposals"</p>	<p>Mr M. Hodder, Council for British Archaeology</p>	<p>Reference revised to include archaeological remains</p>	<p>Section 8</p>
<p>810. Should identify a range of indicators with appropriate targets to cover key areas of uncertainty in the environment. It should select monitoring indicators that are integrated with wider biodiversity and countryside monitoring in the</p>	<p>Mr R. Duff, Natural England</p>	<p>New National Indicators incorporated and additional indicators included. There is a wide range of monitoring data outside of the Core Strategy, including the new National Indicators. These can be drawn upon as necessary</p>	<p>No change.</p>

sub-region.		without the need to repeat them in the Core Strategy	
-------------	--	--	--

<p>811. Include an indicator to measure the amount of accessible natural greenspace as referenced RSS1 page 139, Annex b.</p>	<p>Mr R. Duff, Natural England</p>	<p>New National Indicators incorporated and additional indicators included. There is a wide range of monitoring data outside of the Core Strategy, including the new National Indicators. These can be drawn upon as necessary without the need to repeat them in the Core Strategy</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>812. Page 205 Item 13 Windfall development – Would like to see a target for this item</p>	<p>Mr I. Snaith, Chapel Chorlton</p>	<p>It is difficult to set a target for windfall development. The level of windfall developments is affected by having (or not) up to date land use allocations. An up to date plan would see very few windfall developments and an aged, out of date plan would see a high proportion of windfall developments. For example, at the time of writing, all development in Stoke-on-Trent is windfall development as all former City Plan 2001 allocations have lapsed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>



<b>Publication of Annual Monitoring</b>			
813. Annual Monitoring report to be sent to all who comment on this plan	J. Huff, European Information Bureau	The Annual Monitoring Report is published on-line and is available to all. This is in line with national government policies. A printed version is not currently produced. Copies can be made available in line with our obligations under the Freedom of Information Act.	No change.