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1.0 Introduction

1.1 All planning authorities have a strategic plan which provides a framework for the future planning of their area and contains policies for the determination of planning applications. South Staffordshire’s Local Plan is made up of two main documents, the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations Document (SAD). The Core Strategy was formally adopted in December 2012 and is at the heart of the Local Plan setting out the long-term vision, objectives and planning policies to deliver the vision and secure a sustainable future for the District. The SAD once adopted, will set out site specific proposals and policies for the use of land to guide future development, in order to help to deliver the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy.

1.2 This Statement describes the public consultation undertaken by the Council in relation to the Site Allocations Document (SAD) Preferred Options process. The Statement outlines the consultation methods used by the Council, the local communities and organisations that were consulted and summarises the views of respondents to the key issues raised throughout the Preferred Options consultations. It also highlights some of the key messages that have emerged from the consultations that have informed the preparation of the Council’s Publication Plan document.

1.3 The Preferred Options consultation was carried out to meet the requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The regulations set out the legal requirements that LPAs must comply with in relation to early engagement. This is set out in Regulation 18 – Preparation of a Local Plan and requires the Council to:

- Notify specific consultation bodies as well as general consultation bodies, residents and other persons that the LPA considers appropriate of the Local Plan that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) proposes to prepare.
- Invite all those invited to make representations to the LPA to comment on what the Local Plan should contain.
- Take into account any representations received when preparing the Draft Local Plan.

1.4 The Council has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement, or SCI, which sets out how we aim to engage with local communities and stakeholders in plan preparation as well as when determining planning applications. The SCI contains a list of the types of organisations, individuals and statutory bodies that are consulted in preparing a plan.
2. **Consultation**

2.1 The Council is committed to involving local communities and stakeholders in the preparation of the Local Plan and sees consultation as an ongoing activity, which feeds the views of residents and consultees into the plan process.

2.2 We have a Local Plan Register which is a database of people or organisations that have expressed an interest in the Local Plan, or have made comments to previous Local Plan consultations. Some of the organisations are statutory consultees such as adjoining local authorities, Natural England, Highways England, Environment Agency etc and others include community groups, parish councils and residents. A full list of the types of individual and bodies we consult can be found in the SCI.

2.3 Anyone who makes representations to any Local Plan consultation is automatically added to the database. There is also an opportunity for people to register themselves using our online consultation system, or they can send us their contact details via the Planning4Places page on the Council’s website.

**Duty to Co-operate**

2.4 The Localism Act 2011 brought in the Duty to Co-operate which requires planning authorities and other public bodies to actively engage and consider joint approaches to plan making where appropriate. A number of meetings and workshops have been held with infrastructure and service providers and neighbouring authorities and the information received has informed the site selection process. It has also been used to keep the Infrastructure Delivery Plan up to date. Details can be found in the updated **Duty to Co-operate Schedule** which will be published in tandem with the Publication Plan consultation.

**SAD Preferred Options Consultation**

2.5 The purpose of the SAD Preferred Options consultation exercise was to gain views on the preferred site options for delivering the site specific aims and objectives of the Core Strategy. The sites had been selected following assessment and evaluation against the methodology and taking on board information and representations from the Issues and Options consultations. The Preferred Options SAD identified sites for housing, extensions to strategic employment sites, identification of safeguarded land, special policy areas, Green Belt and Open Countryside boundary changes and potential pitch options to meet the needs of our Gypsy and Traveller community.

2.6 We also consulted on a Methodology Paper which set out how sites had been evaluated following the Issues and Options consultation; a Sustainability Appraisal which considered the environmental, social and economic impacts of the SAD; and a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) which looked at any impacts on internationally protected sites.

**Preferred Options Consultation 15th December 2015 – 12th February 2016**

2.7 Consultation on Preferred Options for the SAD was carried out for just over 8 weeks beginning Tuesday 15th December 2015 and ending at midday on Friday 12th February 2016.

2.8 The Preferred Options SAD contained those sites, which after evaluation and assessment were considered to be the most suitable to be taken forward for
allocation at each of the villages identified for development. In addition to the proposed housing sites, land was identified for safeguarding for longer term development needs; extension options to two strategic employment sites at i54 South Staffordshire and ROF Featherstone; and additional pitches for gypsies and travellers.

2.9 The preferred sites were selected to meet the adjusted housing numbers as set out in the Preferred Options document. These numbers had been revised through the SAD process to take account of development new to supply since the adoption of the Core Strategy and where permissions had lapsed or were under delivered. For each of the proposed allocated sites an indicative area and capacity were given; and for safeguarded land site area.

2.10 In terms of employment sites, a specific area of land was identified at i54 South Staffordshire, but an effective ‘area of search’ was proposed at ROF Featherstone. This was due to the fact that at the time of the consultation, there were 3 potential road options for delivery of ROF still under consideration and subject to further detailed assessments. There were also onsite assessments still underway relating to detailed site feasibility and constraints, for example the extent of the brook and the landscape buffer requirements. This meant that until further work had been carried out it was unclear what the detailed site boundaries would be. Consulting on a wider area gave people the opportunity to consider all options.

2.9 We published 5 main consultation documents which were:

- Preferred Options SAD
- SAD Methodology Paper
- SAD Discounted Sites and Site Assessment Paper
- Sustainability Appraisal
- Habitats Regulations Assessment

2.10 The purpose of the South Staffordshire SAD is to identify the detailed allocations required to deliver the Core Strategy. As a Tier 2 Plan, the Council does not consider the Site Allocations Document to be the appropriate point at which to revise the housing target established in the Core Strategy. The Preferred Options SAD therefore contained a Policy – SAD1: Local Plan Review, which aimed to offer certainty that this matter will be addressed when the Core Strategy is reviewed.

2.11 The Preferred Options SAD contained the preferred sites for new housing development; sites to be safeguarded for longer term development needs; extensions to i54 South Staffordshire and ROF Featherstone (including road options to deliver ROF); pitch options for Gypsies and Travellers; and amendments to Green Belt boundaries. In addition it included new Open Space Standards and proposed policies for The Bratch, Wombourne, and the Hatherton Branch Canal.

2.12 There were other documents published at the same time as the consultation documents including a Site Assessment Topic Paper; SAD Preferred Options Matrix Topic Paper; Frequently Asked Questions Sheet; Duty to Co-operate Schedule; Issues and Options Consultation Statement; Landscape Sensitivity Studies; Sub regional Employment Studies and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
Publicity and Procedures

2.13 We wrote to everyone on our Local Plan Register, by email or letter, to advise them the consultation was starting and where the documents were available to view. This included any people or organisations that had responded to the Issues and Options consultations held in 2014. Copies could also be purchased at the Council Offices or at the local exhibitions (see below). The documents were made available online on the Council’s website at www.sstaffs.gov.uk/siteallocations and remain available for information. They were also provided in hard copy at:

- Reception, Council Offices, Wolverhampton Road, Codsall
- All 27 South Staffordshire Parish Councils
- Public Libraries at Brewood, Cheslyn Hay, Codsall, Great Wyrley, Kinver, Penkridge, Perton, Wombourne and Staffordshire County Mobile and Trailer Libraries operating in the District.
- The Council’s four Leisure Centres at Codsall, Cheslyn Hay, Penkridge and Wombourne

2.14 We provided response forms online and at each of these venues and at the exhibitions. We encouraged people to make representations electronically, either via our online system or by email, however the majority of responses were still made in the form of hand written letters, or forms/comments sheets. Examples of the response forms can be seen in Appendix A.

Media

2.15 A public notice was placed in the Express and Star and Chronicle newspapers on Monday 14th December 2015. Information about the consultation was also Tweeted regularly by our Customer Services Team over the consultation period, and featured on the Council’s Facebook page. A half page article with an update on next steps for the SAD was published in the Council’s Review newspaper Edition 61 Summer 2015. There was a further article in the Autumn 2015 Review (62) which stated the consultation would begin in December 2015. The Review is delivered to every household in the District, and copies can also be obtained from our Leisure Centres or online at www.staffs.gov.uk. Copies of the public notice and Review Articles can be seen in Appendix B. We were made aware that the consultation also featured and was discussed in local Facebook groups in villages such as Codsall/Bilbrook, Kinver, Wombourne and Perton.

Exhibitions

2.16 Council officers were available at the Council Offices in Codsall to discuss the Preferred Options documents during normal working hours (8.45am - 5pm, Monday - Friday) for the 8+ week consultation period. Posters were displayed at the Council Offices and sent to all parish councils (see Appendix C).

2.17 In addition to this, local interactive village exhibitions were held where residents and other interested parties could speak with planning officers about the proposals. There was one exhibition in each of the 5 localities (see table below), plus one 2 hour drop-in session at Coven. It was stressed at all the exhibitions, in order for comments to be considered formally, under the Regulations, they would need to be made separately in writing. Posters advertising the exhibitions were sent to relevant parish clerks for them to put up at each location. The exhibitions were held between 2pm and 7pm and details of the dates and venues are given below.
**Timetable For Preferred Options SAD Exhibitions 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 7th January</td>
<td>Haling Dene Centre, <strong>Penkridge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 14th January</td>
<td>Civic Centre, <strong>Wombourne</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 20th January</td>
<td>Council Offices, <strong>Codsall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 28th January</td>
<td>Cheslyn Hay Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 2nd February</td>
<td>Jubilee Hall, <strong>Brewood</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 9th February</td>
<td>Coven Memorial Hall, <strong>Coven</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The additional session at Coven was held because of a misunderstanding early on in the consultation period when the notice intended for Brewood was also erroneously placed at Coven Memorial Hall. Although the error was corrected after a few days, unfortunately some residents turned up in Coven on 2nd February and were understandably unhappy that there was no exhibition being held there. As a gesture of goodwill, officers arranged for a shorter two hour session to be held in Coven the following week.

**Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulations Assessments (HRA) Consultation 15th August 2016 – 26th September 2016**

2.18 As part of the development of the Local Plan, further work was carried out post Preferred Options consultation on 3 key documents. These were an HRA of the cumulative impact of all proposed development including housing, gypsies and travellers; an HRA of employment allocations, cumulative impact of development on protected sites; and a technical note appraising the sustainability (SA) of access options to ROF Featherstone.

2.19 Consultation was carried out for 6 weeks beginning Monday 15th August 2016 and ending on Monday 26th September 2016.

2.20 We published 3 documents, which were:

- HRA Employment Sites
- HRA SAD (Updated)
- SA – Technical Note ROF Access Options

**Publicity and Procedures**

2.21 We wrote to everyone on our Local Plan Register, by email or letter, to advise them the consultation was starting and where the documents were available to view. This included any people or organisations that had responded to the Preferred Options consultation held earlier in the year. Copies could also be purchased at the Council Offices. The documents were made available online on the Council's website at [www.sstaffs.gov.uk/siteallocations](http://www.sstaffs.gov.uk/siteallocations) and remain available for information.

**3. Responses to the Consultations and Key Messages**

3.1 There were over 950 responses to the Preferred Options consultation and comments have been summarised in a number of schedules of responses. These include comments made by statutory bodies, planning agents, developers, site promoters, parish councils and residents. The summary schedules are available online at [www.sstaffs.gov.uk/siteallocations](http://www.sstaffs.gov.uk/siteallocations). Copies of the original full responses can be made available on request. The schedules of responses set out site by site, village by village, the responses received to the consultations.
They also include general comments about specific issues and responses to the questions posed in the consultation documents.

3.2 Responses have been put into 5 different categories which are:

- Responses from agents representing sites and/or landowners
- Responses from statutory bodies and stakeholders, such as Natural England, Environment Agency, Parish Councils etc
- Responses from general public and others
- Responses which were received after the close of the consultation period(s)
- Petitions

3.3 The table below shows the numbers of responses received for the Preferred Options consultation. It is important to note that some respondents made multiple submissions, e.g. by email, letter and online to the consultation; and also via their MP. Many respondents also signed petitions in addition to any responses they had made as individuals. Respondents were made aware that their views would be made public and a very small number withdrew their comments as a result of this.

**Summary of Responses Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Options SAD Consultation</th>
<th>Duly Made</th>
<th>Late/Invalid Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Bodies</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents/Developers</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public and other Responses</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>945</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>957</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 As might be expected, responses from agents/developers were pro-growth and the general thrust was that despite support for sites identified in the SAD, it did not go far enough in identifying more land/sites. It was felt that housing numbers should be increased in recognition of the wider HMA shortfall and that a number of sites had greater capacity for housing development. Many alternative sites continued to be supported and others promoted over and above those identified in the SAD. There was general support for the continuation of the SAD, subject to consideration of an early review of the plan. Most opposition from residents was site specific and from those who lived in close proximity to the preferred sites.

**Summary of Key Responses by Policy/Theme to Preferred Options Consultation**

3.5 The SAD Preferred Options document contained 10 proposed policies:

1. SAD1 – Local Plan Review
2. SAD2- Preferred Option Housing Allocations
3. SAD3 – Preferred Option Safeguarded Land
4. SAD4 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
5. SAD5 – Preferred Option Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Pitch Provision
6. SAD6 – Preferred Option Employment Land Allocations
7. SAD7 – Preferred Option Green Belt and Open Countryside Boundary Amendments
8. SAD8 – Preferred Option Open Space Standards
9. SAD9 – The Bratch, Wombourne Policy Area
10. SAD10 – Hatherton Branch Canal

SAD1 – Local Plan Review

3.6 Responses from the development industry, including planning agents, developers and site promoters, were fairly evenly split between those who objected outright and those who thought that some recognition of higher housing numbers should be acknowledged by the early release of safeguarded land or the identification of additional safeguarded land in the SAD. Recognition that an early review of the plan before 2028 would be carried out was welcomed. Some respondents stated that a lack of OAN meant the plan was out of date and needed to be reviewed urgently or that it should be abandoned and the Council should start again. Other comments supported the SAD as the most expeditious route to significantly boost housing supply.

3.7 Neighbouring Authorities took a more pragmatic view with the majority supporting the progression of the SAD, subject to recognition of the wider HMA housing shortfall. Joint working and continued involvement of partners and adjoining authorities was welcomed. HBF noted that the Core Strategy and SAD were outdated and a comprehensive review was needed immediately.

3.8 There were no specific responses to SAD1 from residents/general public.

SAD2 – Preferred Option Housing Allocations

3.9 A significant proportion of the comments received from agents, developers and residents were site specific. In terms of the adjustments to housing numbers to take account of changes to land supply, agents and developers were in favour of continuing with the Core Strategy numbers as a minimum, with many submissions advocating increased numbers to meet higher housing needs, both within South Staffordshire and the wider Housing Market Area. Many objections to SAD2 by agents and developers were that alternative sites should have been included instead of, or in addition to, the preferred sites. There were also objections that the identified sites were insufficient to meet housing need and that SAD numbers were not an OAN and should therefore be increased. One respondent considered the settlement hierarchy was out of date and the strategy should be reviewed.

3.10 There were site specific objections to a number of sites from some parish councils and a suggestion that numbers should be reduced or met on alternative sites, or sites in other villages. The HBF requested that the Council should maximise housing supply and the type and tenure of housing development. There were concerns from Natural England that much of South Staffordshire’s allocations were on Grade 2/3 agricultural land and that standing advice from NE/DEFRA should be taken into account. Concerns were expressed about the impact development might have on education provision and highways, particularly on neighbouring authorities.

3.11 The majority of comments relating to SAD2 from residents were requests to delete specific sites from the Policy. There was some support for sites and alternative sites, with additional comments relating to provision of additional roads to support development; and ensuring flood risk measures would be in place; and a small number of requests for an extension to the consultation period and/or insufficient consultation.
SAD3 – Preferred Option Safeguarded Land

3.12 Although there was support for safeguarded sites from agents/developers, many also considered that alternative sites should have been identified, instead of or in addition to those in SAD3 or that safeguarded land should be allocated now. There was significant support from the development industry for an increase in the amount of land to be safeguarded - to recognise that South Staffordshire’s housing numbers are not an OAN; that there is a wider HMA housing shortfall; or that the principle of enduring Green Belt boundaries would not be met. There were representations which stated that the amount of land identified to be safeguarded was based on gross development area and that an additional 23ha was needed to recognise on-site infrastructure or open space requirements.

3.13 Statutory bodies made limited reference to SAD3, other than comments from some parish councils about the preferred option site choices which are reflected in site specific comments.

3.14 Again, most of residents’ comments to SAD3 were related to the deletion of sites from the policy. There was reference to the need for an improvement to roads and facilities and services aligned to additional development.

SAD4 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

3.15 Representations from agents on behalf of gypsy and traveller families stated that the 2014 GTAA was flawed and that as a consequence higher levels of pitch provision should be considered. Again, additional/alternative sites were proposed, including a suggestion that the Council consider delivering a publically owned site(s). It was suggested that gypsy sites should be removed from the Green Belt to conform with NPPF; proposals rely on infill of existing sites; too high a reliance on turnover.

3.16 Responses from statutory bodies were concerned with minor amendments to the policy to include reference to coal mining and foul sewerage issues, and the continued protection of ancient woodland and trees and the Cannock Chase AONB. Telford & Wrekin Council requested clarification on need versus supply in terms of pitch provision.

3.17 There were no responses to SAD4 from residents/general public.

SAD5 – Preferred Option Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Pitch Provision

3.18 Agents representing Gypsy and Traveller families stated that the needs assessment will prove to be an underestimate and that turnover assumptions are incorrect. It was also considered that the intensification of existing sites as a solution on its own was not appropriate and that additional sites should be identified to meet needs over and above those of existing families. Again it was stated the sites should be removed from the Green Belt and that the Council should consider a publicly owned site.

3.19 The majority of responses from stakeholders were from parish councils and were objections to specific sites or that alternative site options should be explored. Cheslyn Hay Parish Council stated that the spread of proposed sites was disproportionate with the majority of new pitch provision concentrated in the north of the District. Featherstone Parish Council supported the pitch provisions in that they did not extend or intensify sites in Featherstone. There was support from the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups in addressing the needs of
Gypsies and Travellers. Telford & Wrekin Council requested clarification on need versus supply in terms of pitch provision.

3.20 SAD5 contained the pitches that were proposed as preferred pitch options. As with comments relating to housing provision, the vast majority of responses were related to removing sites from the Policy. There were a small number of letters of support for sites.

**SAD6 – Preferred Option Employment Land Allocations**

3.21 It was requested that reference to the aims of the Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent LEP should be included in the policy wording. There was support from the development industry for the proposed extension to i54, but that this would be insufficient to meet the needs of the sub region and that additional sites should be identified. It was also stated that the delivery of ROF Featherstone had not been demonstrated and that there remained a regional shortfall which should be addressed through the SAD. There was support for the ROF site including its expansion and for additional flexibility by the identification of additional safeguarded land.

3.22 There was support for the delivery of i54 and ROF Featherstone Strategic Employment Sites from Featherstone Parish Council, Staffordshire County Council and Wolverhampton City Council. Highways England noted that delivery of ROF was dependent upon access solutions being agreed. There were objections to ROF from National Trust and the local MP.

3.23 The majority of comments relating to SAD6 by residents were in relation to the strategic employment site at ROF Featherstone. Most comments were that reference to Route Options A and B should be deleted from the plan and a few residents felt that the ROF site should be deleted in its entirety. There was support from two correspondents that employment opportunities should be available at other villages to avoid unsustainable patterns of commuting.

**SAD7 – Preferred Option Green Belt and Open Countryside Boundary Amendments**

3.24 Comments from developers and agents related to consideration of alternative sites; that greater areas of land should be removed from the Green Belt for additional development in light of economic growth; that boundaries should be credible and endure; and that gypsy sites should be removed from the Green Belt in order to meet national policy.

3.25 Cannock Chase AONB Unit supported the incorporation of the former Littleton Colliery site into the development boundary and requested that links and references to the AONB be added to the supporting text.

3.26 There were no comments specific to SAD7 from residents/general public.

**SAD8 – Preferred Option Open Space Standards**

3.27 No comments were received from agents and/or developers, or from residents, on SAD8.

3.28 Both Cannock Chase AONB Unit and The Lichfield & Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust supported SAD8, subject to references to the AONB and Cannock Chase SAC. It was suggested that the Heritage Towpath Trail would provide opportunities for developer contributions and improved green corridors.
The Woodland Trust requested that SAD8 should incorporate a Woodland Access Standard.

**SAD9 – The Bratch, Wombourne Policy Area**

3.29 Representations were received from agents on behalf of the land owners that Policy SAD9 should be deleted as there was insufficient evidence to support the policy approach.

3.30 There were no comments from residents, stakeholders or statutory bodies to SAD9.

**SAD10 – Hatherton Branch Canal**

3.31 No comments were received from residents, agents and/or developers on SAD10.

3.32 The Environment Agency referred to the need for the sustainable abstraction of water to feed the branch canal. The Inland Waterways Association, and the Canal Restoration Trust both supported the policy and it was suggested that an inset be created to cover the full extent of the route. There was confirmation that the project is deliverable and would see greater public access.

**Housing - Preferred Site Options**

3.33 A significant proportion of the comments received from agents, developers and residents were site specific. The Council has produced spreadsheets which contain more detailed information about the nature of the comments made and summarising the reasons for supporting or objecting to a site. As might be expected, opposition from residents to sites, both allocations and safeguarded, were in the main from people who lived in close proximity to the sites.

3.34 Responses from agents and developers were generally split between those sending in supporting information in relation to a site that they were proposing/representing, and those proposing an alternative site. Included in both types of responses was additional information about sites, potential mitigation measures to meet concerns outlined in the methodology and varying degrees of alternative housing land supply calculations. There were challenges to some of the scoring of sites, particularly in respect of Green Belt and Landscape judgements.

3.35 Residents were concerned about impact on the Green Belt and landscape quality, loss of open or green space, the impact on the natural environment, flooding issues, historic environment and landscape, and the loss of good quality farmland. Many residents highlighted that new development should be supported by necessary infrastructure and raised concerns about the adequacy and capacity of highways, schools, GP surgeries, drainage and sewerage, and other services, to cope with the impact of new development. This was a consistent and recurring theme through written submissions and expressed at the exhibitions. There were comments from some residents that the process and sites had not been publicised widely enough.

3.36 Many of the submissions raised issues such as devaluation of existing properties, loss of views, site construction problems, conflict of interest, too many properties for sale, use of Crown Estate land etc. However, these are not material planning considerations and will not influence the site selection process.
3.37 In addition to the generic comments referred to above and which were common to many sites, there were some issues raised by residents which related to specific sites/villages. These included the use of Moog factory site in Bilbrook as a possible housing site; car parking for schools; retirement village developments; and an increase in affordable and specialist elderly units. A summary of all representations can be viewed online. (See also Appendix D)

**Employment – Preferred Site Extensions**

3.38 There was support from developers for the extension to the west of i54 South Staffordshire, and for extensions to ROF Featherstone, including for the new link road to ROF. Concerns were noted that the quantum of employment land proposed was not sufficient and that additional land should be safeguarded. Some respondents objected to the inclusion of the ROF site on the basis of viability issues, stating that the site had yet to be developed despite being allocated for 20 years. There was support from developers for extensions to Hilton Cross and Hilton Main, and other alternative employment sites at Junction 11 M6 and Dunston, in addition to or instead of the preferred site extensions. Concern was also expressed that the proposed extensions exceeded the ‘modest’ expansion referred to in the Core Strategy.

3.39 Staffordshire County Council supported the SAD employment proposals at i54 and ROF, including the ROF access road. There was support too for extensions to ROF Featherstone from Featherstone Parish Council, subject to the provision of landscaping to protect the amenity of the village.

3.40 A small number of residents objected to the ROF Featherstone site extensions on the basis of impact and loss of Green Belt, highways issues, including volume of traffic, hazardous materials on site and the impact on the natural environment.

**Employment – ROF Featherstone Road Proposals**

3.41 Comments from the development industry comprised one outright objection to the proposed access options because the road would have a significant impact on the landscape and the setting of Mosley Old Hall. Others lent support to option C as the most credible option, with one planning agent suggesting an alternative route be explored.

3.42 There were objections from Essington Parish council, the National Trust and the local MP, to Routes A and B (as shown in the SAD) because of the loss of and impact on the Green Belt; highways issues, including volume of traffic; significant impact on the setting and character of listed buildings and heritage asserts (Moseley Old Hall and surrounds); impact on the natural environment and lack of SA of route options. There was support from Featherstone and Essington Parish councils and the National Trust for route C. Highways England and Natural England commented on the need for highways improvements and the requirements for a Masterplan for future development. Wolverhampton City council noted that access options should not have a detrimental impact on the Wolverhampton road network and that infrastructure should recognise other modes of transport.

3.43 There was one comment from a resident in support of the principle of a new access road, which would reduce congestion on local roads, provide new jobs and improve accessibility to Mosely Old Hall. There was considerable opposition from local residents, not only within South Staffordshire, but from local people in Wolverhampton and from National Trust Members to the provision of a new road. Objections included loss and impact on Green Belt, highways issues,
impact on wildlife and the natural environment; impact on local amenity and the impact on a heritage asset and surrounding land at Moseley Old Hall.

Gypsy and Traveller – Preferred Pitch Options

3.44 All comments from planning agents about individual sites came from agents representing the Gypsy and Traveller community. Whilst there was support for the pitches as identified, it was also suggested that additional pitches, over and above those allocated, should also be considered as extensions to existing sites. There was also support for sites that had been discounted after Issues and Options and for the promotion of new sites. Comments were made about the robustness of the 2014 GTAA, in particular in relation to turnover.

3.45 Essington Parish council supported site GT14 and suggested that another pitch at site GT24 be removed and added to a different site. There were objections from Hatherton Parish council, Hatherton and Longford Residents’ Group and Wombourne Parish council to the allocation of pitches in their localities for a number of reasons including highways issues, impact on Green Belt, unsustainable location, access to school places, disproportionate spread of sites in District, social cohesion problems and cumulative impact. The Environment Agency advised on main and foul sewerage requirements and objected to a site in Prestwood due to its location in the functional flood plain. Comments also related to the provision of pitches on sites where previously planning applications had been refused, or where temporary permissions exist. Historic England made general comments about assessment of and potential impact on heritage assets.

3.46 Responses from residents were overwhelmingly objections to sites/pitches; in particular sites at Long lane, Newtown; High House, Hatherton; and New Stables Poplar Lane. The mains reasons for objections were contrary to Green Belt policy, previous planning history, unsuitable access/highway, social cohesion issues, disproportionate spread of sites, proximity to settled community, and the ‘in combination’ effect of along with other site/pitch proposals. There was support for pitch provision from site owners.

Summary of Responses to Preferred Options Addendum Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulations Assessments (HRA) Consultation

3.47 Due to the nature of this consultation which was of a more technical nature, there were significantly fewer responses than to the Preferred Options consultation. Responses were, in the main, from statutory bodies such as Highways England, Historic England, Cannock Chase AONB Unit etc. There was general support for the studies, subject to mitigation measures, taking on board site specific recommendations and further technical work. The National Trust objected to two of the nine road options consulted on.

3.48 There was one response from a planning agent which was a site specific representation suggestion that one housing site should be reconsidered in the light of its sustainability credentials. In relation to the road options for ROF Featherstone another planning agent raised concerns that there was insufficient supporting evidence, including traffic modelling, impacts on the wider highway network, viability or costs appraisals, land acquisition and harm on heritage assets.

3.49 A local Wolverhampton City Councillor supported the delivery of ROF, but not any of the road options south of the M54. Responses from residents related to
general sustainability issues of settlements and or sites, rather than to the content of the documents themselves.

4. **Responses to Supporting Documents**

**SAD Methodology Paper**

4.1 The Methodology Paper that was published with the Preferred Options SAD was a revised version of that published in March 2014 as part of the Main Issues and Options consultation. The revisions had been made as a result of the comments received to the earlier version.

4.2 There was some support from the development industry for the refined methodology, saying the assessment process was robust, effective and that the RAG scoring was clear. Other comments felt that it was flawed; that it was too simple; that the weight given to the issues should have been different, and that the highways assessment was too limited. It was suggested that the Green Belt Review should have been site specific rather than strategic based and that landscape character was weighted too highly in the process. Some representations disagreed with the scoring of individual sites and considered that the Council had assessed sites incorrectly and that changes should be made. Comments were also made that the provision of additional material through responses which could mitigate against scoring outcomes in the methodology paper should weigh in favour of certain sites. Although not a point made at Issues and Options stage some respondents felt that community benefit should have been a consideration in the determination of choice of sites.

4.3 No comments from residents.

**SAD Preferred Option - Sustainability Appraisal**

4.3 There was general support for the SA and the majority of comments related to site specific issues. One respondent felt that the SA had not considered commercial or recreational issues in relation to the Cannock Chase SAC.

4.4 Staffordshire County Council raised a number of points relating to the historic environment. A separate meeting was arranged to discuss a way forward with the County Council and Historic England, and the methodology for the assessment of sites for the Publication Plan was amended as a result. The Environment Agency raised a number of points regarding water and flooding issues. Staffordshire Wildlife Trust felt that site appraisal should have been finer grained at Preferred Options stage.

**SAD Preferred Option - Habitats Regulations Assessments**

4.5 There were very few comments on the HRA reports, with one objection, and one comment regarding the importance of mitigation when considering the Cannock Chase SAC.

**Green Belt Review/Landscape Sensitivity Study**

4.6 A number of respondents submitted evidence and/or comments that these studies had not assessed parcels of land appropriately, and that as a result some sites had not been scored correctly. Some planning agents submitted their own assessments as alternatives to the Council’s studies, whilst others felt that amendments should be made to the original documents. Comments were made that the strategic nature of the Green Belt parcels/Landscape cover parcels
disadvantaged some sites and that a more fine grained approach should have been taken in the applying the methodology.

5. **Outcomes**

5.1 As a result of the information submitted in response to the consultations a number of studies were revisited and statutory bodies asked for further information. Representations which challenged the Green Belt Review and the Landscape Sensitivity Study were evaluated, and where necessary, were sent to the independent consultants who undertook the work, for further analysis and comment. In addition where concerns had been raised about site specific issues which necessitated further investigation, we contacted the appropriate organisation/ bodies and asked them to look again at the issues raised. This included further meetings and correspondence with County Highways, County Education, County Flood Risk Team, Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water Ltd, Historic England, County Historic Environment Team, Natural England, Environmental Health, and the Coal Authority.

5.2 Some submissions from site promoters contained detailed information that was intended to mitigate against the scoring which informed the Preferred Option site selection process. This additional information was carefully considered and where it justified a change, scoring was adjusted appropriately.

5.3 Taking on board all this information and the responses from the consultants on the Green Belt and Landscape Sensitivity studies, each site was re-assessed and rescored. In some cases this led to a change in the Preferred Site Options, most notably where Green Belt scoring had been revised. All changes to site scoring can be seen in the Site Selection and Discounted Sites Paper January 2017.

6. **Summary**

5.1 The Council undertook wide ranging public consultation with stakeholders, landowners, developers, statutory bodies and local communities in line with the requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, our adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and under the Duty to Co-operate. This resulted in just over 8 weeks public consultation on the SAD Preferred Options in 2015/16 and a further 6 weeks on the SA/HRA Addendum papers.

5.2 The consultations were widely publicised through a variety of means including online, posters, public exhibitions, the Council’s Review newspaper, and social media including Twitter and Facebook. Officers were available throughout the consultations to answer queries and discuss the proposals in person, by telephone and through email.

5.4 The responses to the consultations have been read and recorded and the information in them has been used to take the SAD forward to Publication stage. This has involved a significant amount of work and includes reassessment and rescoring of sites and in some cases a change in the site being taken forward in the Publication Plan. Where changes have been made reasoned justification for the changes has been provided.
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## Appendix D
### Summary of Responses from Residents to Preferred Options Housing Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>A or S*</th>
<th>Preferred Options</th>
<th>Issues &amp; Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Pendeford Mill Lane, Bilbrook</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Pendeford Mill Lane, Bilbrook</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Engleton Lane, Brewood</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55/68</td>
<td>Four Ashes Road, Brewood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Saredon Road, Cheslyn Hay</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Saredon Road, Cheslyn Hay</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>W-ton Road, Cheslyn Hay</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Watery Lane, Codsall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Histons Hill, Codsall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Keepers Lane, Codsall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Keepers Lane, Codsall</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Wergs Hall Road, Codsall</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>West School Lane, Coven</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>East School Lane, Coven</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Hobnock Road, Essington</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Brinsford Lodge, Featherstone</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Adj Brinsford Lodge</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Pool View, Great Wyrley</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>154a Walsall Road, Great Wyrley</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Love Lane, Great Wyrley</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Jacobs Hall Lane, Great Wyrley</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pear Tree Farm, Huntington</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Hyde Lane, Kinver</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>White Hill Kinver</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>White Hill, Kinver</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Moor Lane, Pattingham</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>West Wrottesley Road, Perton</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>West Wrottesley Road, Perton</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Church Road, Swindon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Church Lane, Swindon</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Back Lane/Ivetssey Road, Wheaton Aston</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281a</td>
<td>Ounsdale Road, Wombourne</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Bridgnorth Road, Wombourne</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Beggars Bush Lane, Wombourne</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Bridgnorth Road, Wombourne</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Orton Lane, Wombourne</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A* Allocation or *S* Safeguarded
Site Allocations Document
Preferred Options Response Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print name:</th>
<th>Agent: Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate which document (e.g. Preferred Options Document; Methodology Paper etc.), page number(s), paragraph number(s) and site reference number(s) that your comments refer to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page Number(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph Number(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please turn over
### Contact Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Address:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that your contact details will not be published, but **your comments are not confidential** and will be summarised in a Schedule of Responses which will be published as part of the Site Allocations process.

All comments should be made in writing using this response form, or by email, letter or via our online consultation system.

*Responses should be received no later than **12 noon on Friday 12th February 2016***
Motorists - Protect your valuables

South Staffordshire has one of the lowest crime rates in the Midlands but you cannot be too careful.

Car crime is upsetting and annoying and it could cause a lot of inconvenience – you could be without your vehicle for weeks, waiting for the garage to make repairs or the insurers to pay up. Police are urging drivers to take simple crime prevention measures to deter would-be thieves who target vehicles with valuables left on display.

Advice to residents is that you should ensure your vehicle is securely locked including passenger doors and sunroof, and that alarms or immobilisers are switched on, even if you are just popping to a car park ticket machine, or to pay for petrol.

Remove EVERYTHING from your car when parking including Sat Nav cradles and phone holders - even a bag of rubbish or a jacket can convince a thief it’s something worth stealing. Vehicles with valuables left on display are easy pickings for opportunist thieves and they can steal thousands of pounds worth of goods, or even the vehicle itself, in seconds.

Secure your vehicle in a garage overnight if you have one. If not, park in well-lit areas where possible.

Keep car keys out of sight at home - away from windows, doors and letterboxes to reduce the chances of thieves stealing them.

Report any suspicious activity to your local police immediately by calling the non emergency police telephone number 101 or anonymously to the independent charity, CrimeStoppers on 0800 555 111.

If you see a crime in progress, always dial 999.

Our Local Plan Update

Site Allocations
2014 was a busy year for the Local Plans Team.
We carried out three major consultations of which we received over 2500 responses.
You can read the responses received and our summary of comments online at www.sstaffs.gov.uk/siteallocations

Where are we now?
We are now evaluating the sites to see which should be taken forward as our preferred options. We may need to contact some site promoters for more information in the next few weeks.

The results of our evaluations will be published with the preferred options so that you can see why a site has been chosen, or has been discounted.

We are aiming to publish the chosen sites and pitches in the summer of 2015, subject to member agreement. There will be a full public consultation, for a minimum of six weeks, on the preferred options and we welcome your views.

consultation, Consultation, Consultation

We have read all the comments that were made to us of each of the three consultations. In addition to comments raised by residents and local parish councils we have received responses from stakeholders and statutory bodies covering issues such as highways, flooding, the impact on the environment, the historic environment and heritage assets. Comments were made not only on the suitability of specific sites, but also on our approach to site selection and the criteria we planned to use to evaluate sites further.

As a result of these comments, we have looked again at our approach and made some changes to take board what was suggested. You will be able to see the revised procedure when we publish our chosen sites later in the year. We have produced a summary of the responses we received and these can be found on the website at www.sstaffs.gov.uk/planning4places

Community Council of Staffordshire
We asked the Community Council to carry out some independent consultation with local people about the SAD (Site Allocation Document) and they arranged to attend a number of local events to ask people what they thought of the suggested sites. You can see their report online and the information in it will be very useful in understanding the concerns of local people. Find the reports at www.sstaffs.gov.uk/consultation

Next Steps
The next stage of the SAD work is to publish the preferred options. Once we are happy that we have made the right choices, we will publish a final SAD and then, following another round of consultation, submit the SAD formally to the Secretary of State. He will appoint an independent Inspector to look at all aspects of the SAD and who will hold

Other Projects
• Consultation on the Open Space Strategy ended in March 2015 and we hope it will be adopted in later in the year.
• The South Staffordshire Village Design Guide has been updated and will be published for comments in June 2015. This will be a six week consultation.

Keep in touch
If you would like to sign up for all Local Plan news and consultations, then please complete the eform at www.sstaffs.gov.uk/Planning4Places
For more information on the SAD process or any aspect of the Local Plan, please call the Local Plans Team on 01902 696593 or email localplans@sstaffs.gov.uk
Look out for more information in the South Staffordshire Review, or at your local library, leisure centre and of course your local Parish Council.
STOP AND THINK
DON’T ACCEPT DOMESTIC ABUSE

Christmas and New Year can be incredibly difficult for victims of domestic abuse.

Domestic abuse is not always physical. It can be of an emotional, sexual or mental nature. It can happen between heterosexual and homosexual couples, family members and offenders can be men and women.

People found guilty could face up to 14-years in prison.

Councillor Roger Lees, Cabinet Member for Public Health Protection Services said: “Domestic abuse is never ok. Men and women can be victims but it is also an offence that affects more than those direct victims. It affects children, wider families and friends.

South Staffordshire Council view Domestic Abuse very seriously, and through the Community Safety Partnership the council is working extremely closely with key partners to safeguard and protect victims of domestic abuse.”

Staffordshire Police treats incidents of violence and domestic abuse very seriously and always strives to find safe measures for victims.

There are many organisations that also offer help and advice. Victims can contact Staffordshire Women’s Aid (Stafford, Cannock, South Staffordshire and Staffordshire Moorlands) on 0870 2700 123.

For more information, advice for victims and offenders, please visit www.staffordshire.police.uk/info_advice/victims/domestic_abuse/

Site Allocations - Where are we now?
Following our initial assessment and evaluation of sites, which took on board the wide ranging consultation responses from residents, we pulled together our key findings and scored them against a range of key planning issues. These included impact on the Green Belt, landscape quality, historic and natural environmental and highways issues.

Members of the council have since agreed for the planning team to contact the promoters of the best scoring sites to discuss in more detail how these sites would provide the much needed housing, and where appropriate, community benefit for South Staffordshire. Members also agreed for more work to be carried out to consider extensions to our four main employment sites and to meet our need for new gypsy pitches.

Cabinet Member for Strategic Services, Cllr Bob McCordle said: “Our consultation process has proved to be extremely valuable. All the information gathered has provided us with the insight we needed for future planning arrangements. Thank you to everyone who took the time to take part.”

Next Steps
We hope to be consulting on the preferred sites in December and will consult publicly on whichever sites are chosen. The consultation will last for a minimum of six weeks and will be widely publicised. You will have the opportunity to make your views known when the consultation is underway.

Keep in the loop
You can see all the work so far and keep updated at www.sstaffs.gov.uk/siteallocations
You can also sign up for all Local Plan news and consultations, by completing the eform at www.ssstaffs.gov.uk/Planning4Places

Help us to help you!
If you have previously made comments on any of our consultations we will automatically contact you to let you know when a new consultation begins. The best way to do this is by email. So if we only have your postal address and write to you each time, please let us have your email address if you have one. It’s the quickest and cheapest way to get all the Local Plans news, as soon as it is available.
Call us on 01902 696593 or email localplans@sstaffs.gov.uk to let us know your details.

www.sstaffs.gov.uk/siteallocations
The Council has published Preferred Options Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SAD) for public consultation alongside a number of supporting documents.

There is an 8 week period during which you can make comments on the SAD and it is available to view on our website at www.sstaffs.gov.uk/siteallocations. The SAD, response forms and a frequently asked questions sheet are also available at the following locations:

- South Staffordshire Solutions at the Council Offices, Wolverhampton Road, Codsall WV8 1PX on Mondays – Fridays 8.45am to 5.00pm.

And at the following locations during normal opening hours:

- Public Libraries at Brewood, Cheslyn Hay, Codsall, Great Wyrley, Kinver, Penkridge, Perton, Wombourne and Staffordshire County Mobile and Trailer Libraries operating in the District.
- Parish Council Offices in the District.
- South Staffordshire Leisure Centres at Cheslyn Hay, Codsall, Penkridge and Wombourne

If you would like to make any comments, you can do so via our consultation website www.sstaffs.gov.uk/siteallocations, or by email direct to sadconsultation@sstaffs.gov.uk or hard copy to the address above.

**Consultation Period:** 15th Dec 2015 until 12 Noon 12th February 2016.

For further information please contact the Local Plans Team on 01902 696593 or see our website at www.sstaffs.gov.uk.

**Plans and Supporting Documentation – Dec 2015**

Site Allocations Document (SAD) 'Preferred Options’ Consultation Document

Site Allocations Document (SAD) 'Preferred Options’ Consultation Statement
Site Allocations Document (SAD) ‘Preferred Options’ Methodology Paper
Site Allocations Document (SAD) Site Assessment and Discounted Sites Paper – Explanation of Matrix Assessment Criteria
Site Allocations Document (SAD) Site Assessment and Discounted Sites Topic Paper
Site Allocations Document (SAD) ‘Preferred Options’ Consultation Habitats Regulation Assessment
Site Allocations Document (SAD) ‘Preferred Options’ Consultation Sustainability Appraisal
Consultation on the preferred sites for new housing, employment land, and gypsy and traveller pitches runs from
Tuesday 15th December 2015 to Friday 12th February 2016

You can see the documents on the Council’s website, or at the Council Offices in Codsall, your local parish council office, and libraries and leisure centres in South Staffordshire

Please take this opportunity to let us have your views