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Introduction and Overview

The Design SPD (informed by the Characterisation Study) will be a key guidance document making up part of the Local Development Framework and supporting Core Strategy policies in particular. It will guide the nature of new developments in the District, promoting high quality design that reflects, enhances or adds to the best of the local character. As part of this process a Local List of Buildings and Structures of Local Architectural or Historic Importance is also being compiled to support design policies.

The purpose of the pre-draft consultation was to front load the process, obtaining early views from key stakeholders on work done to date and its progression. In order to make the process manageable the consultation was separated into two phases. It was also considered that a public consultation post-Christmas period would yield more results. The first phase ran from 15th November-22nd December 2010 and sought views from developers, local architects, statutory agencies and local Parish Councils. The second phase ran from 20th January-17th February (although the deadline for the photo competition was extended until the 28th February) and sought to engage the wider public. The consultation strategy along with lists of consultees contacted is available at Annex 1.

In summary 10 organisations responded to the first phase of the consultation. As part of the second phase 16 people attended the local residents workshops; approximately 67 young people attended the local schools workshops; and 19 questionnaire responses (and 3 photo competition entries) were received. This report summarises the methods of consultation employed and the results of each stage. Key conclusions on the feedback are then identified followed by a reflection upon the consultation process and next steps for the Design SPD.

Overall, the work to date and suggested scope of the Design SPD was well supported. The consultation has provided useful feedback on a number of local areas and the future contents of the SPD.
Consultation Strategy

As set out in Annex 1 a variety of consultation methods were employed to raise awareness and engage a diverse range of stakeholders, as per the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (2006). This section elaborates on some of the key methods employed.

Phase 1
For this phase of the consultation the Council's Local Development Framework database was utilised to identify key relevant stakeholders to be targeted, having regard to statutory consultees (see Annex 1). 284 consultees were contacted via letter within which an offer of attending a timetabled general presentation/question and answer session (8th December) was made as well as offers to host individual meetings or presentations for interested parties. All of the Members were consulted via letter with a similar offer for presentations. Two presentations were held to Members (1st December- 3 attendees) and other stakeholders (8th December- 6 attendees), including development management officers and local architects.

A summary leaflet of the key findings to date and suggested next steps for the Design SPD was produced. This was accompanied by a Technical Appendix, consisting of the detailed methodology employed for the 'Characterisation Study' to support the SPD. This enabled those with a greater interest and/or expertise to consider further information if they desired. The summary leaflet was aimed at a wider audience who may not have been as interested in the technical information.

Phase 2
For this phase of the consultation the Council's Local Development Framework database was utilised to identify key relevant stakeholders to be targeted, namely local community and resident groups (see Annex 1). 39 consultees were contacted via letter. All of the local schools were contacted individually via email. All of the Members were also re-consulted via letter. Local community groups and Members were asked to distribute the information to residents where possible to raise awareness. To enable a wide range of different people to participate in the consultation a number of methods of response were made available (as set out in Annex 1). This included the opportunity to send in detailed comments; respond via a questionnaire; participate in a local focus group; and submit entries to the photo competition. The competition asked people to send in pictures of their favourite places, buildings and landmarks across the District with a prize of a camera for over 16s and a canvas print of the winning entry for under16s (promoted via local schools).

Posters were displayed in the Council's offices and libraries as well as copies being provided to all of the consultees for them to also promote the consultation locally. The consultation and photo competition were also advertised on the Council's website homepage and via the Council's Twitter account.

To ensure wider coverage, the consultation and photo competition was run in tandem with the local Cannock Chronicle newspaper- a free paper that had the widest circulation in the District. Articles promoting the consultation and photo competition were posted on the 13th January and 10th February, with a summary article on the 3rd March.

For the focus groups all of the consultees contacted were offered the opportunity for further information via a presentation or discussion with planning officers. Contacts with existing 'resident champion' groups and community networks were utilised to arrange 3 adult focus groups across the District-Etching Hill and Western Springs; Blake Residents Champions; and Norton Canes. Other offers were
made to groups in the area but unfortunately they were not taken up. The format of the focus group workshops is provided at Annex 2.

In order to arrange young people’s focus groups offers were again made to a selection of schools across the District aiming for equal coverage of the main urban and rural areas. Three schools decided to participate in the workshops including Fair Oak College; Redbrook Hayes Primary School; and St Mary’s Primary School. The format of the focus group workshops is provided at Annex 2.

As in Phase 1 of the consultation the summary leaflet of the key findings to date and suggested next steps for the Design SPD and the Technical Appendix, consisting of the detailed methodology employed for the ‘Characterisation Study’ to support the SPD, were also made available at this stage for more detailed comments. This enabled those with a greater interest and/or expertise to consider further information if they desired. The questionnaires and workshop events were designed in a way that didn’t require participants to read the full technical material available. The different methods and documents were designed to enable people with different levels of understanding and interest in the topic to engage with the consultation. Regardless of the method used by respondents the results could all be interpreted to contribute in the same way i.e. the ‘simplified’ questionnaire results could be used to update the character area information just as readily as the more detailed respondent comments (see Annexes 4-6).
Summary of Consultation

Phase 1
In total 10 organisations responded to the consultation. The full comments and officer responses are available at Annex 3. Overall the work completed to date was well supported with suggestions for specific changes to character areas and additional information being highlighted to utilise in the characterisation being made.

The Members presentation was attended by 3 Councillors. Overall the Councillors were supportive of the work and concept and expressed particular interest in raising the profile of local areas and buildings (including protection of these). There were discussions around how some modern developments didn't always fit into surrounding areas and the impact of economic viability issues upon the quality of design. The developers and other stakeholders workshop was attended by 6 people. Key points raised included that the space around buildings was just as important as the building itself; local lists shouldn't be used prohibitively; master planning guidance would be useful; and use best/good practice examples from the District to demonstrate key principles in the SPD.

Phase 2
In total 19 questionnaire responses were received. Graphs 1-9 below summarise the responses and comments submitted are noted in Table 1. Given the number of responses received analysis has been conducted on a District wide basis rather than by localities. However, responses by area will be considered in revised versions of the Character Area Profiles, particularly the comments received (as set in Table 1- see Annexes 4-6). Overall historic buildings and green spaces were the most popular features of people's local areas whilst new buildings, lack of availability of local services and transport links where the least. To improve the design of their areas most people favoured more trees and greenery and new development that reflected the character of the area. The least popular option was replacing older properties with modern designs followed by including pavements on all roads.

In terms of the town centres, people liked the historic buildings the most and the new buildings the least.

In terms of the design of new dwellings, all of the options rated highly with the inclusion of adequate green space and landscaping being the most popular marginally. However, when asked if they would be prepared to pay more for these features responses suggest that overall people were happy to pay more but less so in the case of green spaces and play areas (despite these being high priorities). Perhaps this is indicative of people expecting such features to come as part of a new development, and not be an additional ‘luxury’.

In terms of the design of different types of properties there was a preference for houses to be ‘traditional’ in style or represent a mixture between traditional and modern. There was a slightly greater appetite for new business or office developments to be modern or a mixture of styles whilst public buildings and schools were considered to be more suitable for modern designs (although a mixture of new and traditional was still the most popular option).
Graph 1. What do you like most and least about the character and appearance of where you live in the District?

Graph 2. What would you like to see to improve the design and appearance of your area?
Graph 3. What do you like least and most about your nearest town centre?

Graph 4. What do you consider to be the most important features to include in the design of new dwellings?

Graph 5. Would you be prepared to pay more for these features?
Graphs 6-9. Do you prefer modern or traditional designs for new homes, new business and offices; new schools and new public buildings e.g. libraries?
Character Area | Comment
--- | ---
Cannock Town Centre and Historic Suburbs | I would like a better play area for the children
Better quality shop fronts
More trees, flower arrangements and greenery in the public spaces
Selection of shops much the same as the other local town centres
Thanks to planning department all the interesting buildings have gone
Appearance is not all about buildings and trees- people drinking alcohol in the town centre is not good
Avon Road cuts the town centre in half
Pavements in state of disrepair
Was a pretty place in the 1960s and 70s but now resembles a third world locality- is dreadful.
To improve area should start again
Wouldn't like to see the Prince of Wales or Leisure Centre close down
We have some older buildings making it more historic and a pleasure on the eyes
Less concrete balls
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Area</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazelslade and Rawnsley</td>
<td>Rawnsley and Hazelslade are isolated from the mainstream and the residents do value this on the whole. Walls fronting the terraced housing in Rawnsley Road are in a poor condition. The iron railings that capped them were ripped off at the beginning of World War 2 and they have been deteriorating ever since. Representations made regarding the importance of a piece of land that separates Rawnsley from Hazelslade (see full letter submitted by the Community Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagley</td>
<td>The old style buildings will make Rugeley look very nice and traditional which I like so if we have modern buildings put them on the outskirts. Somewhere with an orchard to make it look pretty and somewhere with a place for the animals at the park. Leisure centre is a lovely building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hednesford Town Centre and Historic Suburbs</td>
<td>Have a local railway and bus station in the town with easy access to the surrounding Hednesford Hills where the beauty of Hednesford Hills can be admired. Would like more trees and greenery in the public spaces. Hednesford town centre is in a state of transition. I hope that this process does not degenerate into a state of terminal decline. The quality of the property frontages has deteriorated. The changes to the post office, the “New Club” (Cardigan Place) and the pet shop opposite have done little to promote the town as the place it once was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cannock</td>
<td>All amenities are very near to where I live. People help one another out. Designs keeping in with their surroundings is very important. Take into account the Chase and the wildlife that’s in the area and also the outlook that the existing properties have in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Canes</td>
<td>We have Chasewater on the doorstep and we have Cannock Chase a short drive away. We also have good food shopping places local. Destruction of historic and character-full buildings. Isolation from surrounding areas and lack of facilities. Residential roads make more attractive- add trees and improve street furniture. Norton Canes does not receive due care and attention from the Council- saddled with all the commercial areas and extra housing for whole district without the facilities to support them. Futuristic buildings here would be a no-no. The area used to associated with coal mining and a stop over for pilgrims on their way to St Chads in Lichfield. Surrounded by a ‘natural’ boundary of A5, Lichfield Road, and Kingswood Lakes. The topography does not lend itself to high rise developments. This helps to retain a ‘self-supporting’ atmosphere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlying Rural Areas</td>
<td>Visual beauty, wildlife and peace of the Chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pye Green Valley</td>
<td>Beautiful surrounding Cannock Chase where you can take the family for picnics, walks and cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugeley Town Centre and Historic Suburbs</td>
<td>Good service and friendly and knowledgeable staff in the independent shops. Help the small shops, through leaflets targeted at visitors. Improve public owned areas, especially the covered market. Mix the old with the new to please a lot of people—include the younger and older generations. Better quality shops. More greenery and cleaner parks—more planted areas e.g. fruit, veg, flowers. More places to sit and relax. Quiet town with good access by all transport—easy access to all parts. Flat/plenty of walking space—car parking charges are off putting to some visitors—too expensive. Local shops/traders would do better if they were reduced/removed. More small, individual shops—less none descript chain stores. Access is ok—not of the best quality. Train stations aren't great access to the town. Other areas walk straight into the shopping centres or green spaces e.g. Stafford, Walsall. Have more of a feature of the actual centre. Revamp the large brick planters with something that’s more attractive. Keep all the old style buildings. Have 2 rail stations (one of the smallest towns in the country to have 2), a lovely canal with lots of boaters passing through—they should be encouraged to stay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Rugeley</td>
<td>Undiscovered area of countryside with easy access to rural parts – canal, Chase, fields. Near to Cannock Chase—nice quiet lanes to the east, ideal for cycling. Well used canal—we should make more of it. No more spread of housing—Levett Grange should be the last development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Please no more blue buildings. Don’t let the Council do so called improvements or build properties. I like both types of structures, traditional, but also I am aware that buildings have to move forward. More traditional designs are better and consulting the people in the area is extremely important. Housing styles should fit in with what’s already in the area. Usually town centres have materialised resulting from local activities over previous years. Whilst some areas of modification do take place not a lot can be done. Not a lot that can be done to revitalise Cannock Chase without completely devastating what has been left of previous results from activities of time e.g. Castle Ring, Cannock Chase etc. Designing out crime—Welcome safety locks but concerned about excessive lighting, especially on the Chase. Small tasteful buildings are preferable to big, non-descript modern (if any of these are built it would need to be out of sight—not near other house/older buildings, towering over them). Don’t build glass things like on the Towers Business Park. Ramada hotel shouldn’t be in the same box as Rugeley Leisure Centre—leisure centre is a lovely building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Summary of Phase 2 Questionnaire Responses*
In total 15 photos from 3 entries to the photography competition were received. These mainly covered the Cannock Chase AONB area. The winning entry and description is set out below.

**Birches Valley**

The wind is blowing through the trees,
Soft swaying branches and gentle leaves,
Nature is around us, we are side by side,
When life gets busy we can come here and hide.

It's fun to Go Ape or to mountain bike,
Take the children to its park, even just to hike,
There is something to do for whoever you are
Whether you're local or come from afar

Our wildlife is important and this is their home
Where birds make their nests and pretty deer roam,
Take a breath of fresh air, feel this great open space,
This is the beauty of our Cannock Chase.

The adult focus groups were attended by a total of 16 people and detailed summaries from each group are provided at Annex 2. Draft versions of these summaries were forwarded to the groups to confirm their accuracy. Overall, the focus groups reinforced the initial background work completed by officers and served to highlight additional issues based upon the resident’s local knowledge i.e. key buildings or areas with local importance not picked up by the background work were identified. Below are brief summaries from each group.

**Etching Hill and Springfield’s Community Network Focus Group** - reinforced importance of ‘The Chase’ and open countryside to the local identity. Etching Hill highlighted as key feature but enhancements to it were needed. Potential of the canal as a key feature was highlighted and it was felt this theme could be brought through into the town centre. The group expressed concerns about ‘saturation’ of high density developments in the area.

**Blake Residents Champions Focus Group** - reinforced importance of green open spaces within the area and its overall semi-rural identity. Importance of people keeping garden hedges to contribute to this was raised. Littleton Green Primary School highlighted as a positive example of a modern-style development. It was felt that recent housing developments in the area had no individual character or variety in design- they didn’t fit in with the surrounds. Preference for modernising existing, traditional properties and for modern designs where they were ‘standalone’ schemes. Importance of homes being built that are suitable for elderly people and have a minimum, decent sized room.

**Norton Canes Focus Group** – highlighted importance of key features including the Millennium Garden and library which are a focus for the village. Need for improvements in the local centre and parks. General preference for traditional style, 2 storey developments, with some scope for modern buildings...
e.g. the library was viewed positively. Referred to legacy of the area’s mining history and how this could be utilised e.g. improving old railway lines for walkways.

The young person’s focus groups were attended by approximately 67 students and detailed summaries are provided at Annex 2. Overall, the focus groups were largely positive about their respective areas with common messages being that improvements were needed to local shops, town centres and parks as well as young people’s entertainment facilities. Below are brief summaries from each group.

**St Mary’s Primary School**- In terms of the design of buildings the least popular was the modern, contemporary style housing- comments included that the mixture of colours didn’t work and that it wasn’t ‘symmetrical’. Also, the litter around the shared grassed areas was mentioned. Most popular was the new, but traditional style housing- mainly because students liked the gardens and cleanliness as well as the mixture of colours. Analysis of the local features that mattered the most to the young people showed that St Mary’s School; ASDA (Cannock) and Cannock town centre were all mentioned the most and largely positively. There were suggestions for improvements to the public realm and type of shops within the town centre. Local shops; local parks and the Cannock leisure centre were the next most referred to features and largely positively. There were suggestions for improvements to the quality of all of these features. Overall there was an emphasis more upon the local parks and leisure facilities than the importance of the Chase (compared to Rugeley/Brereton- see below). Some students commented that they wanted bigger rooms and gardens for their homes. There was an emphasis upon cleanliness and clearing litter from places.

**Fair Oak College**- In terms of design there was a preference for new but traditional style properties and modern buildings that ‘fitted in’. All groups referred to Elmore Park positively and suggested some improvements. All groups referred to the leisure centre positively and the desire for a cinebowl/MacDonalds i.e. more entertainment facilities nearby. Overall, key features highlighted were the town centre and modern community facilities e.g. the Redbrook School and NHS centre. For the town centre the groups referred to a mixture of traditional and modern designs being desirable.

**Redbrook Hayes Primary School**- In terms of the design of buildings the least popular was the traditional cottage- mainly because students felt it looked ‘unsafe’ and ‘dirty.’ Most popular was the new but traditional style housing- mainly because students liked the different colours and the gardens. Analysis of the local features that mattered the most to the young people showed that The Chase/nearby woods; the leisure centre; Redbrook School and the local park (Brereton) were all mentioned the most and largely positively- although improvements were suggested to the local park. The Rugeley Power Station was the next most referred to feature, however this was negatively. Rugeley town centre was the next most referred to feature, with mixed views. Views were largely positive but with room for improvements, particularly in terms of the shops available. Overall preference for adding more greenery and trees and responses reinforced importance of local community assets/services.
Key conclusions and Next Steps

- Overall the draft work was largely supported by a range of different stakeholders. Useful suggestions for alterations to some of the characterisation work and descriptions for different parts of the District have been made. Useful comments on the scope of the SPD have also been provided. The importance of retaining the green character of the District was a key common theme.

- Overall, there appears to be a preference amongst local residents for a mixture of modern and traditional designs (particularly for housing) but new developments need to ‘fit in’ to their surrounds. This highlights the importance of consulting local communities in the design of new developments. For example, the groups highlighted positive examples of modern developments such as the Rugeley Leisure Centre and Littleton Green Primary School as well as less popular examples such as the Ramada Hotel. However, the differences observed between opinions towards designs between Cannock and Rugeley students also highlights the importance of considering how a building is used and performs internally e.g. students from Cannock were more positive about the Hednesford Lightworks due to their experiences in it whilst the same applied in relation to Rugeley students response to local modern housing.

- The consultation responses will now be utilised to amend the Characterisation Study and Character Area descriptions (see Annex 4).

- Full draft-SPD will be produced, informed by the findings of the consultation i.e. what key features of design people prioritise the most (see Annex 5).

- A ‘local list’ will continue to be prepared informed by the consultation responses and additional research (see Annex 6).

Reflection

The focus groups provided a quality source of initial feedback and this can be built upon in the next stage of the consultation. Feedback was obtained from each of the District’s main urban areas i.e. Cannock/Hednesford/Heath Hayes, Rugeley and Brereton and Norton Canes. Further information could be obtained from the rural areas in the next stages of the consultation. The photography competition publicity could have perhaps been improved by better poster displays in prominent locations, wider press coverage and the stronger sign up of local schools. However, in light of the resources available for this consultation is it considered that the best possible outcome was achieved. As part of the next stage of the consultation the Council could still encourage people to submit photos and make suggestions for changes to the local area analysis.
Annex 1 Consultation Strategy (including lists of consultees)

Undertake consultation in two phases:

1) Consult ‘professionals’, statutory bodies etc pre-Christmas
2) Consult wider public post-Christmas- complete by end February 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Complete by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finish consultation leaflet and technical appendix for consultation</td>
<td>5th November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do mail shoot to selected parties</td>
<td>12th November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Phase 1 consultation</td>
<td>15th November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Members presentation</td>
<td>1st December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Other stakeholders presentation</td>
<td>8th December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Phase 1 consultation</td>
<td>22nd December (approx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise Phase 2 consultation events including newspaper led photo</td>
<td>Pre- Christmas and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competition, hard to reach group events, public ‘focus group’ events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do mail/email shoot to selected parties</td>
<td>17-18th January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Phase 2 consultation and launch photo competition</td>
<td>20th January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop events</td>
<td>January-February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Phase 2 consultation</td>
<td>17th February (extended to 28th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of consultation and success/next stages in Chase Matters</td>
<td>March-April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 1 consultation plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stakeholders</th>
<th>Key Methods of Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of Parish Councils and Members</td>
<td>- Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Summary Leaflet and Technical Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bespoke presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups/Local organisations e.g. Landor Society</td>
<td>- Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Summary Leaflet and Technical Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bespoke presentation and offer of individual presentation and further contact if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional architects/agents</td>
<td>- Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Summary Leaflet and Technical Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bespoke presentation and offer of individual presentation and further contact if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners/developers</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bespoke presentation and offer of individual presentation and further contact if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/regional agencies e.g. English Heritage</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bespoke presentation and offer of individual presentation and further contact if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannock Chase Council/Staffordshire County Council Officers e.g. Development Services/Control Teams, Building Control</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bespoke presentation and offer of individual presentation and further contact if required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2 consultation plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stakeholders</th>
<th>Key Methods of Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of public</td>
<td>Letter and emails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer of individual presentation/focus group event and further contact if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire, Summary Leaflet and Technical Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photograph competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus groups events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posters at Rugeley/Cannock council offices and all libraries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hard to reach groups- elderly, young people, disabled persons, ethnic minorities, people with learning difficulties, those with long term limiting illnesses**

- Photograph competition, questionnaire and focus group events provide differentiation for different levels of capability and preferred ways of engaging

- Focus group events- liaising with local schools and offering focus group/presentation events to 'hard to reach group' representatives on the Council's LDF database via letters to consultees

**List of Consultees**

**Phase 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Genway</td>
<td>Ancer Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Walker</td>
<td>Atis Real Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Painter</td>
<td>Eddisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Miles</td>
<td>Montagu Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen Property Investors</td>
<td>Aberdeen Property Investors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Acres</td>
<td>Redrow Homes (Midlands) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Murray Planning Consultant</td>
<td>Owners of land at Bower Lane, Rugeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Ames</td>
<td>Chase Tenants &amp; Residents Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Ames</td>
<td>Rumer Hill Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Anderson</td>
<td>Armstrong Burton Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Archer Castle Homes (Developments) Ltd
D. M. Arm Cannock Wood Parish Council
Richard Austen Environment Agency (Midlands Central Area)
Stephen Austin Network Rail Ltd
N. Ballett George Wimpey Midland Ltd
Perminde Balu SUSTRANS
R. E. Barratt Hazel Slade & Rawnsley Community Association
Matthew Bartlett Denstone Architectural Design
Caroline Bedell Country Land and Business Association
Ursula Bennion South Staffordshire Housing Association
R. J. Best Miller Homes Strategic Land
Simon Boardman-Weston W. Boardman –Weston Grandchildren's Trust
Andrew Bowe CB Richard Ellis Ltd
J Bowen Walton Homes
Diane Bowyer DPDS Consulting Group
Donna Bradley Hednesford Community Conservation Group
J. S. Bridgen c/o Mr C Timothy C T Planning
V. Brooks Church Commissioners Property Investment Department
Gillian Bullimore Severn Trent Water
Gerard Burgess London Midland
Rachael Bust Coal Authority
P. Campbell Richborough Estates
M. A. Campbell Rugeley Town Council
James Causer Staffordshire Industrial Archaeology Society
John Clarke Howkins & Harrison
Diane Clarke Network Rail (Town Planning Team LNW)
Spencer Claye JJ Gallagher Ltd
Chris Clifford CBI West Midlands
Ray Colbourne Government Office for the West Midlands
Steve Colella South Staffordshire Water
J. B. Coleman William Davis Ltd.
Colley J. Colley and Sons
P. Collings South Staffordshire District Council
S. Cooper Cannock & District Neighbourhood Watch Association
J. Cooper Norton Canes Parish Council
Neil Cox Lichfield District Council
Lesley Dalby Midland Heart Housing Association
Peter Davies Brereton and Ravenhill Heritage Committee
P. G. Davies Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council
Charlotte Davies Lidl UK GmbH
D. Davis West Midlands Estates
Alice de la Rue Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
A. De Pol De Pol Associates Ltd
Michelle Duffy Pegasus Planning Group LLP
Sidney Dukes Mill Green Action Group
M. Dunton Tesco Stores plc.
G. Dymick Friel Homes
Simon Eddleston Central Networks
J. Ellis c/o Mr C Timothy C T Planning
Chris Ellis Anchor Trust
Julia Ellis
MADE (Midlands Architecture and the Designed Environment)
c/o Mrs Philippa Kreuser, CT Planning

Vivien Evans
Chase Parish Councils' Area Committee

R. Evans
Pritchard Holdings Plc

Rosalind Eyre
National Grid

John Fairlie
Engena Limited

S. P. Faizey
SP Faizey Chartered Architects

Graham Fergus
First City Limited

K. Fitch
Cannock Chase Rail Promotion Group

David FitzGerald
FitzGerald Associates

Steve Forest
West Midlands Regional Housing Board

G. Forster
Robert Turley Associates

Rose Freeman
The Theatres Trust

Karl Fryer
Staffordshire Police

Andrew Galloway
Radleigh Homes

D. Garner
Rugeley Open Spaces Association

B. Godson
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Annex 2 Workshop Formats and feedback

Workshop Formats

Young People’s Workshop (Primary Schools)

Intro and Photo warm up – SPOT THE DIFFERENCE GAME (approx 15mins)

- Explain what planning department does and why we’re here today
- Show photos of different buildings/places and give examples of words used to describe them, including how the place might ‘feel’ e.g. busy, quiet, relaxed.
- Ask them to spot the difference between photos of the different places - get group feedback and reinforce differences between places and buildings. Ask how their local area is different from the photos.

Photo review (approx 15mins)

- Tick which building designs they like and try to explain why.
- Class vote on preferences and short discussion on why.

Your area (approx 20-30mins)

- Summary of work done via map exercise. Draw a ‘memory map’ - think of the routes/areas you use most - what are the buildings and places that stand out and why e.g. local park, buildings they like, buildings they use most. Now think what you would like to add to this area (or take away), if anything e.g. some different buildings, some more trees, some more green spaces? What would the buildings look like if you could design them e.g. traditional or modern?

Photo Competition Info

- Inform class of details

Young People’s Workshop (Secondary Schools)

Photo warm up and review – (approx 15-20mins)

- Explain what planning department does and why we’re here today
- Show photos of different buildings/places and give examples of words used to describe them, including how the place might ‘feel’ e.g. busy, quiet, relaxed.
- Say which designs they like and try to explain why.

Your area (approx 20mins)

- Using maps and photos of the local area (including historical images and maps) encourage students to consider how their area has changed over time and what they would like it to be like in the future. Think of the routes/areas you use most - what are the buildings and places that stand out and why e.g. local park, buildings they like, buildings they use most. Now think what you would like to add to this area (or take away), if anything e.g. some different buildings, some more trees, some more green spaces? What would the buildings look like if you could design them e.g. traditional or modern?
**Photo Competition Info and Questionnaire (approx 5-10 mins)**

- Outline photo competition details and give students summary questionnaire to complete (if time- in session)

**Adults Resident's Workshop**

*Introduction (10-15 mins)*

- Presentation on background to document and ways to get involved

*Your area (approx 20-30 mins)*

- Summary of character area description for the relevant places. Show historical maps and photos to demonstrate how place has changed and present day photos. Ask group to say what features/buildings/places they most value and what sorts of design they would like to see in future. Do they agree with the character area description points?

*Questionnaire (15 mins)*

- Complete questionnaire
Notes from group activities:
- Mixture of views on modern versus traditional although there was a clear preference for ‘new’, clean buildings. Some preference for glass designs e.g. Hednesford Lightworks was viewed positively, although this was influenced by how students felt it looked inside too.
- Cannock needs a landmark for people to visit
- Issue of buildings ‘fitting in’ and being ‘symmetrical’ came through naturally. Some students felt the modern, contemporary housing example was a bit too much.
- Cleanliness and tidiness came through strongly. Walls/fences on properties and how this influence the look of a place

Analysis of preferences for designs:

Least popular was the modern, contemporary style housing- comments included that the mixture of colours didn’t work and that it wasn’t ‘symmetrical’. Also, the litter around the shared grassed areas was mentioned.

Most popular was the new, but traditional style housing- mainly because students liked the gardens and cleanliness as well as the mixture of colours.

Analysis of Memory Maps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure centre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>New room for boxing; more attractions; better roof needed; make it up to date and swimming pool cleaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym Club- Birches Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Make shops bigger; more sports shops; lots of shops and nice; add more greenery; organise shops more- all over the place; more bins and get rid of litter; more decorative and less dirty; add a tourist attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannock town centre</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Make shops bigger; more sports shops; lots of shops and nice; add more greenery; organise shops more- all over the place; more bins and get rid of litter; more decorative and less dirty; add a tourist attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chase</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build some things for people to do; loads of shops for food; nice to have a walk; its fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice and welcoming; stop lots of cars coming in; have more plants, trees and flowers; nice structure; big field, very spacious and quiet; bigger playgrounds; have more colour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make roof like the design of a book and extend it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest/green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be cleaner and better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Marys Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s School; ASDA (Cannock) and Cannock town centre were all mentioned the most and largely positively. There were suggestions for improvements to the public realm and type of shops within the town centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASDA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it sells everything; clean and handy; make child and parent parking bays bigger; my nearest shop; redecorate it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal Griffin School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannock Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make bigger; clean up the gum and make the playground more child friendly; people should stick to age limits- too many teenagers; equipment for older children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local park/football field (including Wimblebury and Hednesford Parks)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put new equipment in; old but nice- new equipment; wish someone supervised it; Hednesford- Dirty, quite fun- no dogs allowed to make cleaner and have an age limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local shops</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make bigger; old but nice; needs to be made more modern; get rid of rubbish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make it a nicer building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Lourdes church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage/petrol station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It smells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrisons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great café</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco (Hawks Green)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different shops built in the side- needs more shops for kids; refurbish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more decoration on the back of it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sainsbury's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

St Mary’s School; ASDA (Cannock) and Cannock town centre were all mentioned the most and largely positively. There were suggestions for improvements to the public realm and type of shops within the town centre.

Local shops; local parks and the Cannock leisure centre were the next most referred to features and largely positively. There were suggestions for improvements to the quality of all of these features.

Overall there was an emphasis more upon the local parks and leisure facilities than the importance of the Chase (compared to Rugeley/Brereton- see below). Some students commented that they wanted bigger rooms and gardens for their homes. There was an emphasis upon cleanliness and clearing litter from places.
Notes from group activities:
- Issue of buildings not standing out too much and not always fitting in
- Mix of modern and traditional favoured
- Some preferred open gardens rather than walled/fenced areas
- Mentioned more leisure/children friendly uses being needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings Liked/Disliked</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Least popular- looks old and dated. Concerns over build quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Town Centre</td>
<td>More popular but issue of building 'not fitting in' was raised and discussed advantages/disadvantages of having a different building e.g. landmark but not necessarily attractive. Nice building but a bit too much for that street. Modern and appealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern housing</td>
<td>Less popular- felt design was 'mixed up' and colours were a little strange. The blue could be cream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern but traditional housing</td>
<td>More popular. Liked the mix of modern and traditional. They look symmetrical and brighten up the street- nice colours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Maps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features liked/to be enhanced in character areas</th>
<th>Occurrences (students worked together in 3 groups)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Towers Point highlighted as a positive landmark</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore Park- old but new. Like that its traditional but would change the area for animals. Green, nice flowers, somewhere to chill</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centre- modern and unique</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide cinema/cinebowl</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide MacDonald's</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Cottage (Sheep Fair)- old and authentic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbrook Hayes School- modern</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant more trees to make Rugeley more environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings made cleaner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock Tower in Rugeley town centre is nice as its traditional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelfgar looks like its falling apart</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the town traditional but have a modern shopping complex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern NHS Centre (Sandy Lane)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Coffee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want lots more shops and restaurants (high street brands) in town centre</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses- change to more modern buildings because they'll look clean and fresh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the schools more modern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make more market stalls in town because there's not many and they need to be more interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the Power Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like River Trent- because its green</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General points for SPD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of lights on buildings to make them more interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like modern colleges- glass and wood. Eco-friendly. Wide but not tall solar panels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for modern buildings- new. Glass and metal.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curves make buildings look warmer and more inviting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All groups referred to Elmore Park positively and suggested some improvements. All groups referred to the leisure centre positively and the desire for a cinebowl/MacDonalds i.e. more entertainment facilities nearby.

Overall, key features highlighted were the town centre and modern community facilities e.g. the Redbrook School and NHS centre. For the town centre the groups referred to a mixture of traditional and modern designs being desirable.
Redbrook Hayes Primary School (Yr 6 class- 29 students)
2nd February 10am-12pm

Notes from group activities:
- Mixture of views on modern versus traditional designs
- Liked mixture of colours in places
- Liked modern, contemporary flats at Brereton more than Cannock students- referred to the interior being modern and attractive
- More preference for the ‘modern traditional’ houses though
- Issues of cleanliness came through in discussions

Least popular was the traditional cottage- mainly because students felt it looked ‘unsafe’ and ‘dirty’
Most popular was the new but traditional style housing- mainly because students liked the different colours and the gardens.

Analysis of Memory Maps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern School (Redbrook Hayes)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The Green’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Needs goal nets; make it bigger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good leisure centre</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Let younger people in; its fine and cool; add more exercising; make it bigger; nice building and facilities; have another astro turf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chase/the woods</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lots of trees; dog walking; clean up litter; put in stuff for babies to do; nice pretty and nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nice old place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugeley Power Station</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Making clouds of gas; have tall trees to hide it; very polluting; knock it down; looks really big and ugly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park (Brereton)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Not enough attractions- needs animals, bike track; sports hall; very messy with litter everywhere; make pool deeper; clean up graffiti; more equipment for older children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrissons (town centre)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nice walk but bit dirty- keep it clean; needs more bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>It's old fashioned- make it more modern; knock it down; like its design but make top more modern; nice and clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugeley Town Centre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nice shops but graffiti lets it down- add more shops; nice atmosphere but too many closed shops-refurbish; redecorate abandoned buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Change to a park; change to houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway station</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Safer for children; a complete mess; make more modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors surgery at Sandy Lane</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Modern building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Add bike shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagley High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local shops (Co-op)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Redecorate; make bigger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The brook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Add a park to play there- its nice but a bit boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Farm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lots of noise from animals- make less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chase/nearby woods; the leisure centre; Redbrook School and the local park (Brereton) were all mentioned the most and largely positively- although improvements were suggested to the local park.

The Rugeley Power Station was the next most referred to feature, however this was negatively.

Rugeley town centre was the next most referred to feature, with mixed views. Largely positive but with room for improvements, particularly in terms of the shops available.

Overall preference for adding more greenery and trees and responses reinforce importance of local community assets/services.
Notes from Etching Hill and Springfields Community Network Focus Group

19th January 7pm-8pm Western Springs Primary School

Officers in Attendance: Angela Grove; Sarah Jones (and Philippa Carr from CVS).

Number of Residents in Attendance: 4

- SJ/AG introduced purpose of the Design SPD and the consultation event
- Group comments as part of task included the need to protect the thatched cottage at Bower Lane, Rugeley- key local building; nicest features of the area were its proximity to the Chase and the walkways that make the place readily accessible for pedestrians. Key issues for the area were ‘saturation’ of new developments, particularly the redevelopment of plots at high density; paths that link to Etching Hill are not well maintained; and trees around Etching Hill common have been allowed to overgrow thus sheltering the area from its wider community and hiding the key heathland feature. One member of the group highlighted that they were being proactive in getting various organisations involved in the management of the Hill, including most recently the AONB partnership. The group also suggested a preference for open plan/hedged gardens and landscaping as opposed to ‘harsher’ boundary treatments such as fences and walls.
- In terms of features that could be enhanced the group referred to the potential of the canal. It is one of the busiest routes in the country yet people just by pass Rugeley because there is no reason to stop. More moorings should be made available and tourism promoted. For instance by extending the Heritage Trail and adding plaques to walls about local historical interest points. Canal themed features could also be incorporated into the town centre to make better linkages. AG highlighted that the Landor Society and Inland Waterways are involved in such schemes along the canal. SJ highlighted that improvements to the canal are proposed as part of the recent Tesco application.
- Following the task the group completed a copy of the questionnaire. Details regarding the photograph competition were also given.
- AG queried how the event could have been improved. The group suggested more time was needed for the task for people to consider their responses. It may also be worthwhile recording people’s opinions rather than asking them to write them down as not everyone is as able to express themselves best in this way.
- AG/SJ thanked the group for their time and advised that if the group wanted further contact they could get in touch and make further comments on the information provided.
Notes from Blake Residents Champions Focus Group

2nd February 10am-12pm Cannock Chase Council

Officers in Attendance: Angela Grove; Sarah Jones (and Philippa Carr from CVS).

Number of Residents in Attendance: 4

- SJ/AG introduced purpose of the Design SPD and the consultation event.
- Group comments as part of task included the need to protect the semi-rural character of the area overall. This could be achieved by people keeping hedges (which would also assist wildlife); by retaining existing open spaces (Mill Green Nature Reserve was highlighted as a positive example) and making sure green landscaping was included in new developments i.e. not high density developments with no gardens or open spaces. In relation to land West of Pye Green Road it was suggested that the design of the houses could reflect this semi-rural nature by being ‘cabin-style’, wooden developments e.g. ‘Centre Parks’ style. The new Littleton Green Primary School was highlighted as a positive example of such a modern design that fitted in with the local area (although one group member felt it still looked a little isolated and barren as their was no landscaping around the site).
- The group highlighted that houses were getting smaller and that the Council should ensure a minimum, decent room size. The Council should also require developments to include bungalows and build houses that are suitable for older people. There was a need for more sheltered accommodation for older people. SJ/AG highlighted the national building regulations that cover such issues and the national Lifetime Homes standards, which encourage developers to design houses to be suitable for a range of different people with different needs. The Council will be considering how we can encourage such standards as part of the Design SPD. The group also raised the issue of sustainability and suggested that the Council should encourage developments to include measures such as solar panels.
- In terms of the type of design the group would like to see in their area, they suggested that the recently built schemes at Bevan Lee and Huntington are almost ‘fashion statements’ and that they have no individual character or variety in the design. They do not ‘fit in’ with the surrounding areas. An example of a new development in Tamworth was highlighted as a positive example where the houses were in keeping with the surrounds and they had variety or ‘individual character’. The general consensus was that modern designs were welcome but that they had to be in right place- it was suggested that they tend to work best when they are ‘standalone’ schemes. It was felt that some of the more modern schemes in Hednesford e.g. The Lightworks didn’t work because it was too imposing and didn’t fit in with the character of the town. The Anglesey Lodge was highlighted as a positive example for the town. The group suggested that modernising existing, traditional properties was sometimes the best approach.
- The group did not identify any local buildings they considered to be worthy of being ‘locally listed’. It was suggested that the Uxbridge Arms, Hednesford was worthy of trying to retain. One group member also raised issues in relation to the Chadsmoor former Primary School (see below).
- Other matters: the group queried the actual need for further housing developments in the District and expressed concern about the loss of green spaces and the impact of new developments upon the ability to sell their properties in the future. SJ/AG explained the nature of how housing targets are established and that the policy is to direct new developments as far as possible to Brownfield sites before considering the use of green spaces. The balance between high density, Brownfield developments (where properties are smaller and have less open space) and lower density, Greenfield developments (where properties can be larger and have more open space) was discussed. AG highlighted that developments on green spaces...
can mean a previously inaccessible area is opened up to public access e.g. as proposed at
land West of Pye Green Road. One member of the group queried the Council’s consultation
process on planning applications- SJ to follow up and feedback. One member of the group
queried why developers were allowed to keep applying for planning permission when a
property is being left to go derelict/creating an eyesore (specific reference to the Chadsmoor
former Primary School building). AG explained that we can not ‘force’ developers to carry out
permissions and although they do have a time limit on them, if the developer then re-submits to
allow a longer period of time it is very difficult for the Council to refuse this on the basis that the
development may not go ahead for another few years- this is not within the realms of planning
powers. Developers have struggled during the recession to get funding and find buyers so a lot
of schemes have stalled.

- Following the task the group completed a copy of the questionnaire. Details regarding the
photograph competition were also given.

- AG/SJ thanked the group for their time and advised that if the group wanted further contact
they could get in touch and make further comments on the information provided.
Norton Canes Focus Group

15th February 2-3pm St Trinity Methodist Church

Officers in Attendance: Angela Grove and Sarah Jones

Group Attendance: 8 residents/Councillors/community representatives

- SJ/AG introduced the purpose of the consultation and the Design SPD document.
- Key features of the area were identified including its mining heritage (leaving a legacy of mineral railway line routes); its Roman origins- the name Norton Canes is derived from the Roman Names for ‘North Street’ as the village is located north of the Roman A5 road; and its village ‘feel’.
- Key positive features of the area were identified as the Millennium Garden; the modern library and community centre (which are a focus for the village).
- Key features to enhance were identified as ‘The Bridge’ area and ‘The Batter’ path at the main crossroad/along the old railway line, which could be a better walkway/open space feature and could better ‘identify’ the area as an entrance point (a nature reserve path could be formed that links to footpaths further up Burntwood Road and then into Chasewater); the local centre in terms of making it more ‘uniform’ and providing more shops (as well as improving the car park facilities behind CO-OP); the main park in terms of providing more trees, benches, flowerbeds, fitness and play equipment; ‘Cema’ land (see map)- old common land that could be improved for a play area. The group identified the need for more playing fields in the village.
- One member of the group highlighted the need for natural progression of places and design i.e. buildings now cherished were once regarded as poor quality, standard designs. There needs to be a balance between retaining historical elements and allowing modern designs too- a process of natural change to suit what people want. Generally the group felt modern buildings were appropriate in the area (but in a traditional style and mostly 2 storeys). Some respondents preferred keeping plots open rather than contained by walls and stated that trees in the area should be protected (as well as new ones being planted). It was commented that there was no need for more business development in the area.
- The group queried if the Norton Aluminium works stack was listed as it has had some damaging alterations made to it
- SJ/AG thanked the group for their input and encouraged entries to the photo competition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council          | Thank you for consulting Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council ("BRPC") on your draft Design SPD, BRPC welcomes the production of this document and its high standard and has the following comments to make on it. Support welcomed  
  
  BRPC suggests that the following should be added at the end of the criteria:  
  
  "In particular the following will also be considered for inclusion in the list even if they do not meet the third of the above criteria:  
  
  all buildings and structures more than 150 years old; and  
  
  all landmark and present and former community buildings more than 70 years old. "  
  
  We are concerned that without this addition, historic buildings of character valued by the local community risk being excluded by the requirement to be in original 'as built' condition or as close as possible. Indeed the older a building is, the more likely it is to have been altered. For example, Breweries Cottages in Armitage Road are shown on a map dated 1804. They have been altered too much to be statutorily listed, but are nonetheless attractive and valued historic buildings. Similarly the Mossley Tavern, also in Armitage Road, which dates from about 1850 has a substantial relatively modern front extension, but is nonetheless a loved historic feature of the parish and the only canal side pub on the Cannock Chase stretch of the Trent and Mersey Canal.
  
  BRPC suggests altering the character description of Brereton and Ravenhill to read:  
  "Post-war development predominates, housing with associated schools. Historic local centre with church, chapel, grand houses and former schools. Victorian/Edwardian housing at north end along Brereton Road, limited interwar and modern housing, modern industrial estates to the south-west and north of the area."
  
  Key features 4th indent could be altered to begin:  
  Noted. Changes will be made to the Character Area Profiles. | Support welcomed                   |
“19th century housing mainly along Main Road and Brereton Road...”

Key features: 6th indent could be altered so that the words in brackets read:

“(St Michael's Church and the converted barn behind Brereton Hall in stone)”

The key features map. BRPC considers that both Brereton House and Brereton Hall are also landmarks. The south-eastern gateway to the Brereton built-up area is not the A51/A460 roundabout, but the point where the Main Road (the A460) enters the built-up area between two historic public houses, the Red Lion and the New Talbot (formerly The Talbot).

As far as your North Rugeley/Brereton area is concerned, BRPC considers that new development should contribute to improving the Trent and Mersey canal towpath so that it has appropriate quality and width for pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchairs users and pushchairs.

The best example of new design is the tower in the Towers Business Park (only just in Lichfield District). BRPC prefers the parish's Georgian/Regency/Victorian Heritage in the Brereton Conservation Area (e.g. Brereton Hall, Brereton House, and the Cedar Tree Hotel and St Michael's Church which are of an exceptionally high standard). The former Community Centre, former Antiques Centre and listed former stone barn are good examples of conversion of historic buildings to residential use.

BRPC can provide photographs of buildings as they are now (e.g. those in the Parish Plan, www.davecottongraphicdesign.com/Parish_Plan_Intro.htm) and also historic photographs showing some of those buildings and their settings as they used to be.

There are good medium distance views of Brereton Hall and Brereton House from the public footpath network on the higher ground in the vicinity of Springs Farm to the south-east of Coalpit Lane. Views of Stile Cop Trig Point at Dinah's Knob are also of value.

In general, new housing in Brereton and Ravenhill should be two-storey red brick with tile or slate. In locations where this matches existing properties render would be acceptable.
In and close to the Brereton Conservation Area (including the site of the former Nurseryfields School and former Brereton Library), buildings should reflect the Georgian/Regency of Brereton hall, Brereton House and the Cedar Tree Hotel. Well designed three-storey buildings may be acceptable here.

Well designed three-storey may also be acceptable adjacent to Wharf Road and Rugeley Town station car park.

BRPC largely agrees with the District Design Profile on pages 2-3 of the leaflet. However, we consider that transport also merits a mention in particular: the Trent and Mersey canal part of the Grand Cross linking the Midlands to the estuaries at the four corners of central England; the coaching inns, such as the Red Lion in Brereton and the Cross Keys in Hednesford; and the railways, principally what is now called the Chase Line from Walsall to Rugeley Trent Valley.

BRPC believes that page 5 paragraph 3.1(ii) (a), 5th indent should end "early 20th century", 'Victorian' might be replaced by 'Victorian/Edwardian'.

The Coal Authority

Although it is acknowledged that the Design SPD and Characterisation Study does not cover minerals specifically as this is contained within the Minerals and Waste Development Framework you will be aware, the Cannock Chase area contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. This information is available to Mineral Planning Authorities free of charge from The Coal Authority following signing a data sharing licence and was provided to Staffordshire County Council in September 2008.

The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unduly sterilised by new development. In instances where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process. Contact details for individual operators that may be able to assist with coal extraction in advance of development can be obtained from the Confederation of Coal Producers'
As you will be aware, the Cannock Chase area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas. The new Planning Department at the Coal Authority was created in 2008 to lead the work on defining areas where these legacy issues may occur.

Within Cannock Chase area the main mining legacy issues which need to be identified are mine entries, fissures and surface mining. The Coal Authority has records of over 171,000 coal mine entries across the coalfields, although there are thought to be many more unrecorded. Shallow coal which is present near the surface can give rise to stability, gas and potential spontaneous combustion problems. Even in areas where coal mining was deep, in some geological conditions cracks or fissures can appear at the surface. It is estimated that as many as 2 million properties of the 7.7 million properties across the coalfields may lie in areas with the potential to be affected by these problems. In our view, the planning processes in coalfield areas needs to take account of the coal mining legacy issues. The principal source of guidance is PPG14, which despite its age still contains the science and best practice on how to safely treat unstable ground. Within the Cannock Chase area there are approximately 196 recorded mine entries and around 6 coal mining related hazards. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be

Noted. These issues are recognised in the District Councils’ Core Strategy and guidance related to them will be contained within the SPD.
considered by the Local Planning Authority to ensure site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards.

Although mining legacy is as a result of mineral workings it is important that new development delivered through the Local Development Framework, recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. Land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on the new development, rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.

As The Coal Authority owns the coal and coal mine entries on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of The Coal Authority may be required.

**Comment** – The Coal Authority would request that the Cannock Chase Design SPD affords appropriate consideration to local mining legacy issues and the resulting potential for land instability. As identified above, our records indicate that there is a significant legacy of past coal mining activity located across the entire district. Ground conditions can influence the design and layout of new development, a point that should be acknowledged within the Design SPD. For example, the presence of mine entries on a site will influence layout as developers will not wish to build over them. Good design is not just about appearance; ensuring that due consideration has been afforded to ground conditions as part of planning applications is important to achieve safe and sustainable new development.

**Reason** – In order to ensure that coal mining legacy is recognised and any resulting issues of land instability are identified as an important consideration in the layout of new development, in line with the requirements of PPG14 and its accompanying Annex 2.

| English Heritage | Overall we fully welcome and support the preparation of the guidance and its character based approach. We also welcome the proactive approach to consultation, Support welcomed. |
| Noted. These issues are recognised in the District Councils’ Core Strategy and guidance related to them will be contained within the SPD. |
and in particular the community focused stages.

1) As indicated we fully support the aims and objectives of the study. The consultation leaflet explains that the design guidance document will also cover other topics such as sustainable design, green infrastructure, and the historic environment. This offers the opportunity to offer an integrated approach to design guidance, and develop relevant links between the different topics. For example in addressing sustainable design and climate change, a relevant consideration will be tackling the energy efficiency of existing buildings as well as new build. For buildings of traditional construction links could usefully be made to the guidance on the English Heritage website: [www.climatechangeandyourhome.org.uk](http://www.climatechangeandyourhome.org.uk) – this includes up to date guidance and research on appropriate approaches to mitigating and adapting traditionally built buildings to climate change.

It would be useful to clarify that the guidance will address conversions of existing buildings as well as new build. As part of the design guidance and in support of the historic environment topic area, we would also be keen that the guidance utilises the existing baseline information and planning tools developed through the West Midlands Historic Farmsteads and Landscape Project. The results of this work are available via the following link and includes the main Summary Report, County Summary Reports and Farmstead Character Statements:

http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/research/landscapes-and-areas/characterisation/West-Midlands-Farmsteads-Landscapes-Project/

We have already notified the Council of the completion of this work, and I would be happy to arrange a meeting to discuss how best the work can be integrated into the planned scope and structure of the design guidance.

We support the general approach to the methodology. It utilises relevant information such as the Extensive Urban Surveys, Historic Landscape Characterisation and Historic Environment Character Assessments, and conservation area appraisals. As

| Noted. The SPD will aim to provide an integrated approach between topics and reference will be made to appropriate sources of other guidance. |
| The guidance will cover extensions and conversions. |
| The Council will liaise with English Heritage regarding the incorporation of the Historic Farmsteads Survey Information into the SPD and characterisation study. |
mentioned above an additional data set should include that generated through the West Midlands Historic Farmsteads and Landscapes Project. This includes Farmstead Character Statements for the entirety of the region and would serve to complement the National Character Areas and county Landscape Character Assessment. The inclusion of these as part of the baseline would also serve to provide coverage of those areas outside of the identified character areas which appear to be predominantly urban/neighborhood focused. For a comprehensive approach the guidance will need to give consideration to the areas outside of the identified character areas, and also carefully explain the basis for the character area boundaries and perhaps also underline the ‘fuzzy’ nature of the boundaries. As a general comment archaeological considerations should be built into the design guidance, these drawing on the Extensive Urban Surveys and Historic Character Assessments.

| Mentioned above an additional data set should include that generated through the West Midlands Historic Farmsteads and Landscapes Project. This includes Farmstead Character Statements for the entirety of the region and would serve to complement the National Character Areas and county Landscape Character Assessment. The inclusion of these as part of the baseline would also serve to provide coverage of those areas outside of the identified character areas which appear to be predominantly urban/neighborhood focused. For a comprehensive approach the guidance will need to give consideration to the areas outside of the identified character areas, and also carefully explain the basis for the character area boundaries and perhaps also underline the ‘fuzzy’ nature of the boundaries. As a general comment archaeological considerations should be built into the design guidance, these drawing on the Extensive Urban Surveys and Historic Character Assessments. | Farmsteads Survey Information into the SPD and characterisation study.

The basis for the character areas will be explained in the SPD and their ‘fuzzy’ nature emphasised (as currently done so in the characterisation study).

Archaeological considerations will be factored into the SPD, referring to local evidence.

| In developing the work further, we would be happy to meet with the Council along with the County Council’s archaeologist to discuss any points of detail as well as more broadly the integration of the historic farmsteads work. With regard to the community consultation, one possible approach might be to utilise historic maps (hard copy or via an interactive display) of the development of their area to help foster a wider appreciation of the historic evolution and indeed surviving character of the local area. The County’s historic landscape characterisation can be used as well as the Extensive Urban Survey’s where available. An example of current best practice on linking characterisation to community engagement is the Lincoln Townscape Assessment: [http://www.heritageconnectlincoln.com/](http://www.heritageconnectlincoln.com/). Although this project was subject to significant funding, its general approach might be helpful in informing the collation and presentation of community views. | The Council will liaise with English Heritage regarding the incorporation of the Historic Farmsteads Survey Information into the SPD and characterisation study.

Historic maps will be used as part of the consultation exercises as suggested.

The Council will liaise with English Heritage regarding the incorporation of the Historic Farmsteads Survey Information into the SPD and characterisation study.

| We welcome and support the proposed approach of linking the consultation to the | Noted. The guidance will be

| | |

| | |

| | |

| | |

<p>| | |
| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Development of a local list of buildings and structures. English Heritage is about to publish guidance on the development of local lists and I will forward this as soon as it is publicly available. This will draw on the key principles of PPS5 as well as Conservation Principles. I suggest that the proposed list of criteria in Appendix 7 is reviewed in the light of the guidance to ensure they reflect the latest advice.</td>
<td>Considered once available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>We consider the A5 Character Description Document might benefit from noting that the A5 is part of the Highways Agency Strategic Road Network. Furthermore, it is important to include that advertisement signage should also be considered in the safety context against the continued safe operation of the A5 Trunk Road.</td>
<td>Noted. Amendment to be made to the character area description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Waterways Association</td>
<td>The Inland Waterways Association (IWA) is a national charity which campaigns for the conservation, use, maintenance, restoration and development of the inland waterways for public benefit. The Lichfield Branch of IWA has considered this study in relation to the environment of the Trent &amp; Mersey Canal and the interests of its users. IWA welcomes this study which is attractively presented and contributes to a better recognition of the value of the canal through Rugeley and Brereton, and helps identify opportunities for its improvement. The map of the Character Areas in the Consultation Leaflet shows their general location although it is obvious that the boundaries shown are approximate only. However, the detailed Key Features Maps do not show the boundaries of their respective Areas which leads to some uncertainty about exactly what is included. For example, whilst the descriptive tables for North Rugeley/Brereton and for Rugeley Town Centre refer to the Trent &amp; Mersey Canal, that for Western Rugeley does not, although the key map indicates that it includes the canal north of Station Road. Therefore, we suggest that future drafts of the maps should show exact boundaries.</td>
<td>Noted. The character area boundaries are intended to be 'fluid' to an extent in recognition of the fact that there are transition zones between areas and that the boundaries are not definitive. An additional reference to the canal running through Western Rugeley will be added. Welcome support for a Local List.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landor (Local History Society)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support welcomed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| for each of the areas, and include descriptions of all of the features within those areas.  

We were not able to find the Local List Criteria referred to as Annex 7 in your questions list, although we welcome the creation of a Local List.  

This Society welcomes the preparation of this document and an opportunity to be engaged at the informal consultation stage. Our interests, of course, are mainly how the document will relate to the Rugeley area and in particular the conservation areas and listed buildings although it is recognised that these already have a good measure of protection from inappropriate development.  

We have read the Consultation Leaflet and Technical Appendix and find that the purpose of the document and how it is being developed is well explained. In this respect we find the District Design Profile so far stated to be a good and adequate description.  

The six ‘character areas’ identified in the Rugeley locality are thought to be generally appropriate and we find the detailed ‘Rugeley Town Centre and Historic Suburbs’ Character Description and Key Features to be correct and sufficient, and agree with the proposed Key Local Design Principles for new development.  

We also agree with the stated five other proposed key topics applicable to future new development.  

- **Aims and Objectives.** The aim of creating a "District Design Profile" is considered commendable provided it only used in a positive way. We are concerned that describing a 'local identity' could include negative distinctiveness such as concentrated urbanisation and past examples of poor planning and we think any such negativity should not risk being used to locally perpetuate more of the same, or similar, in new developments.  

2. The described overall methodology and its individual stages are thought to be on a sound basis.  

- Noted. The aim of the District Design Profile is to promote the best features of the area and this will be emphasised within the Design SPD.  

Welcome overall support.
3. Consultation and Future Stages. We consider that the taking of views gathered from previous Core Strategy and Area Action Plan consultations is wholly appropriate to set the ‘broad picture’ and that the proposed future consultation stages are adequate.

With regard to Annex 7 we think the stated criteria are correct. The Society would be pleased to participate in suggesting buildings or structures in the Rugeley area based on the stated criteria and offer any known historical data, if required.

The Society’s preference is for non-intrusive traditional architecture and materials (although in certain situations there may be a place for good quality modern structures). To illustrate this in the Rugeley Town Centre Conservation Area we submit three photographs taken by a member of the Society's planning sub-committee. One shows how the Georgian-style frontage of the County Library built in the 1960s has enhanced Anson Street. The second shows how a recently added traditional shop frontage and added dormer windows have greatly improved Upper-Brook Street. The third photograph shows how intrusive 1960's incongruous flat-roofed buildings (albeit the use of traditional bricks in the more distant buildings is welcome) have replaced earlier period buildings to the detriment of Brook Square and its surroundings.

We consider that new buildings should generally not be higher than 3 storey, although the Penny Bank flats in Anson Street are an example of how by good traditional design and a multi-faceted frontage, and close relationship with the clock tower, a very large 4 storey new building can be satisfactory.

A building thought to be a priority for placing on a 'Local List' in the Rugeley Area is ‘The Chase’ pub in Hagley Road because of its architectural/historic merit and landmark location.

Important vantage points/views in the locality, are of course, Etching Hill and the Stile Cop car park 'viewpoint' (with its OS triangulation pillar which is unfortunately now entirely grown around by trees) the viewpoint is regrettably being rapidly overtaken by trees spoiling former wide ranging distant views and replacing former mainly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Consultation and Future Stages. We consider that the taking of views gathered from previous Core Strategy and Area Action Plan consultations is wholly appropriate to set the ‘broad picture’ and that the proposed future consultation stages are adequate.</th>
<th>Noted. Such issues will be considered in a revised Character Area Profile for Rugeley Town Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With regard to Annex 7 we think the stated criteria are correct. The Society would be pleased to participate in suggesting buildings or structures in the Rugeley area based on the stated criteria and offer any known historical data, if required.</td>
<td>Noted. The building will be considered for inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Society’s preference is for non-intrusive traditional architecture and materials (although in certain situations there may be a place for good quality modern structures). To illustrate this in the Rugeley Town Centre Conservation Area we submit three photographs taken by a member of the Society's planning sub-committee. One shows how the Georgian-style frontage of the County Library built in the 1960s has enhanced Anson Street. The second shows how a recently added traditional shop frontage and added dormer windows have greatly improved Upper-Brook Street. The third photograph shows how intrusive 1960's incongruous flat-roofed buildings (albeit the use of traditional bricks in the more distant buildings is welcome) have replaced earlier period buildings to the detriment of Brook Square and its surroundings.</td>
<td>Noted. Such issues will be considered in revised versions of the relevant character area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Rail</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sport England</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments to make</td>
<td>PPS1 encourages LAs, through policy and decision making, to improve opportunities for physical activity to help deliver health and access improvements and sustainable communities. This includes encouraging green travel (walking and cycling), open space, sport and recreation facilities and concepts such as ‘Home Zone’s. The new Health White Paper is also now handing responsibilities for improving health to LAs instead of PCTs therefore, as summarized in ‘Planning’ magazine last week planners will have a clear remit to help delivery of improved health. Sport England has developed a concept of ‘Active Design’ and CABE have provided guidance in relation to design and increasing physical activity. Sport England therefore request that the principle of ‘Active Design’ is incorporated into the SPD (see document via the link below) and that any new sports facilities built meet our technical design guidance notes, also found via the following link: <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities_planning/design_guidance_notes.aspx">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities_planning/design_guidance_notes.aspx</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport England</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Reference will be made to Active Design in the SPD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
materials/issues", the first thing a victim of burglary wants to do is move house, and this is not conducive to maintaining a sustainable community. Secured by Design costs the Council nothing, has a **proven track record in reducing burglary by 50% and criminal damage by 25%**, (anti-social behaviour is inextricably linked to criminal damage), is a superb strategic tool to reduce crime and disorder and, has been adopted by other Councils as LDF Policy.

SbyD supports the principles of "designing out crime" that begins at pre-planning stages and works through the use of effective crime prevention methods and the application of a range of security standards. SbyD has been proven to have a positive impact on environmental quality, housing, economic vibrancy, community safety, and the health and well being of the community through the creation of safe, sustainable, secure, quality places where people wish to live and work.

SbyD is a positive marketing tool, is the minimum security standard for home and business’s, has been specified on PFI Gov Buildings and overlaps a number of Government Planning Policy Statements, as well as specific documents:

- By Design - better places to live
- Safer Places, the Planning System and Crime Prevention
- Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods
- Assists developers to gain credits from the Code for Sustainable Homes.

Adopting SBD supports Home Office "Cutting Crime A New Partnership 2008-11". This document refers to Secured by Design as promoting good practice in using the planning system to ensure that designers and builders consider crime prevention measures during the design stage of their proposals (page 35).

Independent research has shown that adopting SBD can reduce burglary by 50%, car crime and criminal damage by 25%, therefore the carbon costs of replacing door-sets and windows on SBD developments as a result of criminal activity is more than
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>50% less than on non SBD developments, installing SBD approved products cost 0.2% of the total build cost.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One of the most revealing elements of research into SBD is how much ‘safer’ residents feel if they occupy a dwelling on an accredited development, even if they are not aware of the award status. There are few other initiatives which can deliver a measurable reduction in fear like this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are direct links between SBD and the Code for Sustainable Homes and credits are available on;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Lighting – SBD link to security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drying space – SBD link to security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle storage – SBD link to security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office – links to PAS 23/24 doors and BS7950 windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party wall insulation – SBD link to reduce noise and subsequent attendance by Police/Env Health re noise /neighbour disputes which impacts on the Police/Council carbon footprints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridors – SBD link to noise and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External private Space – SBD link to security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further information on Secured by Design can be found at <a href="http://www.securedbydesign.com">www.securedbydesign.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Theatres Trust</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Theatres Trust is The National Advisory Public Body for Theatres. The Theatres Trust Act 1976 states that ‘The Theatres Trust exists to promote the better protection of theatres. It currently delivers statutory planning advice on theatre buildings and theatre use through the Town &amp; Country Planning (General Development Procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted. Reference to the theatre will be added to the Character Area Profile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(England) Order 2010 (DMPO), Articles 16 & 17, Schedule 5, para.(w) that requires the Trust to be consulted by local authorities on planning applications which include ‘development involving any land on which there is a theatre.’

Due to the specific nature of the Trust’s remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and therefore anticipate policies relating to cultural facilities.

We do not have any specific comments but generally would like to add that theatres are unique buildings. They announce their presence on the built environment and provide visual landmarks that attract audiences and visitors. This in turn provides a ready-made source of destination marketing for your town centres. The exterior of the building and its signage needs to be of the highest quality to provide public signals that the building is welcoming, safe and inviting. Planning policies in the LDF should insist on the highest standards, providing the means for theatres to advertise their presence and create a focal point for the area.

As The Theatres Trust is a statutory consultee for theatres in the UK please ensure that we are consulted on the redevelopment plans that affect the Rose Theatre in Rugeley.
## Annex 4 Summary of updates required

### Characterisation Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Change required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council</td>
<td>Alter local list criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Have regard to emerging local list guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Ensure reference to historic farmsteads information is included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Emphasise the ‘fuzzy’ nature of the character area boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District Design Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Change required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council</td>
<td>Transport also merits a mention in particular: the Trent and Mersey canal part of the Grand Cross linking the Midlands to the estuaries at the four corners of central England; the coaching inns, such as the Red Lion in Brereton and the Cross Keys in Hednesford; and the railways, principally what is now called the Chase Line from Walsall to Rugeley Trent Valley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Character Area Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Character Area</th>
<th>Change required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Consider historic farmsteads survey work and how this could further inform character area descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>A5 Corridor</td>
<td>Note that the A5 is part of the Highways Agency Strategic Road Network. Furthermore, it is important to include that advertisement signage should also be considered in the safety context against the continued safe operation of the A5 Trunk Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council</td>
<td>Brereton and Ravenhill</td>
<td>“Post-war development predominates, housing with associated schools. Historic local centre with church, chapel, grand houses and former schools. Victorian/Edwardian housing at north end along Brereton Road, limited interwar and modern housing, modern industrial estates to the south-west and north of the area.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key features 4th indent could be altered to begin:
“19th century housing mainly along Main Road and Brereton Road…”

Key features 6th indent could be altered so that the words in brackets read:

“(St Michael’s Church and the converted barn behind Brereton Hall in stone)”

The key features map. BRPC considers that both Brereton House and Brereton Hall are also landmarks. The south-eastern gateway to the Brereton built-up area is not the A51/A460 roundabout, but the point where the Main Road (the A460) enters the built-up area between two historic public houses, the Red Lion and the New Talbot (formerly The Talbot).

BRPC prefers the parish’s Georgian/Regency/Victorian Heritage in the Brereton Conservation Area (e.g. Brereton Hall, Brereton House, and the Cedar Tree Hotel and St Michael’s Church which are of an exceptionally high standard). The former Community Centre, former Antiques Centre and listed former stone barn are good examples of conversion of historic buildings to residential use.

There are good medium distance views of Brereton Hall and Brereton House from the public footpath network on the higher ground in the vicinity of Springs Farm to the south-east of Coalpit Lane. Views of Stile Cop Trig Point at Dinah’s Knob are also of value.

In general, new housing in Brereton and Ravenhill should be two-storey red brick with tile or slate. In locations where this matches existing properties render would be acceptable.

In and close to the Brereton Conservation Area (including the site of the former Nurseryfields School and former Brereton Library), buildings should reflect the Georgian/Regency of Brereton hall, Brereton House and the Cedar Tree Hotel. Well designed three-storey buildings may be acceptable here.

Well designed three-storey may also be acceptable adjacent to Wharf Road and Rugeley Town station car park

Local residents feedback

Refer to Redbrook School as a positive local modern design example. Refer to refurbishing local shops. Highlight Power Station as being viewed negatively to an extent.

Local residents feedback (questionnaires and workshops)

Cannock Town Centre and Historic Suburbs

See Table 1 above and St Mary’s School Memory Maps analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents feedback (questionnaires)</th>
<th>Hazelslade and Rawnsley</th>
<th>Representations made regarding piece of land (see full Community Association letter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local residents feedback (questionnaires and school workshops)</td>
<td>Hagley</td>
<td>Emphasis that the leisure centre is locally considered a good example of modern design - attractive feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents feedback (questionnaires)</td>
<td>Hednesford Town Centre and Historic Suburbs</td>
<td>Add more greenery and trees in public spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents feedback (questionnaires)</td>
<td>Hednesford Town Centre and Historic Suburbs</td>
<td>Reference quality of property frontages deteriorating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents feedback (questionnaires)</td>
<td>North Cannock</td>
<td>Emphasise links to the Chase and wildlife in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breerton and Ravenhill Parish Council</td>
<td>North Rugeley/Brereton</td>
<td>New development should contribute to improving the Trent and Mersey canal towpath so that it has appropriate quality and width for pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchair users and pushchairs. The best example of new design is the tower in the Towers Business Park (only just in Lichfield District).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oak College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Towers Point is good local landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents feedback (questionnaires and workshops)</td>
<td>Norton Canes</td>
<td>See Table 1 comments above for questionnaire points. Add reference to the area’s Roman’s origins. Identify the Millennium Garden as a key local feature. Identify features to enhance as being improvements to paths around the village (see detailed notes for specifics); making the local centre more ‘uniform’; enhancing the main park and ‘Cema’ land. General preference for traditional style and 2 storey developments, with scope for modern buildings e.g. library viewed positively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landor (Local History) Society</td>
<td>Outlying Rural Areas and/or Breerton and Ravenhill/Hagley</td>
<td>Important viewpoint - Stile Cop car park ‘viewpoint’ (with its OS triangulation pillar which is unfortunately now entirely grown around by trees) the viewpoint is regrettably being rapidly overtaken by trees spoiling former wide ranging distant views and replacing former mainly heathland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents feedback (questionnaires and workshops)</td>
<td>Pye Green Valley</td>
<td>Emphasise influence of the Chase upon quality of people’s lives. Protect semi-rural character. People should keep hedges in gardens. Design of developments at West of Pye Green Road could be ‘cabin-style’ to reflect rural feel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Character Area</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landor (Local History) Society</td>
<td>Rugeley Town Centre and Historic Suburbs</td>
<td>Preference is for non-intrusive traditional architecture and materials (although in certain situations there may be a place for good quality modern structures). To illustrate this in the Rugeley Town Centre Conservation Area we submit three photographs taken by a member of the Society's planning sub-committee. One shows how the Georgian-style frontage of the County Library built in the 1960s has enhanced Anson Street. The second shows how a recently added traditional shop frontage and added dormer windows have greatly improved Upper-Brook Street. The third photograph shows how intrusive 1960’s incongruous flat-roofed buildings (albeit the use of traditional bricks in the more distant buildings is welcome) have replaced earlier period buildings to the detriment of Brook Square and its surroundings. We consider that new buildings should generally not be higher than 3 storey, although the Penny Bank flats in Anson Street are an example of how by good traditional design and a multi-faceted frontage, and close relationship with the clock tower, a very large 4 storey new building can be satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Theatres Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>We do not have any specific comments but generally would like to add that theatres are unique buildings. They announce their presence on the built environment and provide visual landmarks that attract audiences and visitors. This in turn provides a ready-made source of destination marketing for your town centres. The exterior of the building and its signage needs to be of the highest quality to provide public signals that the building is welcoming, safe and inviting. Planning policies in the LDF should insist on the highest standards, providing the means for theatres to advertise their presence and create a focal point for the area. As The Theatres Trust is a statutory consultee for theatres in the UK please ensure that we are consulted on the redevelopment plans that affect the Rose Theatre in Rugeley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents feedback (questionnaires and workshops)</td>
<td>Western Rugeley</td>
<td>See Table 1 above for questionnaire points. More of a feature should be made of the canal in the town centre e.g. canal themed street furniture and the Heritage Trail could be extended by adding historic plaques about local interest points. Elmore Park should be highlighted as key feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents feedback (questionnaires and workshops)</td>
<td>Inland Waterways Association</td>
<td>Refer to the uniqueness and potential of the canal. Refer to quiet lanes in area and the walkways that make the place easily accessible (e.g. the green links/underpasses that run through estates and are unique to the area). Concerns about saturation of high density developments. Need to maintain Etching Hill- trees overgrowing obscuring area. Preference for hedged/open plan gardens and landscaping as opposed to walls/fences. Refer to the role of the canal that runs through this character area too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 5 Summary of considerations for coverage and content of the SPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent(s)</th>
<th>Consider...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Stakeholders Presentation (8th December)          | SPD could cover the design of space around buildings as well as the buildings themselves  
|                                                   | Local List shouldn't be used prescriptively/prohibitively  
|                                                   | Spaces/internal sizes of dwellings- perhaps via discussions on densities and layouts  
|                                                   | Including master planning guidance  
|                                                   | Including guidance on who should be used to help design schemes and include good/best practice examples from across the District to demonstrate principles  
|                                                   | Emphasise the value of good design in financial terms e.g. sales values and prestige  
|                                                   | Timeframe of the document- could become quickly out of date, particularly in terms of sustainable construction standards |
| Local residents feedback (including young people’s feedback) | Importance of consulting local communities to understand their design preferences and priorities to inform local development proposals. Importance of developments fitting in with the surrounds and having some individual character/variety in design.  
|                                                   | Preference for mixture of traditional and modern designs but with the latter needing to be appropriate to the context or 'stand-alone' e.g. modern infill developments were not viewed as positively as modern stand alone schemes (comparison of attitudes towards Hednesford Lightworks versus Rugeley Leisure Centre). Preference for new houses to be traditional in design whilst businesses and public buildings had more scope to be modern/contemporary.  
|                                                   | Historic buildings and green spaces were the most popular features of people’s local area, although younger people were more positive about some of the modern buildings and the adult workshops also highlighted positive examples of modern developments e.g. Rugeley Leisure Centre and Norton Canes Library. To improve their area people most favoured more trees and greenery and new development that reflected the character of the area.  
|                                                   | Designing out crime- welcome safety locks but concerned about excessive lighting, especially on the Chase  
|                                                   | All features considered important in new design with the quality and quantity of green space being marginally most popular with majority of people being willing to pay more for these features. Workshops feedback suggested preference for hedges and planting as opposed to walls/fences generally.  
|                                                   | Consider size of rooms and houses overall- seem to be getting smaller with little garden space.  
<p>|                                                   | Need to have more dwellings that are suitable for elderly people e.g. bungalows and sheltered... |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Guidance Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
<td>Include guidance on addressing prior extraction issues and mining legacy issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Ensure guidance provides an integrated approach, particularly in relation to sustainable construction and heritage assets. See <a href="http://www.climatechangeandyourhome.org.uk">www.climatechangeandyourhome.org.uk</a> – this includes up to date guidance and research on appropriate approaches to mitigating and adapting traditionally built buildings to climate change. Ensure importance of archaeology is emphasised in the SPD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Ensure reference to Active Design guidance principles and ensure Design SPD references local open space and recreation targets to inform developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Police</td>
<td>Ensure reference to Secured by Design principles and how this can compliment other sustainable construction standards such as Code for Sustainable Homes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 6 Local List Suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oak Students</td>
<td>Cherry Cottage (Sheep Fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landor (Local History) Society</td>
<td>‘The Chase’ pub in Hagley Road because of its architectural/historic merit and landmark location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etching Hill and Springfields Focus Group</td>
<td>Thatched cottage at Bower Lane, Rugeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Resident Champions</td>
<td>Uxbridge Arms, Hednesford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Canes Focus Group</td>
<td>Former Chadsmoor Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norton Aluminium Works stack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>