

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL

CABINET

27 AUGUST 2009

REPORT OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO LEADER - ENVIRONMENT

CANNOCK CHASE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTIONS

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

KEY DECISION - YES

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To consider the Cannock Chase Local Development Framework, Core Strategy Preferred Options - Summary of Consultation Responses.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Cannock Chase Local Development Framework (LDF), Core Strategy Preferred Options - Summary of Consultation Responses be adopted as an appropriate account of the consultation process undertaken for this stage of the LDF Core Strategy.
- 2.2 That the findings of the report be used to help define policy in the Core Strategy for development in the District to 2026.
- 2.3 That the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Environment Leader, be authorised to make any minor amendments to the Cannock Chase Local Development Framework (LDF), Core Strategy Preferred Options - Summary of Consultation Responses

3. Conclusions and Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 77 stakeholder responses were received to the latest Preferred Options consultation, which ran for six weeks from 27th April to 8th June 2009. In addition, a series of bespoke workshops were held with 'hard to reach' groups and a number of presentations made to key stakeholders. Responses received to the previous rounds of consultation were reported to Cabinet in January 2009.

3.2 The outcomes of this consultation can be summarised as follows:

- Continued broad support for the vision with some suggested minor amendments;
- Broad support for the principles of the strategic approach but less consensus on the way it should be delivered, particularly with reference to overall levels of housing/employment land provision and which specific strategic sites should be chosen;
- Broad support for the policy subject areas with key observations and objections focused on the evidence to support the policies which contain targets e.g. affordable housing or renewable energy.

4. Key Issues

- 4.1 Responses have been received from a cross section of the District's residents and visitors as well as key stakeholders, including developers and their agents. A report attached as annex 1 sets out the methods used to consult and summarises the responses received. The LDF consultation process differs from that under the former Local Plan system in that a summary report for Members is considered sufficient by Government and the Planning Inspectorate rather than a comprehensive response to each individual representation. However, an outcome to every response will still be made available on the Council's website.
- 4.2 The Core Strategy Preferred Options document built on earlier debate and consultation responses by setting out the previously agreed Preferred Strategic Approach of dispersed development across all urban communities and identifying the way in which this might be best achieved. Details were reported to Cabinet in May 2009. Views on further options about the balance of future housing around Cannock/Hednesford/Heath Hayes and the scale of development at Norton Canes were particularly invited.
- 4.3 The headline responses for the vision, strategic approach and policy areas are summarised below:
- Continued broad support for the vision with some minor amendment
 - Broad support for the principles of the strategic approach with less agreement on the way it is delivered. Developers and agents are advocating approaches which favour their particular site interests.
 - Broad support for proposed policy areas. Key observations/objections based around ensuring a robust evidence base for policies and for setting the levels that will be required in targets, for example affordable housing and renewable energy.
- 4.4 The report at annex 1 is an important element in the ongoing process of community engagement designed to contribute towards effective plan making for the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.
- 4.5 In moving towards a finalised Core Strategy a further round of consultation with key stakeholders, including Government Agencies, sub-regional partners, infrastructure providers and developers/agents will be held. This next round of consultation will focus on policy definition and delivery (including standards) and infrastructure delivery. In order to help this process a sub-group of the Local Strategic Partnership was approved

by the Local Strategic Partnership Strategic Board on 24 June 2009 as a channel for involving sub-regional partners. On completion of these further consultations the Core Strategy will then be presented for Publication (currently timetabled for December 2009). This stage is statutory and will require Council approval.

REPORT INDEX

Background	Section 1
Details of Matters to be Considered i.e. Options Considered, Outcome Of Consultations etc	Section 2
Contribution to CHASE	Section 3
Financial Implications	Section 4
Human Resource Implications	Section 5
Legal Implications	Section 6
Section 17 (Crime Prevention)	Section 7
Human Rights Act Implications	Section 8
Data Protection Act Implications	Section 9
Risk Management Implications	Section 10
Equality and Diversity Implications	Section 11
Other Options Considered	Section 12
List of Background Papers	Section 13
Annexes to the Report i.e. copies of correspondence, plans etc	Annex 1, 2, 3 etc
Report Author Details: (name, title and extension number)	

Section 1

Background

The Cannock Chase Local Development Framework (LDF) will eventually replace the 1997 Cannock Chase Local Plan in setting planning policy for the future of the district. The Core Strategy will form the central part in a suite of documents and will provide the strategic planning policy approach for Cannock Chase District to 2026.

In contrast to the Local Plan which was primarily concerned with the use of land, the LDF is more a process of responding to the range of strategies and programmes being delivered in the district and ensuring the availability of land and infrastructure for their delivery. The LDF process also places a much greater emphasis on identifying, and resolving where possible, key issues early in the plan making process in order to make the examination process less confrontational than was the case with Local Plans.

In order to generate debate and identify issues early in the preparation of the Core Strategy a series of consultations were undertaken between 2006 and 2008 based around Issues and Options. These informed the Preferred Options 2009 consultation which set out the implications of the Preferred Strategic Approach across the District and sought more views and preferences on new locations to meet this approach for housing provision in Cannock, Hednesford and Heath Hayes. It also sought confirmation of development options at Norton Canes, given the availability of land and the scope for additional provision where this could be used to achieve improvements to local services in the village centre. Consultation also sought views on potential policy areas which might be developed under the Core Strategy's eight objectives and on the way delivery of the plan can be monitored.

Consultation took the form of written correspondence with stakeholders, partners and parties who have already expressed an interest in the process together with meetings and media coverage using the local press. Particular use was made of electronic consultation where possible to increase efficiency and help reduce costs.

Section 2

Details of Matters to be Considered

Annex 1 provides a summary of the consultation process. 77 stakeholder responses were received to the latest Preferred Options consultation, which ran for six weeks from 27th April to 8th June 2009. In addition, a series of bespoke workshops were held with 'hard to reach' groups and a number of presentations made to key stakeholders.

The main responses for the vision, strategic approach and policy areas are summarised below:

Vision

- Broad support for the vision, although requests were made for greater recognition of some key characteristics (e.g. recreation facilities, the historic environment); greater prominence of climate change issues; and Regional Spatial Strategy targets. The extent to which the Green Belt and AONB should be a constraint on development in the District was debated.

Strategic Approach

- The strategic approach was more contested, with broad support for the principles and less agreement upon the levels of provision. There were key points of contention in terms of the potential use of Green Belt land. Whilst some respondents supported the proposed sites (particularly the Greyhound Stadium in Norton Canes) others argued in favour of utilising the non-Green Belt 'saved' Local Plan C7 sites to their maximum potential; in Rugeley both residential and employment uses were put forward as the most appropriate for the Armitage Lane Green Belt site. It was argued that Norton Canes and the Cannock urban areas' provision could increase as a result of some of these recommendations.
- The reliance upon Lichfield DC to provide for Rugeley's needs and the subsequent impact upon the overall housing distribution was questioned, with some respondents suggesting under-utilised employment land and urban extensions should be considered in Rugeley to fulfil its requirements within CCDC boundaries. However support for the cross-boundary working principle was forthcoming, subject to some clarification on the housing figures. Arguments were put forward for both lower and higher levels of provision across the District, but respondents also noted the need to take into account results of the Appropriate Assessment for Cannock Chase SAC to ensure adverse effects upon the ecology were avoided/minimised.
- Some respondents queried the levels of employment land provision being too low and there were mixed views on the appropriate location of such uses e.g. some respondents supported provision along the M6 Toll/A5 corridor whilst others raised concerns.

Policy Areas

- Overall, many of the proposed policy areas received broad support with key objections/observations being predominately based upon the evidence base for such policies and the levels that will be required in targets (e.g. affordable housing or renewable energy generation). Key observations were made in terms of appropriately managing tourism in the District; the need for increased recognition of historic environment, community and cultural issues (with the appropriate accompanying evidence base for these); increased consideration of flooding issues; further work on sport and recreation provision to be included (via forthcoming studies); greater recognition of strategic waste and mineral issues. Additional recommendations were made to make the policy areas robust and stakeholders welcomed the opportunity to develop more detailed policy wording prior to Publication.
- In terms of key objections, the Police raised the issue of appropriate developer contributions towards the provision of extra services to support growth in the District; respondents queried the housing distribution policies (in line with strategic approach comments outlined above); some respondents queried the levels of employment land provision, arguing for higher levels; and there were mixed views on the degree to which landscape and other environmental considerations, including climate change, should limit development in the District.

Section 3

Contribution to CHASE

The production of a Local Development Framework Core Strategy for the District, is in part driven by the delivery of CHASE and therefore fully supports and develops all CHASE objectives.

Section 4

Financial Implications

There are no direct financial implications for the Council as a result of this report; any costs associated with this report will be contained within existing budgets.

Section 5

Human Resource Implications

There are no identified implications.

Section 6

Legal Implications

The Council has a statutory duty to prepare a Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy is the central document of the Framework. It must be subject to rigorous procedures of community involvement, consultation and independent examination by a planning inspector to test the soundness of the document.

Section 7

Section 17 (Crime Prevention)

The production of the LDF Core Strategy will provide policy to help to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour.

Section 8

Human Rights Act Implications

There are no identified Human Rights Act implications identified in the report.

Section 9

Data Protection Act Implications

There are no identified implications in respect of the Data Protection Act arising from this report.

Section 10

Risk Management Implications

The Council's Local Development Framework has to take account of opinion from the local community and stakeholders. Failure to achieve this could result in the Council's spatial plans being found unsound at any subsequent examination.

Section 11

Equality and Diversity Implications

No specific implications raised by the recommendations of this report. An Equality Impact assessment is accompanying the production of the LDF Core Strategy.

Section 12

Other Options Considered

Effective consultation and reporting of responses is a key requirement of the LDF process in order to be found sound at examination. Not consulting is therefore not a viable option.

List of Background Papers

Cannock Chase Local Development Framework, Core Strategy Preferred Options 2009 Consultation.

Annexes

Annex 1 Cannock Chase Local Development Framework, Core Strategy Preferred Options 2009 Consultation – Report of Consultation.

Report Author Details

Antony Lancaster Planning Policy Manager x4481

Annex 1

Core Strategy Preferred Options Summary and Analysis of Consultation Responses

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Executive Summary	2
3. Who was consulted and how?	5
4. Formal Responses	6
4.1. General Responses	6
4.2. Context Responses	6
4.3. Portrait Responses	6
4.4. Vision and Preferred Strategic Approach	7
4.5. District-wide Objectives	8
4.5.1. General Comments	
4.5.2. Objective 1 Promote pride in attractive, safe, local communities	
4.5.3. Objective 2 Create healthy living opportunities across the District	
4.5.4. Objective 3 Provide for housing choice	
4.5.5. Objective 4 Encourage a vibrant local economy and workforce	
4.5.6. Objective 5 Encourage sustainable transport infrastructure	
4.5.7. Objective 6 Create attractive town centres	
4.5.8. Objective 7 Provide well managed and appreciated environments	
4.5.9. Objective 8 Support a greener future	
4.6. Area Implications	14
4.6.1. General Comments	
4.6.2. Urban Cannock, Hednesford and Heath Hayes	
4.6.3. Rugeley and Brereton	
4.6.4. Norton Canes	
4.6.5. Cannock Chase AONB and the Rural North (including Rawnsley, Hazelslade, Prospect Village, Cannock Wood and Slitting Mill)	
4.6.6. The Rural South	
4.6.7. Cross Boundary Considerations	
4.6.8. Summary of Housing Distribution	
4.7. Plan, Monitor and Manage	19
4.8. Background Evidence Base	19
4.9. Infrastructure Requirements	19
5. Workshop Events Consultation Responses	20
6. Summary of consultation	26
Appendices	
Appendix 1- Key Consultees	
Appendix 2- List of Consultation Events	
Appendix 3- Summary of Young Chamber Consultation Events	

1. Introduction

This report seeks to compile a range of responses from different sources to the Core Strategy Preferred Options 2009 Consultation, which follows on from the previous Issues and Options Consultation Report Analysis in 2008. Responses to the Preferred Options were collected in a variety of different ways, as set out in Section 3, from online responses to stakeholder workshops and this report aims to synthesise these in order to provide a clear picture of areas of support and potential issues arising.

The structure of the analysis follows the order of the Preferred Options document by chapter. The full consultation reports and comments have been collated into a supporting compendium to this summary report. A copy of this compendium is publicly available and can be viewed on request to the Planning Policy Team.

2. Executive Summary

The Core Strategy is the main document in the Local Development Framework. It will determine where development will go until 2026: not on a site by site basis (except for very large developments), but in broad strategic terms. This means that it will determine what proportions of new development will be located where in Cannock Chase District, and what kinds of development should be considered so that it is relevant to the needs and aspirations of those who live and work in the different communities across the area.

Following on from the Issues and Options consultation in summer 2008 (the largest exercise ever undertaken by the Council) this Preferred Options consultation represented the Council's response to comments made by the public and other stakeholders on the issues facing the District and the most appropriate options for tackling them. The Preferred Option consultation ran for six weeks from the 27th April-8th June 2009.

The Issues and Options 2008 consultation had identified a broad preference for Strategic Spatial Option 2: Disperse development across all urban communities. The Preferred Options 2009 consultation therefore took this forward as the preferred strategic spatial option. The implications of this approach for each area of the District were further brought out, with specific implications for cross-boundary working at Rugeley and potential urban extensions or Green Belt releases in the Cannock, Hednesford and Heath Hayes area.

Following on from high levels of support for the eight District-wide objectives suggested in the Issues and Options 2008, the Preferred Options 2009 took these forward as the basis for developed specific policy areas. The eight objectives are:

- Objective 1: Promote pride in attractive, safe local communities
- Objective 2: Create healthy living opportunities across the District
- Objective 3: Provide for housing choice
- Objective 4: Encourage a vibrant local economy and workforce
- Objective 5: Encourage sustainable transport infrastructure
- Objective 6: Create attractive town centres
- Objective 7: Provide well managed and appreciated environments
- Objective 8: Support a greener future

Under each objective specific policy areas to guide the future development of the District were prepared, taking into account previous consultation comments from the Issues and Options 2008. A total of 21 Policy Areas were suggested, with the specific wording of these policies to be further consulted upon with key stakeholders prior to Publication in December 2010.

77 responses were received in 2009, the majority being from developer interests or statutory agencies, however there were responses from members of the public. Key points arising from the consultation are summarised below:

Vision

- Broad support for the vision, although requests were made for greater recognition of some key characteristics (e.g. recreation facilities, the historic environment); greater prominence of climate change issues; and Regional Spatial Strategy targets. The extent to which the Green Belt and AONB should be a constraint on development in the District was debated.

Strategic Approach

- The strategic approach was more contested, with broad support for the principles and less agreement upon the levels of provision. There were key points of contention in terms of the potential use of Green Belt land. Whilst some respondents supported the proposed sites (particularly the Greyhound Stadium in Norton Canes) others argued in favour of utilising the non-Green Belt 'saved' Local Plan C7 sites to their maximum potential; in Rugeley both residential and employment uses were put forward as the most appropriate for the Armitage Lane Green Belt site. It was argued that Norton Canes and the Cannock urban areas' provision could increase as a result of some of these recommendations.
- The reliance upon Lichfield DC to provide for Rugeley's needs and the subsequent impact upon the overall housing distribution was questioned, with some respondents suggesting under-utilised employment land and urban extensions should be considered in Rugeley to fulfil its requirements within CCDC boundaries. However support for the cross-boundary working principle was forthcoming, subject to some clarification on the housing figures. Arguments were put forward for both lower and higher levels of provision across the District, but respondents also noted the need to take into account results of the Appropriate Assessment for Cannock Chase SAC to ensure adverse effects upon the ecology were avoided/minimised.
- Some respondents queried the levels of employment land provision being too low and there were mixed views on the appropriate location of such uses e.g. some respondents supported provision along the M6 Toll/A5 corridor whilst others raised concerns.

Policy Areas

- Overall, many of the proposed policy areas received broad support with key objections/observations being predominately based upon the evidence base for such policies and the levels that will be required in targets (e.g. affordable housing or renewable energy generation). Key observations were made in terms of appropriately managing tourism in the District; the need for increased recognition of historic environment, community and cultural issues (with the appropriate accompanying evidence base for these); increased consideration of flooding issues; further work on sport and recreation provision to be included (via forthcoming studies); greater recognition of strategic waste and mineral issues. Additional recommendations were made to make the policy areas robust and stakeholders welcomed the opportunity to develop more detailed policy wording prior to Publication.
- In terms of key objections, the Police raised the issue of appropriate developer contributions towards the provision of extra services to support growth in the

District; respondents queried the housing distribution policies (in line with strategic approach comments outlined above); some respondents queried the levels of employment land provision, arguing for higher levels; and there were mixed views on the degree to which landscape and other environmental considerations, including climate change, should limit development in the District.

3. Who was consulted and how?

The Core Strategy Preferred Options 2009 consultation was formally launched on the 27th April 2009. A variety of methods were employed in order to both raise maximum stakeholder and public awareness of the consultation and to continue to engage productively with the hard to reach groups (as defined in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement 2006).

The detailed Preferred Options 2009 was made available via the Council's web site using Limehouse software for online consultation. It was also made available as a hard copy in the Council offices and public libraries across the District. Copies of the full document were sent to the key statutory consultees (see Appendix 1). All of the consultees on the Council's Core Strategy database were sent a copy alerting them to the consultation dates and where to access the information (online or hard copies on request).

Given the length and sometimes technical nature of the detailed Preferred Options consultation document, a summary leaflet was produced in the format of a four-page newspaper special article distributed through The Chronicle local free newspaper. This was intended to make the strategic and technical nature of the Core Strategy more accessible to a wider audience. It also drew upon some issues raised by local residents in the Issues and Options 2008 consultation regarding the availability of information and it was highlighted that The Chronicle newspaper had the most reliable and wide-reaching circulation. Alongside this summary leaflet, the Council advertised a series of consultation events where residents could visit Council officers to discuss the matters in more detail and obtain copies of the detailed Preferred Options consultation document. The consultation events were held in the District's leisure centres, community halls and libraries (see Appendix 2). Press articles advertising the events were posted in The Chronicle, The Mercury and The Chase Post local newspapers.

The Planning Policy team presented the Core Strategy Preferred Options to the Local Strategic Partnership Board and the Local Strategic Partnership Theme Groups where issues were felt to be of particular relevance. In recognition of the difficulty that hard to reach groups may have in accessing the document, the Council's Disability and Equality Forum was revisited and a presentation made to raise awareness of the document, its purpose and relevance to the group. Following on from the success of the forums held in summer 2008 and requests from stakeholders to be continually involved in the process, another bespoke workshop was held for the community and voluntary sector as part of this consultation. This workshop was organised in collaboration with the Chase Voluntary Service in order to give the event a sense of neutrality and all voluntary groups listed on the Chase Voluntary Service and Council databases were invited. Young people were again specifically engaged through the South Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce via their Young Chamber programme with the Council jointly conducting workshops at Fair Oak High School and Cannock Chase High School.

In total, 74 individual stakeholders responded to the Preferred Options 2009. Approximately 134 members of the public and other stakeholders attended the public consultation events for further information; a further 100 people participated in the consultation process via the LSP Theme Groups, the voluntary sector workshop and the South Staffordshire Young Chamber events. The following sections bring together the various strands of the consultation in summary form in order to provide an overview of the key issues. The formal responses made directly to the Preferred Options are summarised first, followed by a summary of the workshop events consultation.

4. Formal Responses

4.1. General Responses- *4 respondents Campaign to Protect Rural England; Network Rail; Walsall Council; Staffordshire Police.*

Network Rail expressed no comments, but wished to remain informed on the process; Walsall Council expressed concern over the Council acting against RSS objectives in terms of undermining the urban renaissance principles and not fully considering the cross-boundary implications; Staffordshire Police highlighted the need for the Core Strategy to consider the long-term implications of growth for the provision of Police services in the District; the Campaign to Protect Rural England commented on the understating of the implications of climate change and resource depletion in the vision and document overall suggesting that inconsistencies between national, regional and local policy/desires should be recognised particularly, in relation to the Green Belt.

4.2. Context Responses- *11 respondents British Waterways; Mr. M. Brothwell; Mr. & Mrs. D. H. Dale; English Heritage; Government Office for the West Midlands; Planning Inspectorate; Somerfield Stores; Sport England; Staffordshire County Council; Walsall Council; West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium.*

The majority of comments related to support for references made and the need for additional references/updated information. Comments included the need to ensure the appropriate PPG17 evidence base was completed and translated into policy; encouraging greater recognition of role of canals within the District; clarification of Regional retail floorspace requirements; further clarity needed on the status of the RSS Phase Two revision; additional reference should be made to Cannock and Rugeley's designation in the RSS as areas for waste management facilities; recognition needed that the RSS Phase Two revision figures may change and are considered too generous to areas outside the Major Urban Areas; recommendations that the Council should object to the development of waste-energy facilities proposed at Kingswood Lakeside; reference should be made to the Cannock Chase- Sutton Park Biodiversity Enhancement Area Action Plan; concerns raised about the robustness and independence of appraisals and assessments used, particularly relating to environmental matters; clarity required on historic environment evidence base and additional sources of information were recommended.

4.3. Portrait Responses- *24 respondents AONB Unit; Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council; British Waterways; Mr Simon Boardman-Weston; Campaign to Protect Rural England; Centro; Mr F Dorsett; English Heritage; GOWM; Inglewood Investments; Inland Waterways Association; Landor Society; Marstons PLC; Natural England; Newlands Consortium; Persimmon and Bloor Homes; Rugeley Power Ltd; Somerfield Stores; Sport England; St Modwen Developments; Staffordshire County Council; Staffordshire Police; West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium; Wyrley Estates.*

There was general support with recommendations made for alterations to some references and additional information required. Comments included the need for greater recognition of the limited range of housing available in the area; the need for family style accommodation specifically at Cannock; greater recognition of transport and work area links to the West Midlands conurbation; of the leisure/tourism/climate change/transport benefits of the canals; Cannock's status in the RSS as an other large settlement; the multi-functional role of the Green Belt; the accessibility of the District

via public transport and the role of the Forest of Mercia. Additional information was requested on historic assets; the employment/economic position of Rugeley and Brereton; reference to recent housing developments in Rugeley; underutilized employment land in the area; updates to household projections and it was noted that up date to sport and recreation existing situation may be required following PPG17 assessments. The use of Census figures could be considered to be out of date.

Other comments included a need to recognise that the Green Belt coverage should not be expanded; any expansion of the retail offer of the town and district centres should be of a scale appropriate to the role and function of the centre in the retail hierarchy; surplus land at Rugeley Power Station could accommodate some of the housing requirements for Rugeley on previously developed land within the Rugeley urban area. It was also considered that the portrait map could be amended to better reflect the District's features.

One respondent (Persimmon and Bloor Homes) objected overall on the basis that whilst the portrait is an improvement, it is still not robust enough. It should contain a clearer picture of the individual settlements and address the underlying causes of deprivation in the District. Another respondent argued that the portrait was inadequate and required further information on commuting patterns, employment zones, public support for countryside protection, declining bus services, effectiveness of rail services, countermeasures for high levels of deprivation, the proportions of housing types, justification for retail growth and access to the countryside (including areas outside Cannock Chase District).

4.4. Vision and Preferred Strategic Approach-37 respondents *Mr George Adamson; Advantage West Midlands; AONB Unit; British Waterways; Mr Simon Boardman-Weston; Campaign to Protect Rural England; A B Carpenter; CENTRO; Mr F Dorsett; English Heritage; Environment Agency; Fresh Space Developments Ltd; Government Office for the West Midlands; Harper Brothers Ltd; Inglewood Investments; Inland Waterways Association; JJ Gallagher Ltd; Landor Society; Marstons PLC; Mr and Mrs Matthews; Morston Assets; Natural England; Newlands Consortium; Persimmon and Bloor Homes; Rugeley Power Limited; Somerfield Stores; Sport England; St Modwen Developments; South Staffordshire District Council; Staffordshire County Council; Staffordshire Police; The Coal Authority; The Theatres Trust; UK Architectural Antiques; West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium; West Midlands Regional Assembly; Wyrley Estates.*

Overall support for style and content of vision specifically in relation to climate change adaptation, transport, retailing, historic environment and the Biodiversity Enhancement Area. Some additional specific inclusions were recommended including increased coverage of community and cultural facilities (particularly theatres); priority being the provision of an adequate amount of housing, not necessarily that which is built at the highest sustainability standard; sensitive developments at edge of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty being permitted and more positive wording to allow this in the vision; reference should be made to the existing accessibility and quantity of leisure and recreation facilities; a specific reference to the RSS figures and a review of the Green Belt to allow settlements to grow sustainably should be made; reference to ensure appropriate level of funding for Police services required; alterations to canal references; inclusion of protection of urban and rural landscapes; an explicit reference to the Forest of Mercia; alterations to Biodiversity Enhancement Area reference; alterations to reinforce tighter control of Green Belt required; and positive management of the provision for day and other visitors in the AONB. It was suggested that climate change should be given a higher priority in the vision.

An overall objection was made in terms of the need for greater recognition of longer term climate change and resource implications and it was noted that the vision is very general and so receives good public support but this might not be the case once the detail is developed.

There were mixed views on the strategic approach. In general terms the principles of the approach were supported but amendments were recommended in terms of the levels of provision in each settlement- it was suggested that higher proportions of housing in the AONB and rural settlements could increase the capacity of the District. Respondents also highlighted the need to consider flood alleviation/SUDs in new developments upstream of Mill Green and limited development in the Ridings Brook catchment; town centre living above shops and offices; refurbishment of existing old housing stock; providing housing for pensioner's close to local shops/facilities; additional references to the multi-functional role of the Green Belt and its future protection. It was noted that the strategic approach should indicate whether growth proportions are for housing development only or employment too and that the approach should not prejudice the development of Brownfield sites which should be the priority for redevelopment first. Concerns were raised regarding Rugeley and Brereton as separate entities of the C3 Housing Market Area and one respondent highlighted the need to ensure surface coal or clay resources were not being 'sterilised' as a result of the development options. One respondent expressed concern that the strategic approach could lead to the erosion of the countryside in practice. One respondent supported cross-boundary provision at South Staffordshire.

Objections to the strategic approach were based upon preference for maximising C7 sites; the impact of the credit crunch; any potential cross boundary employment provision in South Staffordshire; levels of employment provision and its location; the prescriptive and simplistic nature of the approach based on fixed proportions for each settlement without a robust evidence base; the need for lesser amounts of development in Rugeley (20%) and Norton Canes (5%) and a greater amount of development to Cannock/Hednesford/Heath Hayes (75%); a specific objection to the approach in Rugeley- the oversupply of historic employment land in the area should be given over to housing rather than provision in Lichfield District; no more development in Norton Canes and no strategic urban extensions South Of Lichfield Road A5190 or East of Wimblebury Road/South of Littleworth Road. Greater clarity on cross-boundary implications was requested from several respondents, particularly in relation to Stafford Growth Point and Lichfield.

In terms of conformity with the RSS it was noted that there was broad conformity at present but that the policy areas needed expanding; possible detail for retail phasing and a greenbelt policy/objective could be included. The need to consider mitigation measures for the Chase/SACs to avoid the adverse impacts of development was highlighted and more detailed evidence is required to support the need for out-of-centre office development. More detailed comments are discussed under Area Implications.

4.5. District-wide Objectives

4.5.1. General comments- 4 respondents Fresh Space Developments Ltd; Government Office for the West Midlands; Staffordshire Police; The Theatres Trust

General comments included development control policies should be minimal and focus should be on strategic matters; the document is lengthy and could be summarized for publication; no

guidance on developer contributions; unclear policies on how cultural/community facilities will be protected and enhanced.

One respondent had broad reservations regarding all of the Strategic Objectives and the issue of local distinctiveness; alterations were subsequently recommended for the structure of the document to address concerns e.g. Chapter 2 "Spatial Vision" and Chapter 4 "Strategic Objectives" could be amalgamated and a simple table setting out the objectives stemming from the Core Strategy Spatial Vision could then be included. Staffordshire Police set out justifications for Secured by Design principles to be incorporated across policy and for the seeking of Section 106 contributions towards police services in the District to cover the increased demand as a result of growth.

4.5.2. Objective 1 Promote pride in attractive, safe, local communities- 13 respondents Advantage West Midlands; British Waterways; Mr M Brothwell; Campaign to Protect Rural England; English Heritage; Inglewood Investments; Marstons PLC; Natural England; Sport England; St Modwen Developments; Staffordshire Police; Staffordshire County Council; Wyrley Estates.

There was overall support for the principles, subject to design guidance not being overly prescriptive; further reference to the role of historic environment and local ecological/natural environment characteristics; reference to 'Active Design' to encourage layouts etc. which provide the best opportunities for people to be physically active. Separate guidance was felt to be appropriate.

Objections were raised in terms of the Core Strategy should advance policies to ensure appropriate funding for Police services as redesigning 'hot spots' is not enough; more specific detail should be in the Core Strategy rather than a Supplementary Planning Document and it was felt that there is too much emphasis on combating crime when it is the underlying problems that need addressing.

It was noted that high quality design should be suited to the context of the area; should take into account the amount and type of green infrastructure required; policy should recognise that larger, master planned developments offer greatest opportunity to integrate with their surroundings, rather than dispersed development proposals and it was suggested that reference be made to the encouragement of volunteers to assist in the amelioration of the local environment.

4.5.3. Objective 2 Create healthy living opportunities across the District- 15 respondents Advantage West Midlands; British Waterways; Campaign to Protect Rural England; CENTRO; Mr F Dorsett; English Heritage; Inglewood Investments; Inland Waterways Association; Newlands Consortium; Sport England; St Modwen Developments; Staffordshire Police; Staffordshire County Council; West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium; Wyrley Estates.

There was overall support for policy areas subject to further reference to the role of historic environment; open space provision should be carefully designed to link in with the attractive environments around Cannock; updating of the Council's Leisure Strategy via a revised PPG17 assessment and priorities/policies being developed to reflect its conclusions.

It was suggested that the mental health benefits of open spaces and recreation should be recognized; that Policy Areas 2 and 3 should be combined; the role of the creation of new open

spaces as part of large scale housing developments should be recognized; all developments should incorporate private and public amenity space; references should be made to include housing choice for the elderly, support for older people living independent lives in their own homes, sheltered housing, extra care housing, residential care homes and continuing care retirement communities as a separate policy area.

4.5.4. Objective 3 Provide for housing choice-22 respondents Advantage West Midlands; AONB Unit; Campaign to Protect Rural England; Mr F Dorsett; English Heritage; Environment Agency; Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group; Friends, Families and Travellers; Government Office for the West Midlands; Inglewood Investments; Inland Waterways Association; Landor Society; Marstons PLC; McCarthy and Stone PLC; Newlands Consortium; Rugeley Power Ltd; St Modwen Developments; South Staffordshire Council; Staffordshire County Council; Walsall Council; West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium; Wyrley Estates.

There was support for the policy areas and housing distribution, in particular the cross boundary working with Lichfield DC; prioritising development on Brownfield sites (so long as they are in sustainable locations); affordable housing (provided that the maximum level of 36% on sites of 15 or more is not exceeded) and that 'needs match provision'; aspirational housing (provided no maximum levels of provisions are set); the Gypsy, Traveller and Show-people policy area (subject to further consultation with interest groups); the work of Housing Associations; and the proposed review of Green Belt at Rugeley Eastern by-pass (Armitage Lane).

Objections were made to some of the policy areas on the basis that the current District Housing Strategy will have expired before the Core Strategy is adopted so is not suitable evidence; that contradictory affordable housing level requirements are put forward; and reference to Stafford Borough helping meet some of Cannock Chase District's unmet need. There were also objections in terms of the inclusion of an extra 2,200 houses into the provision targets and that Rugeley's development needs should not rely on land within Lichfield District Council's area as there are suitable sites on the south western side of Rugeley. There were conflicting views regarding the level of housing provision with some respondents arguing the figures for housing are too high and that the Council should be resisting these whilst others suggested that the figures should be higher, particularly for affordable housing needs to be met. One respondent objected to the reference of low support for aspirational housing – it was argued that this was supported and required based upon the needs of the housing market area. However, other respondents raised concerns about the potential conflict between aspirational housing and conservation ambitions.

It was noted that the policy areas omit other housing standards, such as development densities; that housing figures will need to take into account the RSS revision and SAC Appropriate Assessment outcomes; in respect of cross-boundary working attention should be paid to Stafford and Lichfield's historic environment evidence base; Policy Area 6 should accord with aims for sustainable mixed communities; more private rented sector housing should be provided; and that accommodation for Gypsies, travellers and Travelling show-people policy requires a new assessment of the occupational and social infrastructure requirements for this group. It was suggested that Policy Area 7 and 20 should be combined; that unmet need will require Green Belt release, and priority should therefore be edge of urban sites; that greater clarity is required on the use of the Green Belt land alongside the Rugeley Eastern Bypass at Brereton, which should be allowed for development; that an affordable housing rural sites exception policy should be in place; that the Council work with RSLs and the Gypsy and Traveller community to identify and enable the

provision of traveller sites and should consider producing a 'Gypsy and Traveller accommodation Site Allocation DPD', considering Green Belt sites for such uses where appropriate. It was suggested that in order to meet the specific needs of the elderly and those in need of care a separate policy area should also be established to complement health-driven objectives. One respondent noted the need to balance new housing at Norton Canes with sufficient employment provision.

4.5.5. Objective 4 Encourage a vibrant local economy and workforce-16 respondents Advantage West Midlands; AONB Unit; Campaign to Protect Rural England; English Heritage; Environment Agency; Fresh Space Developments Ltd; Government Office for the West Midlands; Inglewood Investments; Landor Society; Marstons PLC; Newlands Consortium; Rugeley Power Ltd; St Modwen Developments; Walsall Council; WM Morrisons; Wyrley Estates.

There was support for the broad policy approaches particularly Policy Area 13 in terms of low key tourism (especially within the AONB); employment land provision as part of urban extensions near main population centres; employment land provision at Norton Canes; positive management of the provision for day and other visitors, which should be referred to as part of the vision and objectives.

Objections were made in relation to the potential option for 'no further significant employment land need for Rugeley'- this should be deleted; Policy Area 10 as it is 'vague and imprecise' and should not seek to discourage legitimate employment uses which are appropriate for employment areas; specific reference should be made to Rugeley Power Station site in Policy Area 10; references to cross boundary working to secure sufficient employment land provision should be deleted; reference to proposed out of centre office provision is conflict with national, regional and local policy and should be removed. One respondent recommended that a higher level of employment land provision should be set at 100ha, based on RSS levels being indicative only and additional evidence base including the regeneration ambitions of the District. Existing and under-used employment sites should as far as possible be protected for this use.

It was noted that national policy guidance requires local authorities to undertake an assessment of existing and allocated employment land sites and that there was no mention of the RSS rolling reservoir of employment land requirements; any deviation from national and regional policy should be justified in respect of Policy Area 10. It was noted that retail development allocations should have an up to date assessment of retail need, as required by PPS6 and address key retail tests of scale, sequential approach, retail impact and accessibility; Policy Area 13 Rural Economy should take account of emerging evidence base work from the County Council on traditional farmsteads; concerns raised in terms of evidence base used to justify developments within sensitive areas, particularly AONB.

4.5.6. Objective 5 Encourage sustainable transport infrastructure-15 respondents Advantage West Midlands; British Waterways; Campaign to Protect Rural England; CENTRO; Mr and Mrs Dale; Inglewood Investments; Inland Waterways Association; Mr M Lomas; London Midland; Marstons PLC; Newlands Consortium; St Modwen Developments; Staffordshire County Council; Walsall Council; Wyrley Estates.

There was overall support for the measures and policy areas subject to the use of maximum parking standards for residential development being carefully managed; furthers amendments to the explanatory content for greater accuracy; provided that employment uses are concentrated

together near to town centres and that housing developments should have good infrastructure e.g. transport links; the M6 Toll remaining as a movement corridor and not being considered a growth corridor; improved access to rail stations via walking or cycling; safeguarding of the Hatherton Canal route; and existing and redundant rail lines being protected for the sustainable transport of minerals. Respondents largely supported the need for a review of the proposed Winchester Road Extension.

Objections were made in terms of considering mountain bike trails in same context as cycle ways- the former are much more destructive; the use of maximum car parking and charging regimes that discriminate against those outside public transport routes; the omission of Public Rights of Way (the County welcome opportunity to work with the District to address this transport network).

It was suggested that more clarity could be given under 'area implications'; that barriers to sustainable means of travel can be over come by larger development sites along good quality public transport corridors; that Rugeley town centre can be made more attractive through continuing to incorporate the canal assets within the regeneration schemes; that development needs to be supported by a high quality public transport system from the outset and focused on those areas with existing connections; there is a need to ensure compatibility with regional transport policy and the West Midlands Local Transport Plan and sufficiently address cross-boundary considerations as Cannock Chase lies within the West Midlands 'travel to work' area.

4.5.7. Objective 6 Create attractive town centres- 9 respondents Advantage West Midlands; British Waterways, Campaign to Protect Rural England; English Heritage; Somerfield Stores Ltd; St Modwen Developments; Staffordshire Police; The Theatres Trust; Walsall Council

There was broad support for the measures proposed subject to more consideration of enhanced police provision and developer funding of this; the historic environment; the overall quality of the environment as a whole in the District; the creation of a strong link between the proposed Tesco store and Rugeley town centre, with the use of S106 contributions for canal moorings. There was particular support for Hednesford's and Rugeley's regeneration with respondents suggesting that the expansion of Hednesford should be supported by assessments of need rather than restricting regeneration unnecessarily.

There were objections to the weak wording of Policy Area 16 as it was considered that greater recognition needed of cultural and community facilities, particularly theatres, was required. An objection was made to provision of additional retail floorspace in Cannock town centre before 2021.

4.5.8. Objective 7 Provide well managed and appreciated environments - 15 respondents Advantage West Midlands; AONB Unit; Campaign to Protect Rural England; Mr and Mrs Dale; Mr F Dorsett; English Heritage; Inglewood Investments; Inland Waterways Association; Lichfield District Council; Marstons PLC; Newlands Consortium; St Modwen; Staffordshire County Council; Walsall Council; Wyrley Estates.

There was broad support for the measures and policy areas suggested subject to them reflecting the fact that environments change over time (some development in the Green Belt surrounding the AONB will be needed); altered landscape interpretation in policy wording to better reflect the historic environment; further evidence base work been drawn upon in relation to the historic

environment. There was support for future joint working in relation to the Cannock Extension Canal SAC and support for the role of Chasewater and green networks linking to the AONB for sport, leisure and recreation.

Objections were raised in relation to concerns regarding the evidence base used in Policy Area 18 e.g. the AONB Management Plan; the lack of recognition of the Forest of Mercia; the AONB policy being too negatively worded and concern about the use of the AONB Management Plan in future decision-making; the absence of any “thrust towards achieving environments in new development which compare with the best of older cherished historic urban groupings whilst incorporating modern facilities”; and an objection to landscape definition applied- further detail was recommended for inclusion.

Respondents noted that the removal of some Green Belt land is not necessarily harmful to the principles of this objective, whilst others disagreed. Respondents suggested the strengthening of Policy Area 17 to ensure landscape enhancement is paramount, recognizing the role of the Green Belt in this regard. One respondent advised that Landscape Character could be a policy area of its own, if not greater reference to the developing evidence base should be included. It was noted that these policies should not be deficiency-led i.e. improvements to open spaces etc should only be related to mitigation and enhancement required directly as a result of the development. Some respondents noted that further information on the Regional Biodiversity Enhancement Area should be provided in the submission document. One respondent highlighted the need to consider former coal mining areas as ones with the opportunity to preserve and enhance the natural environment.

4.5.9. Objective 8 Support a greener future- 14 respondents Advantage West Midlands; Biffa Waste Services; British Waterways; British Wind Energy Association; Campaign to Protect Rural England; Environment Agency; Marstons PLC; Natural England; Newlands Consortium; Peel Holdings (Energy) Ltd; Richborough Estates; St Modwen; Staffordshire County Council; The Coal Authority

There was broad support for the measures proposed subject to more detail the level of water conservation to be achieved through the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM; not going beyond national requirements; use of the Level 2 SFRA for Rugeley; consideration of the costs and impact upon the viability of schemes; appropriate measures to support the use of recycled materials in construction with monitoring; expanding of the policy to other mitigation and adaptation considerations e.g. beyond flooding; specific recognition of the potential role of the waterway in water management for both flood control and drought management and in relation to sustainable urban drainage solutions; greater recognition of protected and enhanced green networks to support climate change measures and an indication of the amount, type and location of the green infrastructure required being brought out further. It was suggested that more detail could be added to this section in terms of future renewable energy generation, energy standards and recycling in new developments and that management plans are needed to maintain green/blue environments.

There was support for Policy Area 21 given the recognition that this proposed policy area gives to the issue of mine water contamination issues but the omission of wider mining legacy considerations was highlighted. It was recommended that the policy be expanded to deal with ground stability considerations (as per PPG14). There was an objection to the policy area on the basis that it was too narrowly focused upon air pollution.

There were objections to Policy Area 20 on the basis on that it does not give enough emphasis to the waste arising from new built development. Reference could be made to local recycling targets, local facilities needed to enable new communities and businesses to recycle, and also the sub regional facilities needed in Cannock and Rugeley (WMRSS Phase 2 policy W3). It was also suggested that the Core Strategy does not sufficiently promote renewable energy and green technology to the extent required by the RSS and PPS22- clearer policies and an SPD should be produced.

It was noted that climate change is likely to have a far wider-reaching impact than already envisaged and one respondent raised concerns in terms of resource use, particularly future food shortages. It was argued that the global responses to climate change are inadequate; the Council's approach is adequate within the information currently available but this is not considered to be correct in a wider context. It was suggested that Policy Areas 7 and 20 should be combined due to their overlap.

4.6. Area Implications

4.6.1. General comments- 5 respondents Biffa Waste; English Heritage; Inland Waterways; Natural England; Sport England;

There was support for reference to the Staffordshire Waste Core Strategy and possible new waste facilities at Poplars/KingswoodLakeside as well maintaining the land designation for employment/industrial uses. In conjunction with these proposals it was argued that development of Heath Hayes towards Poplars should be avoided.

It was suggested and noted that growth in areas should be informed by detailed historic environment assessments and data; a reduction in Rugeley/Brereton's proportion due to constraints and impact upon Green Belt locations elsewhere; the need for green space and for additional spaces will be guided by the Habitats Regulation Appropriate Assessment; incursions into the Green Belt should be considered carefully given its role within the BEA in particular; the implications will require updating with the PPG17 assessment and the loss of sports facilities would not be supported for housing.

4.6.2. Urban Cannock, Hednesford and Heath Hayes- 25 respondents Mr George Adamson; AONB Unit; Campaign to Protect Rural England; Mr A B Carpenter; Mrs D Crombwell; English Heritage; Environment Agency; Fresh Space Developments Ltd; Government Office for the West Midlands; Great Wyrley Parish Council; Hawksmoor; Heath Hayes and Wimblebury Parish Council; Inland Waterways Association; Mr M Lomas; Morston Assets; Newlands Consortium; Marstons PLC; The Coal Authority; The Theatres Trust; Mr Peter Sidgwick; Mrs Sue Smith; Somerfield Stores Ltd; Sport England; St Modwen Developments; Staffordshire County Council

There was broad support for the Cannock, Hednesford and Heath Hayes vision and strategic approach from some respondents subject to the housing allocation remaining at 68% of the allocation figure should RSS figures increase; support for out of centre office growth, but this should be provided as part of a 'hub' e.g. in neighbourhood centres and at Kingswood Lakeside; and support for the emphasis upon reinforcing the town centre. Some respondents broadly supported the approach but considered that employment land should be provided as part of urban

extensions to enhance sustainability and that higher levels of development in Cannock should be pursued to reflect its sustainability and importance.

Objections were made to the levels of provision being either too high or low; the retention of the Winchester Road Extension Scheme; any potential development of the land between Cannock and Great Wyrley, especially Green Belt and open space; continued building where large housing sites already exist; a lack of infrastructure which is needed alongside new development including open spaces, improved roads, schools and GP practices; and to the unclear vision for Cannock theatres. It was considered that the retail figures used put forward a contradictory approach, particularly in relation to Hednesford, and it was queried where the figures had come from.

It was noted that the overall approach to the Cannock/Hednesford/Heath Hayes area needs to be informed by evidence base and clarification is required on the evidence base in progress; the Council's views on minerals and waste issues should be clearly stated; any spatial distribution of development chosen for Cannock Chase (particularly at Heath Hayes) should take into account the prior extraction of the surface coal resources and clay resources, as MPS1 indicates; consideration needs to be given to the expansion of waste facilities in this area and their long-term restoration plans; additional employment provision at Kingswood needs to take account of SBIs; and reference to Sport and Recreation instead of health (& recreation) at para 6.8 should be made. It was noted that further detail was needed in relation to the impacts of developments upon the Ridings Brook; that increasing densities within the existing built-up area should not be pursued at the expense of local character, distinctiveness and environmental quality; that housing sites should be well related to employment areas and sustainable transport routes; further development in Cannock should not be on green spaces and only open spaces that can be readily accessed should be counted towards the District's provision; and graveyard space is running out at Norton Canes and Heath Hayes. One respondent noted that the final spatial strategy will need to specify locations in more detail including broad locations and possibly strategic sites; some respondents put forward specific development sites for consideration.

In terms of the urban extension options there were mixed views. Some respondents suggested that Cannock, Hednesford and Heath Hayes should be allocated higher levels of growth overall and the respective developer interests for each proposed strategic site put forward cases for the appropriateness of their proposals over alternative options. Some respondents suggested that the areas removed from the Green Belt under the Local Plan and currently subject to safeguarding policy should be reassessed through the LDF but there were also particular objections to using Green Belt land south of Heath Hayes and east of Wimblebury Road. It was argued that land west of Pye Green Road should not be developed based upon sustainability and landscape assessments; only part of the land west of Pye Green Road should be developed to protect the northern section for environmental and landscape reasons; there should be no review of Green Belt around Cannock- the safeguard Local Plan sites are considered appropriate including the whole of land west of Pye Green Road (additions to vision for the area were recommended to reflect specific sites and Green Belt retention); that significant parcels of land within and on the edge of Cannock Town Centre could be identified; that the Mill Green site should be allocated as mixed use development for employment, residential and education; and the finding of alternative developments must include joint working with South Staffordshire District Council.

4.6.3. Rugeley and Brereton-14 respondents AONB Unit; W Boardman-Weston Grandchildren's Trust; Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council; English Heritage; Friel Homes; Government Office for the West Midlands; Inglewood Investments; Inland Waterways Association; Landor Society; Marstons PLC; Newlands Consortium; Rugeley Power Ltd; Sport England; Stockland

There was broad support for the vision, particularly in terms of the town centre regeneration aims and additional retail investment; the development of a mix of high quality housing to be located to the edge of Brereton within Lichfield District; the review of Green Belt boundaries for land at Armitage Land. Some respondents supported the approach subject to recommended changes in line with aspirations for a greater proportion of employment provision; the housing requirement being reduced to constitute 20%, not 25%; development to the south east of Brereton within the A513 boundary; references to support a specific towpath proposal at Brereton; and the approach being informed by evidence base on the historic environment.

Objections were made to the reliance on Lichfield District to provide much of the allocated housing and employment land as this is contrary to the Preferred Strategic approach- all of Rugeley / Brereton's need should be met from within Cannock Chase District Council's boundaries and Greenbelt outside of the AONB should be used to create sustainable urban extensions; the level of development proposed in the area being too high due to physical constraints; the need for an additional option for Rugeley and Brereton to meet the housing requirements which states that the Council will encourage the development of under utilised, previously developed land for housing; the contradiction between meeting existing service needs and those needed for new sustainable housing in relation to cross-boundary provision; and the need to consider employment use on land at Armitage Lane.

It was noted that the Core Strategy should provide a strong framework for each town centre and the Rugeley Town Centre Area Action Plan; more explanation is needed of the housing figures for clarity; greater reference to PPS25 should be made; sports facilities/playing fields may need planning before the 'super school' is committed to; reference to the "protection and enhancement of the AONB" in the vision for Rugeley and Brereton should be included and there must be some recreational space very close to new homes to help address any further recreational pressure on the AONB (the AONB/green belt boundaries on the Rugeley and Brereton Spatial diagram should also be clarified).

4.6.4. Norton Canes- 22 respondents Mr J S Bridgen; Mr M Brothwell; Campaign to Protect Rural England; Mr A Coleman; English Heritage; Environment Agency; Mr J Ellis; Estate of Mabel Meacham deceased; Mr F Dorsett; Mrs C Footman; CA Harrington; Harper Brothers Ltd; Hawksmoor; Inland Waterways Association; Marstons PLC; Newlands Consortium; Persimmon and Bloor Homes; St Modwen Developments; Mr A Silvester; The Coal Authority; Mr A Webster; Wyrley Estates.

There was support for the Preferred Option including developing the Norton Canes greyhound stadium Green Belt site, Local Plan site at Burntwood Road and the safeguard site north of M6 Toll/A5, subject to a selective Green Belt review, careful design and landscaping. Some respondents supported the level of growth but felt that development should be employment-led, particularly on the safeguarded site. However, some respondents felt that more housing could be accommodated in Norton Canes than proposed. It was felt that population statistics were out of date (2001 Census) and housing demand should be met to remain sustainable - Cannock's

housing needs can be met without expanding into the Stafford growth point area. There was support for more houses that will enhance the sustainability of the retail centre.

Objections were made to the principle of Norton Canes accommodating Rugeley/Brereton's 'overspill' in housing; employment development in any Norton Canes extension; intrusion into Green Belt, particularly at the Greyhound Stadium when the safeguarded C7 site could accommodate this growth alone; the need for Norton Canes to be identified for a significantly larger degree of housing growth to sustain the settlement encourage increased infrastructure provision; the need for growth in Norton Canes to be kept to a minimum and the Green Belt between Norton Canes and Kingswood Lakeside protected. There were a number of local resident objections to the development of a potential site at Norton Springs proposed as part of the 2007 Site Allocations consultation; however the Council is not considering this site as part of the Core Strategy process.

It was suggested that land at the junction of Burntwood Road/Norton East Road and Green Belt release for development north of Hednesford Road could provide additional growth. It was noted that open space/play areas in new developments should be provided; that appropriate infrastructure should be in place for new developments including schools, traffic calming and improvements to public transport Norton Canes; that any proposals for additional development in Norton Canes lies on the surface coal resource and the prior extraction of the surface coal resource should be considered as MPS1 indicates; the habitat regulations may force development towards Norton Canes to reduce the impact on the Chase; that affordable housing needs will be challenging to meet; and that sites put forward in Site Allocations DPD 2007 should be noted.

4.6.5. Cannock Chase AONB and the Rural North (including Rawnsley, Hazelslade, Prospect Village, Cannock Wood and Slitting Mill) – 10 respondents Campaign to Protect Rural England; Mr and Mrs D H Dale; English Heritage; Hazelslade and Rawnsley Community Association; Howkins and Harrison; Marstons PLC; Newlands Consortium; St Modwen Developments; Staffordshire County Council; West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium;

There was broad support for the approach and vision subject to the adoption of a rural exceptions policy to allow for 100% affordable housing development to meet local needs; no development taking place unless there is an overwhelming justification related to agricultural need; the approach not prejudicing the need to release land adjacent to the built-up area of Rugeley and Brereton to meet the development needs of these settlements; the 'assessment of local need' including the needs of all the community in all settlements

It was suggested that the AONB Management Plan should not be relied upon too much and other environmental protection organisations should also be consulted; that the land between Rawnsley Road and Rugeley Road should be designated part of the AONB (or as Green Belt) and the land at The Bungalow, 34 Rugeley Road, Hazelslade should be considered for development. It was noted that clarification is needed on the scope of the landscape character analysis 2008 with regard to its incorporation of relevant historic environment data on the AONB fringe and that the Appropriate Assessment needs to inform policy for this area.

4.6.6. The Rural South - 6 respondents Campaign to Protect Rural England; English Heritage; Hawksmoor; Inland Waterways; Marstons PLC; Staffordshire County Council

There were mixed views in relation to the use of Green Belt, as related to the proposed extensions at Cannock/Hednesford/Heath Hayes. There was some support for the expansion of employment uses along the A5/M6 Toll; however concerns remained regarding issues of traffic congestion and ribbon development

There were some concerns in relation to whether the Council has enough evidence to support its proposals for Gypsies and Travellers, although there was some support for provision around the A5 and M6 Toll. It was noted that clarification is needed on the scope of the landscape character analysis 2008 with regard to its incorporation of relevant historic environment data and that a reference should be added to ensure the Hatherton Canal route protection. It was suggested that the vision could be altered to better reflect the issues covered.

4.6.7. Cross Boundary Considerations- 10 respondents Advantage West Midlands; AONB Unit; Campaign to Protect Rural England; Fresh Space Developments Ltd; Inglewood Investments; Marstons PLC; Natural England; Newlands Consortium; Sport England; St Modwen Developments

There was support for Lichfield/Rugeley cross boundary working, however some respondents argued that provision should count towards Cannock Chase Council's targets. Objections were made to the expansion of the A5 employment corridor as it is not sustainable and it severs the Green Belt; that the Preferred Strategic Approach should be entirely achievable within the boundaries of Cannock Chase District even if this requires selective Green Belt release; any provision of Cannock Chase 'unmet need' in housing via Stafford Growth Point.

There was further clarification requested on the Cannock Chase-Sutton Park BEA proposals. It was noted that there might be some cross boundary issues which arise out of the PPG17 assessment which will need to be included (for example that a significant amount of demand for indoor sports facilities appears to be imported); that cross boundary working will help disperse the housing allocation into districts also incorporating and bordering parts of the AONB-therefore the overall impact will not be reduced in terms of recreational and commuter pressures and account should be taken of this impact (the Appropriate Assessment work may assist to provide further guidance on this).

4.6.8. Summary of Housing Distribution - 4 respondents Campaign to Protect Rural England; Inland Waterways Association; Lichfield District Council; St Modwen Developments

It was suggested that the summary highlights the departure from fundamental planning policies as a result of imposed regional targets and that a reduction at regional level is thus required; that the housing figures are excessive, inconsistent and allocations should not include any significant Green Belt incursions. One respondent provided an alternative proposal for increased housing provision in the District, with support for land West of Pye Green Road for development. Clarity was sought upon the Rugeley/Lichfield cross-boundary figures, but the approach was supported in principle.

4.7. Plan, Monitor and Manage- *7 respondents Campaign to Protect Rural England; Mr and Mrs D H Dale; English Heritage; Government Office for West Midlands; Landor Society; Natural England; West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium.*

There was support for the proposal to monitor the number of new developments incorporating Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.

Additional indicators were recommended in relation to Objective 7, specifically the historic environment and biodiversity. It was recommended that monitoring be developed to inform elderly housing choice, affordable and special needs housing.

Comments included the need to recognise that the quality of the environment is vital and should be accounted for; recognising the issue of housing deliverability in Rugeley; recognising that the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate delivery and have appropriate monitoring in place, including the need to consider how potential changes to the RSS requirements could be accommodated; concerns about potential lack of outside specialist input in relation to evidence for Objective 7.

4.8. Background Evidence Base- *1 respondent Environment Agency (other references to evidence base made implicitly throughout responses)*

West Midlands Climate Change Adaptation Strategy needs to be included in the evidence base and further reference should also be made to the relevant Catchment Flood Management Policy Unit or Policy.

4.9. Infrastructure Requirements- *10 respondents AONB Unit; Environment Agency; English Heritage; Inland Waterways; Mrs J Lee; National Grid; Mr I Price; Mrs R Robinson; Sport England; The Theatres Trust*

There was support for the inclusion of Environment Agency comments related to water use, drainage and flooding (particularly green roofs); support for improved Council services, public transport, education facilities, flooding mitigation measures and recycling initiatives; support for improving rural services; improvements to the Trent & Mersey Canal and restoration of the Hatherton Canal.

Additional references were requested in relation to the historic environment; theatres; traffic calming on Norton Hall Lane and Church Road if 340 new houses are built; improved facilities for walking and cycling; further work on the AONB infrastructure, within the framework of the Cannock Chase AONB Management Plan, and recognition of the desire to include Hednesford Hills within the AONB.

Comments included a need for recognition that abstraction of water to fill the Lichfield and Hatherton canal - if restored - will require an Environment Agency licence and there is no guarantee this can be issued; infrastructure requirements will need to be updated pending the outcomes of the PPG17 assessment and Leisure Strategy; during the next 20 years the national gas and electricity network will need updating and whilst the National Grid network should be able to cope with the development currently proposed in Cannock Chase District, further consultation on specific proposals will be required; energy projects will need to take account of visual impact and landscape character.

5. Workshop Events Consultation Responses

In addition to the formal stakeholder representations a series of more informal workshop events were held for the more 'hard to reach' groups. The Young Chamber workshops held at Fair Oak and Chase High highlighted differing views amongst the students in terms preferred directions of growth and priorities. For instance in Cannock there was a sense that the area was already too over developed and that more houses should be directed towards Rugeley- some students questioned the actual need for further houses in the area. In terms of commonalities all of the students expressed concern at the levels of provision in their respective town centres and the difficulties in travelling to nearby larger centres (with costs being the most prohibitive issue in most cases). Many students also emphasised the need to protect the natural environment in their areas and increase provision for young people (please see Appendix 3 for full consultation summaries).

At the Voluntary Sector workshop there was more emphasis upon the policy areas proposed. Those present at the workshop were divided into three groups. Each group was, in turn and with a facilitator from the Planning Policy team, to look at the policies which were being proposed under key themes to see whether they agreed with them and whether they were relevant and workable from a voluntary and community sector perspective. The themes were: Economy, Housing, and Environment / Health and Wellbeing.

To assist with the discussion, each facilitator had a matrix which set out the relevant policy areas to the topic. It was divided into the following sections: 'who is the plan likely to affect / benefit?'; 'Are there any potential negative impacts? How could these be overcome?' 'Resources required to implement the plan effectively', 'please specify any activities to be delivered / supported by the Third Sector' and 'effects of the economic downturn'. The results of these workshops are summarised below:

Housing workshop comments

Who is the plan likely to affect / benefit?

- Some need for aspirational housing linked to business need
- Needs to focus on dealing with empty homes before building new ones
- Carbon friendly development – new and old housing
- Help needed for those not on benefits (e.g. Bevan Lee)
- Designing out crime
- Parking is a problem, car reduction isn't working
- Beneficiaries for 'affordable needs'
- Provide for a wide range of people
- Lifetime homes: scope needed for adaptation, location is important. Cost implications.
- Size standards – for all developments
- Need to allow for downsizing (lifetime homes)
- Bevan Lee – has a community room: good practice
- Perception that there are too many houses which are empty or run down
- Heath Hayes is full of commuters not spending money in local shops
- 'Hidden households' (e.g. multiple occupation, adults still living with parents etc)
- Generation wants something nice to live in instantly, don't want to wait

- Some have to find cheapest available accommodation e.g. those on incomes <20k p.a.
- Elderly in inappropriate housing
- CAB seeing high levels of bankruptcy: houses that have been repossessed are sitting empty
- Scepticism about ability of lifetime homes to cater for more than one generation
- Extra Care at Bridgtown is a good idea

Are there any potential negative impacts? How could these be overcome?

- Affordable houses for first time buyers
- Affordable houses for established families – then scale down later in life
- Scepticism about ‘Lifetime Homes’ – people may want to move out, the houses themselves must be suitable, the idea isn’t working in Cannock
- Garden space is needed to ‘chill out’
- Community facilities needed as part of new housing developments
- There is a glut of apartments and possibly a shortage of larger houses
- Should return to bungalows, but 1 bedroom bungalows are being sold off
- Problems with mix of elderly / young people
- Should de-categorise ‘categorised’ schemes
- Sheltered schemes are too small to downsize
- Standards need to be improved with sheltered schemes
- More flexibility needed with sheltered schemes for the disabled
- Need more choice with sheltered accommodation as needs can change quickly

Resources needed to implement the plan effectively

- Re Gypsies and Travellers – There should be officer contact at District level; transit sites should be kept separate to permanent residential pitches; re - education of the public is needed
- Funding for third sector for community facilities / projects
- Community room – provided in consultation with CVS (recognises range of needs)

Please specify any activities to be delivered / supported by the Third Sector

- Community Payback – help with garden care
- Community pride generated via new community facilities – library. Heath Hayes has no new facilities
- Youth – clubs / school facilities / extensions / skate parks / car parks / access
- More press releases from the voluntary sector to promote work / involvement
- Community forums to involve local people in planning issues
- Realities and perceptions of the immigration issue (channel for communication)
- Bevan Lee – leads by example – flag up successes and celebrates

Effects of economic downturn

- Affordable housing needs increasing

- People losing homes
- Need community support
- Private landlords benefiting
- Very little emergency accommodation
- Having to relocate to the Black Country
- Costs of energy efficiency / fuel poverty issues
- House needs to become a home: interest free loans needed for furnishings e.g. carpets
- Money lender issues
- Residential / nursing homes for the paying population
- People have children to get benefits
- Extensions to homes for elderly relatives – need to be flexible – links with lifetime Homes.
- (additional comment via flipchart) – homeowners hit by economic downturn, not able to maintain

Health / wellbeing and environment workshop comments

Who is the plan likely to affect / benefit?

- Private sector should be addressed in same way as public sector in terms of climate change policy
- Need to address car parking issues for fear of crime at the hospital
- Mental health benefits of the Chase and green areas
- Target people to visit the Chase to build the economy – cafes etc
- Carers support needs to be higher on the agenda e.g. sitting services
- CCTV etc works if it's subtle
- Lifetime homes standards – issues of disabled access under Policy area 1

Are there any potential negative impacts? How could these be overcome?

- Cost prohibitive for renewable energy / sustainable construction
- Promotion of approach to renewable energy and people's attitudes
- 're use before recycling'
- Car parking facilities at the hospital are inappropriate
- Costs of public transport are prohibitive
- Cost of Chase Leisure Centre fees
- Provision of appropriate facilities for voluntary sector organisations
- Promoting use of the Chase for more activities – waste facilities to tackle littering/pollution
- Security issues around the Chase and with allotments – vandalism
- Lack of provision of facilities and open spaces within some urban areas
- Concern over change of character re the Chase
- Are allotments a 'phase'? Risk of over-provision
- Appropriate landscaping so doesn't interfere with CCTV etc
- Negative equity of existing properties for those who can't afford to maintain them
- Lifestyle – reducing reliance on private transport i.e. cars difficult to overcome
- Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems – issue of utility companies not adopting them and charging residents extra fees for water surface drainage

- Historic environment – need appropriate balance between conservation and re use. Need to be looking at other benefits of regenerating historic buildings/areas.
- Centralisation of health facilities as planned via Cannock Health Centre could be detrimental to some.

Resources required to implement the plan effectively

- Art facilities / agenda needs to have higher profile
- Transport to Stafford Hospital from rural areas
- Improved cycle routes between urban areas to AONB (not safe at present). Cycling proficiency tests needed
- Lack of / poor quality football pitches
- Awareness raising of impacts on the Chase e.g. signs re litter
- Linking the Chase via Hednesford – more formal organised facilities e.g. picnic areas, and create a better 'flow' through the areas. Friends of Hednesford Park
- Growing demand for allotments
- Greater provision of cycle routes across District that are safer
- Concessions for carers at Leisure Centres for swimming etc
- CCTV had benefits for town centres and Chadsmoor – reduces the need for police patrols and improved safety
- Are the PCT health centre plans taking into account access to this new centre via bus routes etc as GP services closing may reduce access for communities
- Appropriate funding – particularly in respect of Code For Sustainable Homes
- Skills to manage policies
- Outreach services to rural areas and suitable transport connections
- Dial-a-ride buses not necessarily suited to local needs. People now don't receive tokens for taxis and the bus is not always at appropriate times. Free bus passes – what times do these cover?

Please specify any activities to be delivered / supported by the Third Sector

- Reuse and recycle
- Sports – quality of pitches, cost of renting school pitches
- Activities for people recovering from hip replacements/arthritis but high cost of financing facilities in hospital
- Friends of Cannock Chase – utilise the Chase for family / health benefits
- Friends of Hednesford Park – activities at the Museum
- Brereton Gardeners - allotments
- Supporting carers via sitting services
- AONB management, natural environment sector in promoting 'green' activities, transport services (e.g. volunteer car scheme in Uttoxeter)

Effects of economic downturn

- No comments made via the workshops

Additional comments via flip chart

- Residents locked into living in houses which are not adapted as they grow older
- Enable elderly and those with poor mobility to access community activities to maintain social contact and friendships
- Make sure cycle racks are clear and fit for purpose without obstructions
- If someone with a disability cannot access a facility then if they have a carer it means both are excluded. Don't just think 'wheelchair' – poor mobility in general
- Encourage local employers to work towards care friendly flexible working policies to enable carers to carry on working and care
- Encourage community groups to improve their local environment by giving them support and not red tape. Creates more ownership of community.

Economy

Who is the plan likely to affect / benefit?

- Currently town centres don't cater for the younger generation (e.g. music / clothing), more investment needed so retailers WANT to invest
- In principle the policies are a good idea, are they likely to work on a day to day basis?
- Local labour
- Construction skills – link between housing and economy
- Rugeley is more wheelchair friendly than Cannock or Hednesford which are both hilly. Cannock has lots of steps and levels and the indoor escalator is usually broken and the lift not in service
- Lack of enforcement over disabled bay parking
- Diversifying town centres is not just about pubs and clubs

Are there any potential negative impacts? How could these be overcome?

- Sustainable transport links carry people OUT to Birmingham etc
- Need to invest urgently in town centres so people want to stay local.
- Rugeley has real character, is attractive and has real potential
- Cannock lacks character but is perceived as getting all the investment
- Play on strengths of individual towns e.g. Cannock modern / young, Rugeley more traditional / touristy / possible café culture
- How will office growth in Cannock benefit Rugeley people? They will still need to travel
- Smaller business units needed – start ups. Existing units (Hawks Green) – costs are prohibitive as small units are just as expensive as larger ones. Subsidising is necessary and this could be time limited to give business time to grow. To start up just a one room office is needed.
- Leases can be prohibitive e.g. tie in's for 3 years as it discourages people from piloting new ideas. 6 months notice is often needed which puts people off. Notice periods need to be shorter.
- Not enough capacity to place trainees and support and mentor
- Good practice – Bevan Lee / Sanctuary

- Move into private sector (business enterprise / training opportunities / health and safety etc) – needs targets and outputs
- Redesign of exiting town centre (Cannock). Big names needed – anchors to attract new / better shops
- Bus access – buses capable of taking wheelchairs but users still need assistance getting on and often the driver won't help. Trains are easier but need to book in advance

Resources required to implement the plan effectively

- Section 106, can't just rely on this
- Friends of...groups etc (e.g. Town Centres, Landor Society)
- Human resources (time / skills etc)
- Princes Trust / Groundwork?
- Community Services e.g. probation
- Simple stuff – cleaning, hanging baskets, filling in potholes
- Chadsmoor traffic is very busy, puts people off shopping there
- Subsidies for small business units – time limits , incentives, needs to be council controlled e.g. managed workspace, funding bids
- Sharing skills – voluntary / public / private sectors
- Favourable assets for a business contributing to volunteering and social enterprise – proportions of PAID staff, non paid volunteers, work based training volunteers, ex offenders
- Developer led housing estates: up front S106 contributions to get people ready to take part in construction of the building
- Need to promote Cannock Town Centre's offer more effectively

Please specify any activities to be delivered / supported by the Third Sector

- Local authority don't use the voluntary and community sector enough
- CAB – putting people back into employability
- Untapped resource, e.g. office staff (developers) – not just construction
- Evidence e.g. growth in volunteering can be found via Staffs Observatory
- Partnerships e.g. volunteer centre
- Get to know details of the Third sector – very wide ranging

Effects of economic downturn

- Shops closing
- Cannock market – empty units that could be used (Inshops). Rents too high.
- What incentives to be self employed?
- Low rate start ups needed
- Poor range of shops in Cannock

6. Summary of consultation

Overall it is felt that the consultation process was robust, inclusive and wide reaching. It followed on from the largest consultation ever undertaken by Cannock Chase Council and feedback was generally very positive (as evidenced by feedback from the community and voluntary sector workshop, for example). In order to take the consultation and Core Strategy forward it is recommended that more bespoke sessions or meetings are now held with those stakeholders who wish to further participate in detailed policy wording/development prior to Publication in December 2009.

Appendix 1- List of Key Consultees

Advantage West Midlands

Central Networks

CENTRO

English Heritage

Environment Agency

Government Office for the West Midlands (including Secretary of State for Transport)

Highways Agency

Local Town and Parish Council's (including those adjoining the District)

Lichfield DC

National Grid

Natural England

Network Rail

Severn Trent

South Staffordshire DC

South Staffordshire Primary Care Trust

South Staffordshire Water

Stafford BC

Staffordshire County Council

Staffordshire Police

The Coal Authority

Walsall MBC

West Midlands Regional Assembly

Appendix 2 Preferred Options 2009 Consultation timetable

Date	Venue	Time	Officer in Attendance and Attendance numbers (approx)
Weds 13 May 2009	LSP Executive Board	14.30	AL
Friday 15 May 2009	Trinity Methodist Church, Poplar Street Norton Canes	4pm to 7pm	CE/SJ 40 people
Monday 18 May 2009	Hednesford Library, Market Street	3.30pm to 6.30pm	CE 3 people
Monday 18 May	Sustainable Development Group (LSP)	2pm to 4pm	SJ 10 people
Tuesday 19 May 2009	Rugeley library	10.00 am to 2.00pm	CE 12 people
Tuesday 19 May 2009	Fair Oak School	1.15pm to 2.00pm approx	SJ 10 students
Tuesday 19 May 2009	Children's Trust Board	4.00	CE 18 people
Tuesday 19 May 2009	St Aidan's Church Hall, Albert Street, Cannock	3.00pm to 6.00pm	AL/JM 0 people
Wednesday 20 May 2009	Rugeley Leisure Centre	4.00pm to 7.00 pm	AL/MH 6 people plus 10 leaflets handed out
Thursday 21 May 2009	Heath Hayes library, Hednesford Road	3.30pm to 6.30pm	JM 6 people
Friday 22 May 2009	Disability Equality Forum	12 - 2	CE 12 people
Friday 22 May 2009	Cannock library	10.00am to 2.00pm	MH 10 – 12 SJ 12 – 2 7 people
Monday 1 June 2009	Gentleshaw Village Hall, Buds Road	4.00pm to 7.00pm	SJ/AL 15 people
Tuesday 2 June 2009	Trinity Methodist Church, Poplar Street Norton Canes	10.00am to 1.00pm	CE/AL 8 people

Date	Venue	Time	Officer in Attendance and Attendance numbers (approx)
Tuesday 2 June 2009	Prospect Village Hall, Williamson Avenue	3.00pm to 6.00pm	SJ/CE 10 people
Wednesday 3 rd June 2009	Hednesford Library, Market Street	10.00 am, to 1.00 pm	CE 12 people
Wednesday 3 rd June	Cannock Chase High Young Chamber	11.00am to 12.00pm	SJ 10 students
Wednesday 3 rd June 2009	Cannock Leisure Centre	4.00pm to 7.00pm	MH/JH 14 people
Friday 5 th June 2009	Brereton Library, Talbot Road	3.00pm to 5.30pm	CE 1 person
Monday 8 th June	CVS	12pm – 4.00pm	JH, CE, AL and SJ. 14 people
Tuesday 9 th June	South Staffs Chamber	16.00	AL. 7 people
Tuesday 16 th June	LEEP group	9.30	CE 10 people
Tuesday 16 th June	Health and Wellbeing Group	2.00	CE 9 people
Wednesday 24 th June	LSP strategic board		Paper prepared – follow up to 13 May

Appendix 3 Young Chamber Consultation

Core Strategy Preferred Option Consultation 2009

Chase High School 03.06.09 11am-12pm

Sarah Jones was the officer in attendance for the consultation event and approximately 12 students were present (some of these students had taken part in the Issues and Options consultation in July 2008). Students were presented with a 15 minute presentation via a printed slide-show summary handout of the Core Strategy Preferred Strategic Spatial Options and proposed policy areas. The focus of the strategic spatial option was the Cannock, Hednesford and Heath Hayes area given the catchments of the school. The options were presented as a potential choice between building houses on land at Pye Green Road (Hednesford), around Heath Hayes and Wimblebury Green Belt (on the way to Burntwood) or some building of more flats/smaller homes within the urban area. Students were advised that they could choose between the options or suggest a combination of them.

The students were then asked to comment on any aspect of the plan, saying whether they agreed or disagreed and to explain why. The young people were provided with handouts of the summary and A3 printouts of the slides to attach Post-it notes with comments on.

A summary of the comments is provide below by the overall approach and proposed policy areas:

1. What you've already told us- 1 student commented "I think all of these are good" and another stated "I agree with the first bullet point because I have to go to Birmingham and Wolverhampton to go to TK Maxx and the cinema. It would be nice if we could walk into Cannock to go and watch a film and buy clothes." No other comments were received on this area. The comments provided below appear to reinforce that the interpretation of the student's previous feedback was appropriate.

2. Overall Spatial Strategy- There were some students who felt that Cannock was already too overcrowded and that development should be spread to other areas such as Rugeley and Heath Hayes instead. Comments included:

- "How this is shared its obvious that the Council just want to develop Cannock and Hednesford area without losing public popularity."
- "I think they should put more houses into Heath Hayes and Rugeley because Cannock is getting densely populated with people and houses."
- "I think they should spread more houses into Rugeley. Less in Cannock, Hednesford and Heath Hayes. I think this because Cannock is densely populated."

There were also some broader concerns were students felt that the overall level of housing proposed was too much and questioned whether it was actually need. Comments included:

- "I don't think we'll need that many dwellings unless the population is actually increasing."

- "There are a lot of houses being built around by my house (Huntington)¹ and no one is buying the houses so they are just sitting there also they are taking so long to build them."
- "There are too many houses being built."

3. What will happen in Cannock, Hednesford and Heath Hayes? – In general terms there was more support for the site west of Pye Green Road than that at Heath Hayes, with students commenting that they felt the Green Belt area should be protected. There was some support for building more in the urban areas, with the provision of flats evoking mixed responses (reflected in Providing for Housing Choice responses). Comments included:

- "That many houses are most likely not needed. I believe that building should continue in Bridgtown which is quite ugly as it is so it won't really make a difference."
- "It would be better to build them on the land near Hednesford rather than on the way to Burntwood."
- "I think you should build the houses on Heath Hayes land as in Hednesford I reckon there is too many houses."
- "I think that the houses just in one of the areas is a good idea but not the flats because there is too many now."
- "I think that it is ok to build some houses but I also think that there should be some green area for people to go to for walks and take their dogs for a walk."
- "I don't think you should build houses on Green Belt because it uses up habitats for animals."
- "Build on little bits of land instead of big places."
- "The areas of new employment and building are good choices away from the houses and in a more industrial area rather than where people live."
- "Keeping the green land and as much of the Chase is important to the local economy and people of Cannock area."

4. Provide for Housing Choice- Comments under this section reflected some of those made in response to the overall targets and approach. There was overall support for building 'attractive' houses although the views on flats were mixed. Some students expressed concerns regarding the provision of land for gypsies and travellers, which suggest more consultation and awareness-raising may need to be undertaken in order to overcome perceptual barriers. These concerns were focused upon the need to ensure that land used for gypsies and travellers was well cared for, during and after its use by the communities and Council. Comments included:

- "There does not need to be that many houses but if they were nice houses I think people would be more happy about the idea".
- "The new houses should look nice as if they look bad no-one would move in."
- "I think that houses that are being refurbished or set for demolition they are taking too long and make streets look dirty."
- "I don't think there are enough facilities for elders and young children."
- "I agree with the policies on this page because even though you're building houses you're looking after the environment as well."
- "I don't think there are enough cheap flats for pupils to start their first home."

¹ Not in Cannock Chase District (South Staffordshire)

- "I think that there should be flats around the town because they take up less space."
- "I don't think that flats are a good idea because flats always look horrible and unattractive."
- "Build houses in a city or something like a restriction on how many people live here."

5. Encourage sustainable transport infrastructure- There was one comment supporting this policy:

- "A better local transport system would be great".

6. Create attractive town centres- There was overall support again for increasing what was on offer in Cannock town centre. Comments included:

- "I think that making the town centre attractive is good."
- "There are a lot of talks on the A34 about demolishing and new cinemas being built but nothing has happened. It's one of Cannock's main roads and it looks horrible."
- "Too many pubs, charity shops and banks in the town centre not enough decent shops."
- "Cannock Cinema has been closed down too long and Cannock's getting boring without it!"

7. Provide well managed and appreciated environments- There was overall support for protecting the environment and concern that future development might have a negative impact upon it. There were also some concerns that pollution was not being tackled appropriately. Comments included:

- "I think the Council are sort of right at the moment but I do not want them to ruin or waste the environment/nature".
- "Protect Pye Green Valley. If not protected make it Green Belt."
- "Get more activities up the Chase."
- "Don't build on the Green Belt."
- "I don't think that the pollution policy is working because I haven't seen any moves to improve pollution around Cannock."
- "Some of the policies are very good and that people care for the world but building more factory and things it is going to cause more pollution."

Summary

There was overall support for the environmental policies and the approach to protect these areas as much as possible. There was also support for increasing the offer of shops and entertainment facilities in the town centre. However, there was overall concern that the amount of development wasn't necessarily needed and that Cannock was already densely developed. Some of the students felt that development should be located elsewhere in Rugeley for example. Out of the options for Cannock the general support for protecting the Green Belt and specific comments suggest more favour for developing the Pye Green site, although this is not conclusive. There were concerns amongst some students regarding the provision of land for gypsies and travellers and this suggests that further work will need to be undertaken in order to address some of the stereotyping and other perceptual barriers to such communities living in the District.

Core Strategy Preferred Option Consultation 2009

Fair Oak High School 18.05.09 1.15pm-2pm

Sarah Jones was the officer in attendance for the consultation event and approximately 10 students were present. Students were presented with a 15 minute presentation via a printed slide-show summary handout of the Core Strategy Preferred Strategic Spatial Options and proposed policy areas. The focus of the strategic spatial option was the Rugeley and Brereton area given the catchments of the school. The students were then asked to comment on any aspect of the plan, saying whether they agreed or disagreed and to explain why. Following the discussion a series of key themes emerged, focusing upon the lack of shopping offer at Rugeley; the lack of employment locally for some of the young people; the cost of travelling to other towns, such as Stafford and access to entertainment facilities not provided in Rugeley or Cannock e.g. a cinema.

Following the discussion with the students, Claire Nurse (Assistant Head teacher) recommended that the students take the opportunity to consider more fully the policies and proposals and then provide feedback through their Citizenship classes. The focus of the consultation was upon three key policy areas that the students would most likely have views upon, based upon the initial discussion outlined above. Students were provided with a copy of the following comments sheet and a summary of the student's comments is provided below. Approximately 200 sheets were returned from students aged 11-15.

Aim	Describe the current problems with transport, local facilities, leisure centre and the town centre in your local area	What would you do to improve the transport, local facilities, leisure centre and town centre in your area?
Sustainable Local Transport Network- to make sure that local transport is good quality and that people have a choice of how they travel e.g. by car or train or walking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Some students felt that the transport in the area was good -Buses and trains untidy and scruffy -Prices need to be cheaper -Not enough crossing paths for walkers -Buses are not regular enough and not enough buses after 4pm -Buses are late -Not enough bus stops -Buses don't do a return to Stafford -Lots of traffic and congestion, especially around the Globe Island -Rugeley bus station in poor condition and toilets dirty -Not enough car lanes causing congestion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Renovate buses and bus shelters -Lower travel costs -Quicker and more regular train routes -More regular buses -More funding for public transport -Bigger taxi rank -More car lanes -People should walk more -Bus timetable information available and electronic systems showing if buses are late -Eco friendly buses -More cleaning of buses -More room for cycling -Safer buses e.g. seat belts

Aim	Describe the current problems with transport, local facilities, leisure centre and the town centre in your local area	What would you do to improve the transport, local facilities, leisure centre and town centre in your area?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Air pollution -Taxi's not always there when needed -The new road (bypass) bypasses the town -Poor road condition -Need other things like trams or metro -Too many cars on the road make riding bike dangerous -No seat belts on buses 	
<p>Access to local facilities- to make sure that people have access to local facilities like leisure centres and shops.</p> <p>Healthy Living- to make sure that there are enough Doctor's surgeries in the District and enough leisure centres to use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Some students felt that the facilities in the area were good -Not much choice apart from the swimming pool -Good facilities like youth club but not enough -Leisure centre too busy- lots of queues -No popular shops -Small GPs that are always busy -Not enough doctors surgeries or chemists -Toilets in poor condition -Parks vandalised or damaged not very good for playing on -People don't stick to the rules at some facilities -Hard to travel to some of the places/facilities e.g. Alton Towers, Derby or Burton -Not enough sports promotion -No hospitals nearby -Leisure centre timetables change too much -Age limits at leisure centre -Too expensive after school clubs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Need different activities for teens e.g. bowling alley and cinema games club -Less crime in parks -More up to date shops -More toilets that are cleaner -Improve the astro turf at leisure centre -Advertise the facilities and sports activities more -Extend the leisure centre/another leisure centre/more activities e.g. tennis, dancing -Bigger lockers and changing rooms at leisure centre -CCTV in parks and safer -More signs to remind people about litter/more bins
<p>Town centres- to make sure our town centres have a good source of shops and services to attract customers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Not many shops on offer -Scruffy facilities -Too much litter and graffiti -Too many charity shops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -More and better shops, especially clothes shops e.g. HMV, TK Maxx, Topshop, Primark and more boys clothes

Aim	Describe the current problems with transport, local facilities, leisure centre and the town centre in your local area	What would you do to improve the transport, local facilities, leisure centre and town centre in your area?
To make sure the design of our town centres is good quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Too many food takeaways and banks -Its boring -Credit crunch on shops making them close -No under-18 clubs -Drinking and fighting in town centre and drug use -Not enough clothes shops -Not enough high profile jobs -Hole/ditch in town centre (water feature) -Not many people have heard of Rugeley- its not known for anything and not many people visit it -Not many things to do as a family in the town 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shops -Renovate benches and other street furniture e.g. bins -Cleaner parks -Litter removal -Less takeaways -More CCTV -Put the pubs outside of town -When a shop closes replace it with another shop -Speed up water feature -Add some restaurants -Have other facilities like a bowling alley or cinema -Get rid of the power station and put wind farms in instead -Curfews in town centre -More police in town

Summary

From the comments above it was clear that the students felt that there were some positives in terms of local transport and access to local facilities such as the train connections and the leisure centre. However, it is also apparent that the students have particular concerns about the condition of the town centre and feel that it could be a place that they would use more if it offered a greater variety of shops and a more pleasant shopping experience. High amongst the students main general concerns were poor environmental quality e.g. litter and air pollution; the cost of public transport; the unreliability of public transport; the busy nature of the leisure centre; lack of choice in facilities and town centre shops. Some of the recommendations put forward by the students are to be covered by emerging planning policy i.e. the aspiration to provide more regular public transport connections and encouraging walking; the desire to retain and improve the retail offer in Rugeley, reducing non-retail uses such as takeaways; and the use of developer contributions to help provide a more attractive environment e.g. providing benches and nicer open spaces as part of new developments. Some of the other suggestions such as increased policing could also be explored.