

# **Submission Document A26**

## **Representations received under regulation 20 – Late representations**



19.12.2013

Dear Sir or Madam

**Comments on ESBC's pre-submission Local Plan. December 2013**

Please find below our comments on your pre-submission Local Plan. We are very supportive of most aspects of the plan and have made some detailed comments which we hope can be accommodated even at this late stage.

CRI's vision is to create and connect beautiful places where people can explore and enjoy water, landscape and wildlife, and to ensure that careful extraction and restoration by the area's many sand and gravel quarries will leave a sustainable network of wildlife habitats, public amenities and agricultural land. We also want to inspire and encourage landowners, communities and individuals to get involved in shaping their local landscape.

We make our comments in relation to our aims, which are:

1. A regionally recognised place that people are proud of, involved with, access and enjoy.
2. An attractive landscape, focussed on rivers and the lakes formed from restored gravel pits, with natural resources and high quality development supporting a thriving and sustainable economy.
3. A wildlife-rich landscape with extensive wetlands, healthy rivers and sustainable mixed farming.
4. Appropriate recreational and business activities that work in harmony with each other and the landscape.
5. Co-ordination of restoration of gravel quarries to achieve most benefit.
6. Increased awareness, understanding and participation in the wildlife, heritage and potential of the landscape.

Our general comments are:

Please can you add CRI boundaries to your maps. We have these in GIS and can supply if required.

Please mention CRI alongside policies referring to the A 38 corridor.

Please add reference to the Trent Valley Way, as there is a long term aspiration to extend this long distance route through the Staffordshire part of the Trent, and Burton is a key stopping point for walkers.

P 131 CRI has little funding but can contribute through other resources such as Project Manager time and partners' expertise, and we hope will have more funding in future.



We make specific comments below which we relate to our aims:

**1. A regionally recognised place that people are proud of, involved with, access and enjoy.**

P 48 please add reference to CRI after 1.124 - Burton is a key town within the CRI, the Washlands represent a major asset in the CRI area and CRI is committed to maximising the benefit from this to residents of Burton, both within Burton and by giving greater access and enjoyment from the landscape of the Trent Valley surrounding Burton.

CRI supports the creation through Staffordshire of the Trent Valley Way. The Trent is the third longest river in England. The Trent Valley Way exists from Trent Lock at the Derbyshire/Notts boundary to the Humber. It has been developed by Notts CC and by OnTrent, now working as Trent Rivers trust and has shown to bring significant economic benefits in the hospitality industry. Burton is a key town along the Trent and through the TVW can be said to link with Nottingham, Newark, Gainsborough and Stoke on Trent. See details and feasibility study at <http://www.trentriverstrust.org/site/projects/trent-valley-way> . We would ask that the local plan also support the aspiration to complete the TVW through Staffordshire. North of Burton the route would need to either go via Newton Solney, where some pedestrian improvements might be needed, or via Claymills, in which case we ask that the Derby Road Gateway work incorporate an attractive route out of Burton which currently encounters obstacles near the sewage works. This could be mentioned in SP12. Please mention Trent Valley Way at p 132 – Green Infrastructure and at 175 – Blue infrastructure and water based recreation.

We support Strategic Policy 15, Tourism, culture and leisure. In the CRI area there are significant challenges in crossing the A38 other than by car. We would like to see a safe pedestrian crossing over or under the A38 north of Alrewas. This would allow the TVW to cross the A38 (the biggest obstacle now along its entire route!). Please add to SP 15 not only that development should not adversely affect the network, but that it should actively improve it eg by providing cycle routes, safe crossings etc.

We support Strategic Policy 22 – communities and SP34 – Health and Wellbeing



**2. An attractive landscape, focussed on rivers and the lakes formed from restored gravel pits, with natural resources and high quality development supporting a thriving and sustainable economy.**

Therefore we support SO1 Well designed communities, SO6 – Centres and Strategic Green Gaps 2.14 p60

We strongly support your Green Infrastructure Policy SP23. We agree that CRI has much to contribute to Green and Blue infrastructure and welcome the reference to CRI here. We agree with the priorities listed in the policy and would suggest adding another, which you may feel is covered in I to iv but may benefit from being spelt out – ‘result in obstacles to the GI network being overcome – eg safe crossings of road, river, canal or railways’. All of these occur in the CRI area and present challenges to connectivity. Also we would like to add here a reference to providing a route for the Trent Valley Way north of Burton and crossing the A38 north of Alrewas.

We strongly support detailed policy 10, Blue Infrastructure, with its specific reference to CRI. We recognise that there are potential conflicts between recreation, wildlife, visual amenity, navigation etc and feel that to say that recreational activities will be promoted only where they do not conflict with the other aspects may be too cautious. Our approach is to talk to stakeholders, understand the issues, map them and arrive at appropriate solutions where the balance tips in different ways in different places. Eg where there is particular wildlife sensitivity this should be the priority, near centres of population recreation may be prioritised. We represent many interests and would not like to see this policy create a hierarchy of priorities. Please add a reference to the Trent Valley Way here too if possible.

SP24 – Does it say enough about energy efficient design to help with fuel poverty, especially in deprived areas eg parts of Burton?

We support SP31 – Green belt and green gaps.

**3. A wildlife-rich landscape with extensive wetlands, healthy rivers and sustainable mixed farming.**

We therefore support SO10 – Flood risk, SO12-Countryside, SP27 – Climate change, water body management and flooding. We specifically welcome the four bullet points at the end within it SP27 and would like to see the strongest possible ‘should’ type language applied to same.

We support SP26 – National Forest and SP – Biodiversity and geodiversity, SP30 – Locally significant landscape.

SP32 Open spaces – should also include water bodies as open spaces – rivers, lakes, canals and ponds.



**4. Appropriate recreational and business activities that work in harmony with each other and the landscape.**

The A38 corridor is noted in your plan as being key for employment and economic activity. It is also key to the CRI. The CRI vision is to provide a high quality, vibrant environment which provides a credible economic alternative to warehousing etc. We ask that development of employment should also seek to deliver CRI aims which we believe would have the effect of increasing the value of the employment land. Relevant also to Burton and Uttoxeter Existing Employment land policy, p105. Relevant for example at p 34 1.74.

P 50 Burton – add that it will have sustainable transport – network of cycle routes etc leading from National Forest and CRI.

We support SO3 – sustainable transport and SO7 – economic diversification

**5. Co-ordination of restoration of gravel quarries to achieve most benefit.**

We therefore support S011 – Prudent use of resources

**6. Increased awareness, understanding and participation in the wildlife, heritage and potential of the landscape**

We therefore support SO9 – heritage

SP25 – heritage. Please add something about interpreting and celebrating history. The gravel industry contributes to the archaeological knowledge base and this should be appropriately shared with the public. Does the same point apply to Detailed Policy 5 – protecting the historic environment?

We realise that this is a late stage to be making detailed comments, congratulate you on your coherent and positive plan, and hope that our suggestions can be accommodated.

Kind regards

Julie Wozniczka

Project Manager

Central Rivers Initiative



**East Staffordshire Local Plan – Pre Submission**  
**Agency's Response - 2 December 2013**

1. The Highways Agency is responsible for maintaining, operating and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in England on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport and is committed to supporting Government objectives for enabling sustainable development as set out in the Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 02/2013 'The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development'. In this instance the HA's interest relates to the A38(T) and A50(T).
2. The Highways Agency welcomes the recent updates to the transport evidence base which now underpin the Plan. This includes the re-runs of the previous SATURN model to assess the impacts of the current development strategy, taking account of the predicted traffic conditions and other influences on the highway network including all committed and proposed improvements.
3. In relation to this however, the Highways Agency notes that the transport work and conclusions arising reflect a relatively limited assessment of the A38, including only limited assessment of junction capacity and operation on this highway. Given the extant issues of traffic congestion and reduced journey time reliability on the A38 around Burton (issues which have been clearly highlighted in the Pre-Submission Local Plan (paragraph 1.72) and also in the Council's Integrated Transport Strategy (paragraph 2.6)), then this shortcoming must be acknowledged.
4. It follows that, whilst the Highways Agency is content that the Local Plan transport evidence base, in respect of the A38, demonstrates that there are no particular barriers to the delivery of the Local Plan's planned growth – this response is caveated by a recognition that the assessment work to date has been of a strategic nature only, and limited in its outputs. It will therefore remain a key requirement on any future applications for development within East Staffordshire to require Applicants to provide a more detailed assessment of traffic impacts on the SRN, arising from their proposals and, in consultation with the Highways Agency, to define any requirements for mitigation measures.
5. The Highways Agency also has an outstanding concern that traffic impacts associated with Local Plan development on and around the A50(T) have not been assessed as part of the evidence base. This would include the impacts of the proposed SUE to the west of Uttoxeter and other key development sites in the vicinity, at Derby Road and Hazelwalls. As a consequence, the related IDP is also relatively silent on the nature of highways improvements which might be associated with future development at Uttoxeter.
6. This absence of transport evidence relating to the A50 means that there remains a level of uncertainty regarding the delivery of Local Plan growth in this location and that there will be a requirement on developers undertaking detailed analysis as part of their site specific

development proposals in order to identify impacts, mitigation and funding and delivery options.

7. Notwithstanding this, you will be aware of the recent Government announcement in respect of proposed improvements to the A50 around Uttoxeter which are intended to help facilitate significant local growth in jobs and housing and which are expected to commence no later than 2015/16. Given these circumstances, we anticipate that the level of proposed growth in Uttoxeter, as defined in the Pre-Submission Local Plan has, at least, a reasonable prospect of being accommodated.
8. Taking all these matters into account, the Highways Agency is content that the Local Plan reflects a robust and credible transport evidence base and can be regarded as ‘sound’ in this respect.
9. In respect of Strategic Policy 35, the Highways Agency also welcomes the commitments within the Local Plan to fostering more sustainable travel patterns within the Borough, including the requirement for Travel Plans to be prepared in association with new development and to encourage other measures which will help reduce the need to travel and to secure modal shift.





## ENGLISH HERITAGE

WEST MIDLANDS

Planning Policy  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
PO BOX 8045  
Burton Upon Trent  
DE14 9LG

Our ref: W 5369 RT  
0117 975 0679  
0121 625 6829  
rohan.torkildsen@english-  
heritage.org.uk

29 November 2013

Dear Sirs,

### **East Staffordshire Borough Council Pre Submission Local Plan Consultation**

Thank you for inviting English Heritage to comment on the draft Local Plan.

My following observations relate to the need for the Plan to effectively enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF')<sup>1</sup>. One of the core dimensions of sustainable development being the protection and enhancement of the historic environment<sup>2</sup>.

As the Government's adviser for the historic environment and a prescribed consultee in the plan making process the following comments are made in order to support revisions and clarifications that secure a justified and effective Plan consistent with the NPPF. We sincerely hope they are useful in doing so.

English Heritage welcomes a commitment to the sensitive and proactive management of the historic environment to ensure its future conservation as expressed in the related section (page 134) of the Plan, strategic policy no.25, the associated detailed policies and in particular the proposed SPDs for local heritage assets, vernacular rural buildings, historic shop fronts and Burton on Trent's Brewing Heritage.

With reference to the Council's obligation to ensure a "*positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment*"<sup>3</sup> English Heritage would encourage the Council to focus effort on a reduction in the number of heritage assets on the national at risk register comprising 7 scheduled monuments (including enclosures, henge, cursor and bowl barrows); 3 listed structures and 2 conservation areas (Clarence Street/Anglesey Road, and George Street, Burton upon Trent), mindful of the expectation that pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements to the historic environment<sup>4</sup>. At present the Plan makes a rather general commitment to heritage assets at risk but limited specific initiatives.

---

<sup>1</sup> NPPF paragraphs 151 and 182

<sup>2</sup> NPPF paragraph 7

<sup>3</sup> NPPF paragraph 126

<sup>4</sup> NPPF paragraph 9



The Plan includes a number of allocations with implications for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment and therefore the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF. I have the following related specific concerns.

#### **Strategic Policy 4 - JCB, Pinfold Road, Uttoxeter (257 new homes)**

Although this site is adjacent to the southern boundary of the towns conservation area and numerous heritage assets there does not appear to be an explicit historic environment assessment of the impact of such development on character, appearance, setting and significance in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF.

Without prejudice to the above and the principle of such a development one would have anticipated that the Plan would have specified a requirement for proposals to positively respond to this historic context ensuring a complimentary development which integrates with the urban form and respects Uttoxeter's historic setting.

#### **Land South of Rocester**

This is a large site within and adjacent to one of the town's conservation areas. There appears no assessment of the implications of the proposal on the character, appearance, setting and significance in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF.

It should be noted that English Heritage has not been consulted on the extant planning application contrary to the appropriate regulations and procedures.

#### **Abbots Bromley**

Again, there appears no assessment in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF considering, and then where appropriate conserving the significance of affected heritage assets. The proposed extension to the settlement boundary and the development affects the conservation area and Leafields Farm, including three listed structures. Can the Plan be considered Sound as a consequence?

#### **Mayfield**

There is no evidence to explain the implications for the conservation area of the reversion back to the former 1999 settlement boundary. Why had it been previously reduced in size omitting the inclusion of the conservation area? What are the consequences of the Plan proposal for the historic environment now?

#### **Marchington**

Again, it is unclear what the implications are for the conservation area and adjacent listed building of the settlement boundary extension at Yew Tree Farm. I presume redevelopment of this open area would ensue. However there is no apparent evidence including an appropriate historic environment assessment to inform the proposal contrary to the NPPF as previously explained above.

#### **Strategic Policy 7 Sustainable Urban Extensions - Branston**

This 20 ha site abuts the Tatenhill Conservation Area. Consequently one would have anticipated that the Plan would have referred to its characteristics - which comprise its historic significance - and ensure, in Policy, that it is an important matter to be considered to ensure compliance with statutory and NPPF obligations.

#### **Strategic Policy 12 Derby Road, Burton on Trent Regeneration Corridor**

English Heritage would have expected Policy 12 to have explicitly reflected Objective SO9 - *Sustainable management of the historic environment - to support heritage-led regeneration*, and Strategic Policy 25 – *focus on heritage led regeneration*.



The historic significance of the Derby Road site appears not to have been considered (Historic Environment Assessment?), addressed and reflected in Policy 12 and the associated design principles for the area's future redevelopment. I would recommend a modification/clarification to ensure the significance of the historic character, fabric and structures including the Grade II listed hydraulic tower and bonded warehouse informs an appropriate heritage led regeneration.

Expertise should be applied to provide a robust and thorough historic environment assessment of the Borough Plan's allocations to demonstrate a clear understanding of the implications for the numerous heritage assets affected. This essential evidence should be applied to inform the Plan and its proposals and ensure conformity with the NPPF and the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with its policies.

Torkildsen  
Historic Environment Planning Adviser for the West Midlands and South West



Date 25/11/13

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: G.A. JEFFREY

Address:  
146 FIELD LANE  
BURTON-ON-TRENT

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date 1-12-13

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: H WRIGHT

Address: 17 Deby Road  
Burton-on-Trent  
DE14 1RU

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date

30/11/13

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name:

J. ELLIS

Address:

153 FOREST RD  
B-O-T

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date 30/11/13

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: JIAMIN XUE

Address: 75 Field Lane,  
Burton-upon-Trent,  
DE13 0NJ

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date 1/12/13

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: Jessica Hill

Address: 34 Eton Road  
Burton on Trent  
Staffordshire  
DE14 2SW

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form. It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods. I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely



Date 1/12/2013

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: L WRIGHT

Address: 17 DEBBY ROAD  
BURTON-ON-TRENT  
DETAIRU

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date 16/11/13

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: M. YOUNG

Address: 123 CAVALS RD,  
BURTON-ON-TRENT  
STAFFS  
DE13 0UN

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date 01/12/2013

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: Mr. C. G. CROFT

Address: 34 ETON ROAD  
BURTON-ON-TRENT  
STAFFS  
DE14 2SW

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date 23/11/13

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: CHRIS HARTSHORN  
Address: CO SHORNALL  
MARINA - B-O-T.

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date 1/12/13

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: Glen Croft

Address: 34 Eton Road  
Burton on Trent  
DE14 2SW

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date 1/12/13

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: Samuel Croft.

Address: 34 Eton Road.  
Burton on Trent.  
Staffordshire  
DE14 2SW.

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date 30/11/13

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: R. Baker  
Address: 75 Field Lane  
Burton on Trent  
DE13 0WJ

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form. It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods. I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date 30.11.2013

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: RICHARDSON  
Address: 12 DE FERRETS CROFT  
STRETTON  
BURTON ON TRENT

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely



Date 1/12/13

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name: Rose Croft

Address: 34 Eton Road  
Burton on Trent  
Staffordshire

RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.

DE14 2SW

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

Date

25/11/013

Mr G Jones  
East Staffordshire Borough Council  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent

Name:

Address:

PCD/Ken  
3 Rylands St  
Burton  
Staffordshire

**RE: RESPONSE TO REVISED (PRE SUBMISSION) LOCAL PLAN.**

Dear Mr Jones

I have read and studied the recently published revised Local Plan (Pre submission) for East Staffordshire, and wish to register my objection to it in its current form.

It certainly appears that ESBC has NOT taken into account feedback from previous consultations and completely ignored objections to the overdevelopment of Outwoods.

I believe that this version of the plan has not been positively prepared, and is unsound for the following reasons:-

1. ESBC has failed to engage in genuinely meaningful consultation by comprehensively dismissing feedback obtained from the process, and is now imposing its own agenda regardless of the wishes of local residents.
2. The methodology used to assess the required level of house building is unsound. It is based on the overambitious growth aspirations of ESBC and their colleagues at the GBSLEP which has not been subject to public consultation. This results in a housing requirement far in excess of that required for normal population growth and migration.
3. We believe that the concept of allocating such a high percentage of ESBC's planned development to Burton has now become unsound. It results in unsustainable levels of growth which are going to overwhelm the local infrastructure and destroy the very character of the town and surrounding countryside.
4. The impact of development on highways has not been properly assessed. The evidence base relies on assessments provided by developers which seek to conceal the true impact on the road network in order to justify their projects. In the case of Upper Outwoods Farm, this has been achieved by using artificially low trip generation levels, a failure to use the most likely traffic growth figures for the full duration of the Local Plan and not properly accounting for all other related development.
5. The amount of development proposed for Outwoods is not compatible with Sustainable Urban Extensions. They amount to nothing more than a huge high density housing estate. The proposals provide little in the way of employment provision and are located too far from commercial centres and major highways to reduce the impact of car use.
6. By imposing such a large amount of development on Outwoods, ESBC is effectively denying both current and future generations the ability to shape their community through neighbourhood planning. This policy of forcing development on communities that is not needed or wanted is in conflict with the Localism Act and should be abandoned before any more irreversible damage is done.

Yours sincerely

**From:** [Mark Locker](#)  
**To:** [LPConsultation](#)  
**Subject:** Hazelwalls Farm Development Proposal  
**Date:** 29 November 2013 21:52:33

---

Hello,

I understand that comments for the pre-submission stage of the Hazelwalls Farm development proposal are closing today - and so I hope it's not too late to send in my thoughts.

To me it is clear that access to this development would be nothing short of awful. The cul-de-sacs that would be opened up were not designed for the amount of traffic a through-road would bring, and Stafford Road already sends streams of traffic to a busy roundabout.

Uttoxeter's town is as dead as it's ever been, the fact that the car parks have been sold off for housing emphasises its decline. There aren't enough jobs within the town and adding a development to the outskirts will only attract those who commute to Burton, Stoke, Derby, Stafford, Lichfield and other surrounding areas - contributing nothing back to Uttoxeter itself.

I know that surface flooding is an issue in the area, and seeing balancing ponds on the plans is a worrying sign - the ground can't cope. Ask anyone living in the area and they'll be able to testify as to how this is already an issue.

What's more, with numerous brownfield options available, I think it would be completely inappropriate for this to go ahead.

In summary:

- The road network is not suitable.
- Surface flooding is a real issue and must not be overlooked.
- Uttoxeter's town is in decline and adding houses to the outskirts will not aid its recovery.
- We're lucky enough to live in a beautiful area and brownfield sites should absolutely be considered first.

I sincerely hope that all of these points are thoroughly considered.

Regards,

Mark Locker

ESBC

12 DEC 2013

Mr & Mrs. Dubes

16 reservoir Road

Shobnall

B-O-T

8-12-13

Dear Sir

I am writing to protest to the proposals you have for the, Shobnall road area, I think there is enough congestion the likes of H.G.V.s. and a continual stream of vans and cars. You people have no thought for the safety of the school children and there parents. Then there is the everyday pedestrians also the elderly people, just think if you lived in this area, the safety of your children

your wife or partner, just give it  
some if you have any thought  
for other people, We do not  
need the stress and strain you  
are going to put on us.

Please think again at what  
you are going to do.

Yours truly

Julian Blakemore  
23, Woodland Views, Marchington Uttoxeter ST14 8NF

27<sup>th</sup> November 2013

ESBC Planning Policy Dept,  
PO Box 8045  
Burton upon Trent  
DE14 9LG

Dear Sir/Madam,

ESBC Pre-submission Local Plan Consultation – October 2013

Objections to local plan for the village of Marchington

Submitted by post and by e-mail to LPconsultation@eaststaffs.gov.uk

I am writing to voice my objections to the proposed local plan consultation document as the building of houses in Jacks Lane, Marchington and at the site marked on the map as Yew Tree Farm in the same village is entirely inappropriate.

These are increases in the settlement boundary of a small village which already has more than sufficient housing for its existing infrastructure. Please note:-

- The map submitted with this proposal does not seem entirely accurate. It should be revised and corrected.
- Marchington has very narrow lanes without any pedestrian footpaths. Pedestrians, including the elderly and young children take a serious risk just walking through the village.
- These narrow lanes mean that vehicles have to give way to each other in many places, often stopping suddenly to allow each other to pass.
- There have been two serious accidents in recent years - one at the Church Lane bridge where two German tourists were seriously injured.
- Another accident took place at the junction of Bag Lane with High Street and Jacks Lane. A local resident on a bicycle sustained life-threatening injuries and was fortunate to survive.
- The expanded 1,200 inmate Category B Dovegate Prison just off Moreton Lane has significantly increased the number of vehicles passing through the village. Current road and parking facilities are unable to cope with this higher level of traffic.
- Efforts to mitigate the increase in traffic have not been successful as service vehicles, taxis, couriers and staff vehicles continually pass through the village. Further development can only add to this.
- The village is very susceptible to flooding and parts of it have been inundated several times in recent years. These developments are on the edge of the floodplain. Extra building will only worsen the situation for all residents.
- A planning application was made not long ago to build houses on the Jacks Lane site which was overwhelmingly rejected.

The local plan should therefore be revised to exclude these proposals.

Yours, sincerely

Julian Blakemore

ESBC

- 2 DEC 2013



Ref:  
(for official use only)

**East Staffordshire Borough Council Pre-Submission Local Plan Representation Form**

Representations should be submitted by no later than 12:00pm on Friday 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013

Online at <http://eaststaffsbc-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>

By returning this form to East Staffordshire Borough Council:

By post to: Planning Policy Team – The Maltsters, Wetmore Road, Burton upon Trent, DE14 1LS

By email to: [lpconsultation@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk](mailto:lpconsultation@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk)

By fax to: 01283 508388

**This form has two parts:**  
Part A – personal details  
Part B – your representation, please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make

## Part A

**Personal details** (if an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent below)

<b>Title</b>	Mr
<b>First name</b>	Alan
<b>Last name</b>	Hubbard
<b>Job title (where relevant)</b>	Planning Adviser
<b>Organisation (where relevant)</b>	National Trust
<b>Address</b>	Hardwick Consultancy Office The Croft Doe Lea Chesterfield Derbyshire
<b>Postcode</b>	S44 5QJ
<b>Telephone number</b>	0161 234 9983
<b>Email address</b>	alan.hubbard@nationaltrust.org.uk
<b>Preferred contact method</b>	e-mail

**Agent's details** (if applicable)

<b>Title</b>	N/A
<b>First name</b>	
<b>Last name</b>	
<b>Job title (where relevant)</b>	
<b>Organisation (where relevant)</b>	
<b>Who are you representing?</b>	
<b>Address</b>	
<b>Postcode</b>	
<b>Telephone number</b>	
<b>Email address</b>	
<b>Preferred contact method</b>	



## Part B

**Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

### 1. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

- a. Paragraph       b. Policy       c. Policies map

### 2. Do you think the Local Plan is:

- |  |     |                                     |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|
| a. Legally Compliant (see guidance notes for definition) | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|  | No  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b. Sound (see guidance notes)                            | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
|  | No  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

If no, please select which test(s) of soundness by ticking the relevant boxes below and provide further details overleaf.

### 3. Tests of Soundness

- |                                    |                                     |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Positively Prepared             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Justified                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Effective                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Consistent with National Policy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**4. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.**

Alternatively, if you wish to support the legal compliance of soundness of the Local Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

National Trust is concerned that the action agreed by the Council in relation to modifying the wording of this Policy in respect of the historic environment has not actually been pursued. In response to the previous consultation comments the Council said in respect of this Policy that it would “add reference to respecting settings of heritage assets as well as utilising them to best advantage”. That action was necessary because as previously worded there was inadequate consideration given to heritage assets, and in particular their settings having regard to their wider role and advice in the NPPF on the historic environment.

Please continue on a separate sheet is necessary

**5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified where this relates to soundness.** You will need to say why this change 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.

Amend the first bullet point in Policy 24 to read as follows:

“Help to create a sense of place, building on the urban, suburban and rural local character, respecting local patterns of development and the historic environment, **including the settings of heritage assets**, and using heritage assets to their best advantage”

Continue on a separate sheet is necessary

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations prior to Submission.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the planning inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies at the examination.**

**6. If your representation is seeking change, do you consider it necessary to speak at the examination in public?**

**a. No, I do not wish to participate in the examination**

**b. Yes, I wish to participate in the examination**

**7. If you wish to speak at the examination in public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. Please note the planning inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Data Protection Statement**

In complying with the Data protection Act 1998, East Staffordshire Borough Council confirms that it will process personal data gathered from this form only for the purposes relating to the consultation and Local Plan examination. It is intended to publish responses to the Pre-Submission Local Plan consultation on the borough council's website.

Personal information will be added to the Council's Local Plan consultation database and will be used to keep you informed of progress with the Local Plan and in order to consult with you further at each stage of the process to enable you to make further comments.

Personal information will also be shared with the Government appointed planning inspector (from the Planning Inspectorate), who may wish to contact you to discuss your comments and concerns, prior to formal examination of the Local Plan and supporting documents.

If you wish to be contacted at different stages of the plan process please tick the boxes:	Submission √	Inspectors report √	Adoption √
If you do not want to be contacted at future stages of the Local Plan preparation please tick the box			



Ref:  
(for official use only)

**East Staffordshire Borough Council Pre-Submission Local Plan Representation Form**

Representations should be submitted by no later than 12:00pm on Friday 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013

Online at <http://eaststaffsbc-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>

By returning this form to East Staffordshire Borough Council:

By post to: Planning Policy Team – The Maltsters, Wetmore Road, Burton upon Trent, DE14 1LS

By email to: [lpconsultation@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk](mailto:lpconsultation@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk)

By fax to: 01283 508388

**This form has two parts:**  
Part A – personal details  
Part B – your representation, please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make

## Part A

**Personal details** (if an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent below)

<b>Title</b>	Mr
<b>First name</b>	Alan
<b>Last name</b>	Hubbard
<b>Job title (where relevant)</b>	Planning Adviser
<b>Organisation (where relevant)</b>	National Trust
<b>Address</b>	Hardwick Consultancy Office The Croft Doe Lea Chesterfield Derbyshire
<b>Postcode</b>	S44 5QJ
<b>Telephone number</b>	0161 234 9983
<b>Email address</b>	alan.hubbard@nationaltrust.org.uk
<b>Preferred contact method</b>	e-mail

**Agent's details** (if applicable)

<b>Title</b>	N/A
<b>First name</b>	
<b>Last name</b>	
<b>Job title (where relevant)</b>	
<b>Organisation (where relevant)</b>	
<b>Who are you representing?</b>	
<b>Address</b>	
<b>Postcode</b>	
<b>Telephone number</b>	
<b>Email address</b>	
<b>Preferred contact method</b>	

## Part B

**Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

### 1. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

- a. Paragraph       b. Policy       c. Policies map

### 2. Do you think the Local Plan is:

- |  |     |                                     |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|
| a. Legally Compliant (see guidance notes for definition) | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|  | No  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b. Sound (see guidance notes)                            | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|  | No  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

If no, please select which test(s) of soundness by ticking the relevant boxes below and provide further details overleaf.

### 3. Tests of Soundness

- |                                    |                          |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Positively Prepared             | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Justified                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Effective                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Consistent with National Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**4. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.**

Alternatively, if you wish to support the legal compliance of soundness of the Local Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

It is considered that the overall approach in this Policy as now worded is both consistent with the NPPF and appropriately addresses, in principle, the key issues faced by East Staffordshire.

National Trust supports the Policy as worded.

Please continue on a separate sheet is necessary

**5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified where this relates to soundness.** You will need to say why this change 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.

Continue on a separate sheet is necessary

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations prior to Submission.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the planning inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies at the examination.**

**6. If your representation is seeking change, do you consider it necessary to speak at the examination in public?**

**a. No, I do not wish to participate in the examination**

**b. Yes, I wish to participate in the examination**

**7. If you wish to speak at the examination in public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. Please note the planning inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Data Protection Statement**

In complying with the Data protection Act 1998, East Staffordshire Borough Council confirms that it will process personal data gathered from this form only for the purposes relating to the consultation and Local Plan examination. It is intended to publish responses to the Pre-Submission Local Plan consultation on the borough council's website.

Personal information will be added to the Council's Local Plan consultation database and will be used to keep you informed of progress with the Local Plan and in order to consult with you further at each stage of the process to enable you to make further comments.

Personal information will also be shared with the Government appointed planning inspector (from the Planning Inspectorate), who may wish to contact you to discuss your comments and concerns, prior to formal examination of the Local Plan and supporting documents.

If you wish to be contacted at different stages of the plan process please tick the boxes:	Submission √	Inspectors report √	Adoption √
If you do not want to be contacted at future stages of the Local Plan preparation please tick the box			





Ref:  
(for official use only)

## East Staffordshire Borough Council Pre-Submission Local Plan Representation Form

Representations should be submitted by no later than 12:00pm on Friday 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013

Online at <http://eaststaffsbc-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>

By returning this form to East Staffordshire Borough Council:

By post to: Planning Policy Team – The Maltsters, Wetmore Road, Burton upon Trent, DE14 1LS

By email to: [lpconsultation@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk](mailto:lpconsultation@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk)

By fax to: 01283 508388

**This form has two parts:**

Part A – personal details

Part B – your representation, please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make

## Part A

**Personal details** (if an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent below)

<b>Title</b>	Mr
<b>First name</b>	Alan
<b>Last name</b>	Hubbard
<b>Job title (where relevant)</b>	Planning Adviser
<b>Organisation (where relevant)</b>	National Trust
<b>Address</b>	Hardwick Consultancy Office The Croft Doe Lea Chesterfield Derbyshire
<b>Postcode</b>	S44 5QJ
<b>Telephone number</b>	0161 234 9983
<b>Email address</b>	alan.hubbard@nationaltrust.org.uk
<b>Preferred contact method</b>	e-mail

**Agent's details** (if applicable)

<b>Title</b>	N/A
<b>First name</b>	
<b>Last name</b>	
<b>Job title (where relevant)</b>	
<b>Organisation (where relevant)</b>	
<b>Who are you representing?</b>	
<b>Address</b>	
<b>Postcode</b>	
<b>Telephone number</b>	
<b>Email address</b>	
<b>Preferred contact method</b>	

## Part B

**Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

### 1. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

- a. Paragraph       b. Policy       c. Policies map

### 2. Do you think the Local Plan is:

- a. Legally Compliant (see guidance notes for definition)      Yes       No
- b. Sound (see guidance notes)      Yes       No

If no, please select which test(s) of soundness by ticking the relevant boxes below and provide further details overleaf.

### 3. Tests of Soundness

- a. Positively Prepared
- b. Justified
- c. Effective
- d. Consistent with National Policy

**4. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.**

Alternatively, if you wish to support the legal compliance of soundness of the Local Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

National Trust supports the overall approach to the distribution of new development as set out in this Policy. It has particularly given consideration to the distribution to the Tier Two Local Service Villages in the context of locations where there could be impacts upon the historic environment with special reference to Sudbury Hall, its Registered Historic Park and Garden and the settings of each. In this context development at Marchington and Draycott in the Clay have the potential to be a concern; however, at the level of provision set out in this Policy it is considered that with sensitive choice of sites and careful attention to the form of development (siting, massing, materials) that the level of development suggested for each should be capable of being accommodated. Nonetheless the Trust would be concerned if the suggested allocation for either of these settlements was to be increased.

It will be important to fully investigate the potential for infill plots in these two settlements and carefully assess the extent of settlement boundaries. National Trust looks forward to contributing to the discussion of these considerations at the appropriate time.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified where this relates to soundness.** You will need to say why this change 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.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations prior to Submission.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the planning inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies at the examination.**

**6. If your representation is seeking change, do you consider it necessary to speak at the examination in public?**

**a. No, I do not wish to participate in the examination**

**b. Yes, I wish to participate in the examination**

**7. If you wish to speak at the examination in public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. Please note the planning inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Data Protection Statement**

In complying with the Data protection Act 1998, East Staffordshire Borough Council confirms that it will process personal data gathered from this form only for the purposes relating to the consultation and Local Plan examination. It is intended to publish responses to the Pre-Submission Local Plan consultation on the borough council's website.

Personal information will be added to the Council's Local Plan consultation database and will be used to keep you informed of progress with the Local Plan and in order to consult with you further at each stage of the process to enable you to make further comments.

Personal information will also be shared with the Government appointed planning inspector (from the Planning Inspectorate), who may wish to contact you to discuss your comments and concerns, prior to formal examination of the Local Plan and supporting documents.

If you wish to be contacted at different stages of the plan process please tick the boxes:	Submission √	Inspectors report √	Adoption √
If you do not want to be contacted at future stages of the Local Plan preparation please tick the box			



Ref:  
(for official use only)

**East Staffordshire Borough Council Pre-Submission Local Plan Representation Form**

Representations should be submitted by no later than 12:00pm on Friday 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013

Online at <http://eaststaffsbc-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>

By returning this form to East Staffordshire Borough Council:

By post to: Planning Policy Team – The Maltsters, Wetmore Road, Burton upon Trent, DE14 1LS

By email to: [lpconsultation@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk](mailto:lpconsultation@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk)

By fax to: 01283 508388

**This form has two parts:**  
Part A – personal details  
Part B – your representation, please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make

## Part A

**Personal details** (if an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent below)

<b>Title</b>	Mr
<b>First name</b>	Alan
<b>Last name</b>	Hubbard
<b>Job title (where relevant)</b>	Planning Adviser
<b>Organisation (where relevant)</b>	National Trust
<b>Address</b>	Hardwick Consultancy Office The Croft Doe Lea Chesterfield Derbyshire
<b>Postcode</b>	S44 5QJ
<b>Telephone number</b>	0161 234 9983
<b>Email address</b>	alan.hubbard@nationaltrust.org.uk
<b>Preferred contact method</b>	e-mail

**Agent's details** (if applicable)

<b>Title</b>	N/A
<b>First name</b>	
<b>Last name</b>	
<b>Job title (where relevant)</b>	
<b>Organisation (where relevant)</b>	
<b>Who are you representing?</b>	
<b>Address</b>	
<b>Postcode</b>	
<b>Telephone number</b>	
<b>Email address</b>	
<b>Preferred contact method</b>	

**Part B**

**Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

**1. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?**

- a. Paragraph       b. Policy       c. Policies map

**2. Do you think the Local Plan is:**

- |  |     |                                     |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|
| a. Legally Compliant (see guidance notes for definition) | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|  | No  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b. Sound (see guidance notes)                            | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|  | No  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

If no, please select which test(s) of soundness by ticking the relevant boxes below and provide further details overleaf.

**3. Tests of Soundness**

- |                                    |                          |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Positively Prepared             | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Justified                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Effective                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Consistent with National Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> |



**4. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.**

Alternatively, if you wish to support the legal compliance of soundness of the Local Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

National Trust supports this important Policy that recognises the tourism potential of East Staffordshire and the role of its existing and potential tourism assets along with those nearby which are also a benefit not only for the Borough's residents and employees but also for its visitors.

Please continue on a separate sheet is necessary

**5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified where this relates to soundness.** You will need to say why this change 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.

Continue on a separate sheet is necessary

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations prior to Submission.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the planning inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies at the examination.**

**6. If your representation is seeking change, do you consider it necessary to speak at the examination in public?**

**a. No, I do not wish to participate in the examination**

**b. Yes, I wish to participate in the examination**

**7. If you wish to speak at the examination in public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. Please note the planning inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Data Protection Statement**

In complying with the Data protection Act 1998, East Staffordshire Borough Council confirms that it will process personal data gathered from this form only for the purposes relating to the consultation and Local Plan examination. It is intended to publish responses to the Pre-Submission Local Plan consultation on the borough council's website.

Personal information will be added to the Council's Local Plan consultation database and will be used to keep you informed of progress with the Local Plan and in order to consult with you further at each stage of the process to enable you to make further comments.

Personal information will also be shared with the Government appointed planning inspector (from the Planning Inspectorate), who may wish to contact you to discuss your comments and concerns, prior to formal examination of the Local Plan and supporting documents.

If you wish to be contacted at different stages of the plan process please tick the boxes:	Submission √	Inspectors report √	Adoption √
If you do not want to be contacted at future stages of the Local Plan preparation please tick the box			



Ref:  
(for official use only)

## East Staffordshire Borough Council Pre-Submission Local Plan Representation Form

Representations should be submitted by no later than 12:00pm on Friday 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013

Online at <http://eaststaffsbc-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>

By returning this form to East Staffordshire Borough Council:

By post to: Planning Policy Team – The Maltsters, Wetmore Road, Burton upon Trent, DE14 1LS

By email to: [lpconsultation@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk](mailto:lpconsultation@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk)

By fax to: 01283 508388

**This form has two parts:**

Part A – personal details

Part B – your representation, please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make

## Part A

**Personal details** (if an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent below)

<b>Title</b>	Mr
<b>First name</b>	Alan
<b>Last name</b>	Hubbard
<b>Job title (where relevant)</b>	Planning Adviser
<b>Organisation (where relevant)</b>	National Trust
<b>Address</b>	Hardwick Consultancy Office The Croft Doe Lea Chesterfield Derbyshire
<b>Postcode</b>	S44 5QJ
<b>Telephone number</b>	0161 234 9983
<b>Email address</b>	alan.hubbard@nationaltrust.org.uk
<b>Preferred contact method</b>	e-mail

**Agent's details** (if applicable)

<b>Title</b>	N/A
<b>First name</b>	
<b>Last name</b>	
<b>Job title (where relevant)</b>	
<b>Organisation (where relevant)</b>	
<b>Who are you representing?</b>	
<b>Address</b>	
<b>Postcode</b>	
<b>Telephone number</b>	
<b>Email address</b>	
<b>Preferred contact method</b>	

## Part B

**Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

### 1. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

- a. Paragraph       b. Policy       c. Policies map

### 2. Do you think the Local Plan is:

- |  |     |                                     |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|
| a. Legally Compliant (see guidance notes for definition) | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|  | No  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b. Sound (see guidance notes)                            | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|  | No  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

If no, please select which test(s) of soundness by ticking the relevant boxes below and provide further details overleaf.

### 3. Tests of Soundness

- |                                    |                          |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Positively Prepared             | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Justified                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Effective                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Consistent with National Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**4. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.**

Alternatively, if you wish to support the legal compliance of soundness of the Local Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

National Trust is pleased to support the inclusion of this Strategic Policy both in principle and in terms of the detailed wording set out. From its own particular perspective it notes that development in East Staffordshire, such as that undertaken in the past at Marchington Prison has, and continues to have, a detrimental impact upon the setting of Sudbury Hall and its associated collection of designated heritage assets – in particular there are adverse visual impacts upon views from the Hall. This is notwithstanding the fact that Sudbury is outside, but close to, East Staffordshire boundaries. It is therefore important that, inter alia, the consideration of the impacts of new development upon heritage assets includes potential impacts outside East Staffordshire. As currently worded Policy SP25 is suitable in this, and other, respects.

Please continue on a separate sheet is necessary

**5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified where this relates to soundness.** You will need to say why this change 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.

Continue on a separate sheet is necessary

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations prior to Submission.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the planning inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies at the examination.**

**6. If your representation is seeking change, do you consider it necessary to speak at the examination in public?**

**a. No, I do not wish to participate in the examination**

**b. Yes, I wish to participate in the examination**

**7. If you wish to speak at the examination in public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. Please note the planning inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Data Protection Statement**

In complying with the Data protection Act 1998, East Staffordshire Borough Council confirms that it will process personal data gathered from this form only for the purposes relating to the consultation and Local Plan examination. It is intended to publish responses to the Pre-Submission Local Plan consultation on the borough council's website.

Personal information will be added to the Council's Local Plan consultation database and will be used to keep you informed of progress with the Local Plan and in order to consult with you further at each stage of the process to enable you to make further comments.

Personal information will also be shared with the Government appointed planning inspector (from the Planning Inspectorate), who may wish to contact you to discuss your comments and concerns, prior to formal examination of the Local Plan and supporting documents.

If you wish to be contacted at different stages of the plan process please tick the boxes:	Submission √	Inspectors report √	Adoption √
If you do not want to be contacted at future stages of the Local Plan preparation please tick the box			

**From:** [Nikki Dunion](#)  
**To:** [LPConsultation](#)  
**Subject:** Uttoxeter resident objections to proposed Hazelwall farm developments  
**Date:** 03 December 2013 18:38:04

---

To Whom it may Concern,

Having read about the proposed developments at Hazelwall farm contained within the pre-submission local plan for East Staffordshire. I was advised I could email my comments to this address rather than registering with the ESBC to express my objections.

I am concerned by the inadequate efforts made by the planning authorities to fully engage the residents of Uttoxeter in the development of the pre-submission local plan and the apparent haste with which they are now seeking to push this plan through the process without gaining a reasonable level of consensus from the local population. The pre-submission local plan contains bold statements such as :

The need to deliver development which is sensitive to the landscape

The need to protect and enhance the Boroughs natural environment

Ensuring that new development does not have a detrimental impact on people's quality of life or the quality of the Borough's built and natural environment

To protect, conserve and enhance the local countryside, character, distinctiveness and quality of the landscape and the diversity of wildlife and habitats

However, it then includes plans to develop the green field site at Hazelwalls farm which is remote from the town centre and all amenities and which has extremely poor road infrastructure around it. The area is rural and a habitat for a great variety of wildlife and is adjacent to the staffordshire way.

Extremely important is the inclusion of the following as one of the 12 drivers :

Public policy and opinion

Yet, as a resident of Uttoxeter, I only became aware of this document recently after overhearing a conversation. As such, I do not believe that sufficient importance has been placed on this key element of the process and that it is now being "pushed" with undue haste in order to prevent the opportunity for concerned residents to raise any objections. I would therefore question the validity of the process and the motives of



those involved.

I would like my objectives to be duly noted and considered in the proposed developments a Hazelwall Farm.

Regards,  
Nicola Dunion