



### Local Plan

Publication Stage Representation Form Ref:

(For official use only)

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:

South Staffordshire Council Local Plan 2023 - 2041

Please return to South Staffordshire Council by 12 noon Friday 31 May 2024

This form has two parts -

Part A – Personal Details: need only be completed once.

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

### Part A

	ase complete only the Title, Name and Organisation (i full contact details of the agent in 2.	2. Agent's Details (if applicable)  f applicable)
Title	Mrs and Mr	
First Name	Pauline and Steven	
Last Name	Holyhead	
Job Title (where relevant) Organisation		
(where relevant) Address Line 1		
Line 2		
Line 3		
Line 4		
Post Code		
1 051 0540		
Telephone Number		
E-mail Address		
(where relevant)		



# Part B - Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organ	isation: Steve	en and Pauline	e Holyhead			
3. To which par	rt of the Local	Plan does thi	s represent	ation relate?		
Paragraph	5.7 Pages 25 to 27		S3 Open ountrysid	Policies Ma		Page 235 Site Ref 036C
4. Do you cons	ider the Local	Plan is :				
(1) Legally com	npliant	Yes			No	NO
(2) Sound		Yes			No	NO
(3) Complies w Duty to co-op		Yes		No	NO	,

Please tick as appropriate

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

We consider that, in respect of site 036c in the South Staffs Publication Plan, the plan is unsound and may not be legally compliant. It has evidently not been the subject of effective 'duty-to-co-operate' in terms of liaison with Stafford Borough Council (SBC).

We ask for site 036c to be removed entirely from the plan.

We believe that the plan is not legally compliant as the use of site 036c fails the National Planning Policy Framework 19 December 2023, where Section 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment states that compliance with the NPPF is a legal obligation. The land is productive farmland, classified by SSDSC consultant Lepus in their report as Grade 3, moving to Grade 2. The Parrott family, who have farmed this land successfully for years, have confirmed that the land is productive and is Grade 3a.

Furthermore, this beautiful rolling countryside provides an excellent and necessary vista from the large Wildwood development and the A34.

The site is well known for its diverse wildlife. 34 species of birds are seen on a regular basis, alongside bats, badgers, deer and hares. This area is a vital biodiversity link between the Cannock Chase AONB and the Staffs and Worcester Canal and the River Penk valley. The Staffordshire Wildlife Trust Biodiversity Report deems connectivity of upmost importance, but this has been ignored in the plan in respect of this site.



We do not believe that it is compliant with Policy DS3. Quoting the policy:

"The council will protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the open countryside whilst supporting development proposals which:

- a) Assist in delivering diverse and sustainable farming enterprises;
- b) Deliver/assist in delivering other countryside-based enterprises and activities, including those which promote the recreation and enjoyment of the countryside, such as forestry, horticulture, fishing and equestrian activities;
- c) Provide for the sensitive use of renewable energy resources (in conjunction with Policy NB5); or
- d) Enable the re-use of an existing building providing that the proposed use of any building (taking into account the size of any extensions, rebuilding or required alternations), would not harm the intrinsic character and beauty of the open countryside.'

The proposed development at site 036c meets none of these objectives.

The policy goes on to state that 'such proposals will only be permitted where they are not located on best and most versatile agricultural land'. As stated above, this proposed development is on Grade 2-3 farming land that is being and has productively been farmed for 3 generations by the Parrott family. The farm there is more than viable and as a country we are facing a situation where we there is a real possibility that we will be in food poverty due to potential food shortages. Indeed, the government has recognised that due to the escalating costs associated with importing food, we need to be more self-sufficient than we currently are. We simply cannot allow good quality agricultural land to go.

Continuing from the above quotation (in respect of site 036c), it states that:
...... and are fully consistent with any other relevant policies set out elsewhere in the Local Plan. These include, but are not limited to, policies which relate to the district's:

- overall development strategy This is arguably not met, the housing is in the wrong location and is already being excessively provided in the SSDS 2024 Plan (the plan is exceeding the target by 473 houses)
- design standards This has not been addressed
- landscape character and assets This has not met
- heritage assets This has not been addressed, the property and adjacent Farm, which will be endangered by this and likely future development that follows it, are part of the historic Earls of Lichfield land and was the home of his land manager/Bailiff
- ecological assets and biodiversity This has not been met and cannot be realistically met by claimed offsets such as 'diversity in gardens' or financial contributions to the Cannock Chase AONB
- recreational assets This has not been met
- housing mix requirements (where applicable) This has not been met
- sustainable travel requirements Nil within SSDC and severely overloaded within adjacent SBC.

The 81 houses are not necessary to meet SSDC housing demand or local demand. Clause 5.28 of the plan makes clear that there is no local 'unmet housing need'.

Therefore we struggle to see how this site could be justified.

Has the plan recognised or addressed the provision of houses by Stafford Borough Council for neighbouring authorities, and thus are they actually necessary or justified?



We do not believe so, and we kindly request that the Inspector considers if this has been properly addressed in the SSDC Plan.

The plan is not sound because:

- 1. There is a lack of spaces in available local schools they are all oversubscribed and full. If this incorrect assessment of the plan in respect of education were to be removed, the consultant's assessment would we expect be reversed given the 5 minor negative assessments, 1 major negative and only 2 minor positives for site 036c.
- 2. The land neighbours Cannock Chase AONB- there is no evidence that this has been taken into account. This directly contradicts policy EQ2. Site 036c is an important part of the continuity of open countryside between Cannock Chase AONB and the Valley of the River Penk, as discussed above.
- 3. It is frankly ludicrous to state that damage to the environment can be mitigated by 'diversity of domestic gardens' or financial mitigation to Cannock Chase.
- 4. The site is unsound in terms of localised housing need. It is adjacent to the southern boundary of Stafford Borough Council, which has provided significantly more housing than their minimum requirements. Local schools and health provisions are already stretched, yet SSDC are presuming that SBC will provide these services. Local roads are also overloaded and struggling to cope with existing traffic.
- 5. Of all the sites assessed by the SSDC consultants Footprint Ecology HRA supporting the Publication Plan, Appendix 4, sites 016 (Pear Tree Farm, Huntington, a Tier 2 Settlement) and site 036c are the closest sites to Cannock Chase AONB, at 2.0km and 2.1km respectively.
- 6. SSDC does maintain a Brownfield Register. It appears to contain 1.9 hectares owned by a public authority and 2.5 hectares not owned by a public authority deemed suitable for development; if the 81 houses are necessary (which we dispute), this 4.4 hectares should be used as a suitable alternative to site 036c.

Finally, our concerns regarding the duty to cooperate will be addressed. As discussed above, there is no evidence that SSDC have exercised their duty to cooperate with Stafford Borough Council in that they have not acknowledged or taken in to account the housing allocation that SBC have declared in their plan. The proposed site also puts pressure on the already overwhelmed local health and education provisions. There are 23,000 people at the nearby doctor's surgery (Weeping Cross).

For all reasons declared above, please delete, in its entirety, the planned development at location 036c.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to cooperate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.



The complete removal of the proposal site ref 036c.						
(Cartinua and a consulta chart (averand have if accesses)						
(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)						



**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a modifice necessary to participate in examination hearing	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
NO NO participate in hearing session(s)	Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)						
Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.							
8. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:							

**Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

Representations cannot be kept confidential and will be available for public scrutiny, including your name and/or organisation (if applicable). However, your contact details will not be published.

#### **Data Protection**

Your details will be added to our Local Plans Consultation database so that we can contact you as the review progresses. South Staffordshire Council will process your personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR). Our Privacy Notice can be viewed at <a href="Data Protection">Data Protection</a> (Strategic Planning) | South Staffordshire District Council (sstaffs.gov.uk)

Please return the form via email to <a href="localplans@sstaffs.gov.uk">localplans@sstaffs.gov.uk</a> or by post to South Staffordshire Council, Community Hub, Wolverhampton Road, Codsall, South Staffordshire WV8 1PX



# Part B - Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organ	isation: S	teven ar	nd Pauline H	Holyhead				
3. To which par	t of the L	ocal Plan	does this	representation	relat	:e?		
Paragraph	5.7 Pages 25 to 27	Policy	HC15 Education		Polid	cies Map	Page 23 Site Ref 036c.	
4. Do you cons	ider the L	ocal Plan	is:					
(1) Legally com	pliant	Ye	S				N o	No
(2) Sound		Ye	S				N o	No
(3) Complies w Duty to co-op		`	⁄es			No	No	

Please tick as appropriate

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

We consider that, in respect of site 036c in the South Staffs Publication Plan, the plan is unsound and may not be legally compliant. It has evidently not been the subject of effective 'duty-to-co-operate' in terms of liaison with Stafford Borough Council (SBC).

We ask for site 036c to be removed entirely from the plan.

The plan is not legally compliant because it does not comply with National Planning Policy Framework, 19 December 2023. Compliance with the NPPF is a legal obligation. To quote the framework:

It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education.

This has clearly not been met since all surrounding schools are full.

The plan is not sound because the assessment of the site by SSDC's consultants Lepus rated the site a major positive when considering education. The first point to note is that SSDC are assuming that they can rely on the educational provision of Stafford Borough Council, with the proposed site's placement being right on the southern

boundary of SBC at Wildwood (and the absence of alternative provision local to the site). There are significant new and planned housing developments in the south of Stafford – indeed, they have provided significantly more housing than their minimum requirements. This has provided significant housing availability (negating the need for the 306c site) and has also put even more excessive demands on local schools and healthcare. Whilst the local schools are excellent – they are already at full capacity and indeed oversubscribed, clearly making this assessment inaccurate. Stafford Borough Council would without hesitation confirm this, and indeed that a collaborative approach has not been taken (again contradicting the quote from NPPF above). The removal of this major positive marking would ultimately reverse the consultant's assessment, as they already identified 5 minor negative assessments, 1 major negative and only 2 minor positives for the site.

We dispute that the SSDC Plan needs to deliver the number of houses on it, as the number exceeds SSDC's target by 473, meaning that this detrimental proposal is not only unquestionably not worth the sacrifice, but also completely unnecessary. However, if it is considered they do need to increase the number of houses on the plan, there are clearly far more appropriate sites (such as Codsall/Bilbrook, or even site further south in SSDC). Importantly, there are also 4.4 hectares available on the brownfield register. These locations would clearly be a more suitable alternative to site 036c.

The plan does not comply with the duty to cooperate because it's not a positive planning process. SSBC did not advise of this form, we only heard about it through neighbours. We struggle to see where the communication of this plan has taken place, nor indeed how any meaningful consultation has taken place.

Furthermore, this plan clearly ignored public opinion and their own past councillor's decisions, as this site has already been proposed, and of course was withdrawn because it is simply not suitable.

As noted in another representation, but relevant to the above, SSDC do not demonstrate that they have exercised their Duty to Cooperate with Stafford Borough Council in that they have not acknowledged or taken account of the housing allocation that SBC have declared in their plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031. They have also not taken account of the already evident pressure on their education and healthcare provision, or the impact on the roads.

Site 036c is clearly unnecessary and surplus to reasonable requirements. I ask the Inspector to consider this matter.



(Continue on a separate sheet /e.	xpand box if necessary)
6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make	
legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or so	
you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance we operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need	
modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It	
you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any	
Please be as precise as possible.	
Complete removal of the proposal of site ref 036c.	
Complete removal of the proposal of site ref 030c.	
(Continue on a separate sheet /e:	xpand box if necessary)
(11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	,,
<b>Please note:</b> In your representation you should provide succinctly and supporting information necessary to support your representation	
suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have	
opportunity to make submissions.	e a rarerrer
After this stage, further submissions may only be made if inv	
Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identified	es for
examination.	
7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do yo	u consider it
necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?	d consider it
No, I do not wish to	Yes, I wish to
NO participate in	participate in
hearing session(s)	hearing
	session(s)
Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your w	ish to participate
in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm y	
participate.	



this to be nec	cessary:	in the nearing	ig session(s),	piease outilile	e willy you co	nisidei

**Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

Representations cannot be kept confidential and will be available for public scrutiny, including your name and/or organisation (if applicable). However, your contact details will not be published.

#### **Data Protection**

Your details will be added to our Local Plans Consultation database so that we can contact you as the review progresses. South Staffordshire Council will process your personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR). Our Privacy Notice can be viewed at <a href="Data Protection">Data Protection</a> (Strategic Planning) | South Staffordshire District Council (sstaffs.gov.uk)

Please return the form via email to <u>localplans@sstaffs.gov.uk</u> or by post to South Staffordshire Council, Community Hub, Wolverhampton Road, Codsall, South Staffordshire WV8 1PX