South Staffordshire EIP – Matter 7 Response Respondent Reference AGT24-037-01-01 to AGT24-037-01-09

Savills on behalf of Barratt West Midlands



Matter 7 - Issue 1

Question 1.

In terms of the proposed planned housing and employment developments:

- a) Is the spatial distribution of the allocations across the South Staffordshire area justified and is it consistent with the Spatial Strategy?
- b) Has the identification and selection of the proposed site allocations been robustly evidenced and subject to robust, consistent and transparent methodologies, including in relation to the approach to existing committed sites?
- c) Is the methodology for assessing the heritage impacts of site allocations robust and are the site-specific requirements for each site allocation consistent with it?
- d) What evidence is there that education provision can be secured in a sustainable manner to support each of the housing allocations?
- e) Is the approach of the Plan to air quality matters relating to planned growth sound?
- f) For any site allocations with a known flood risk, how has that been considered, both in terms of assessing the capacity of the site and any measures necessary to manage the issue? Will the measures be effective and are they consistently applied across the relevant proposed allocations in the Plan?
- g) The Council has set the requirements for each site allocation within appendix B. Is that approach effective? Are the key requirements for each site allocation justified and sufficiently clear?
- h) Do the proposed allocations have a reasonable prospect of meeting the other relevant policies of the development plan? What evidence of this exists?
- a) and b) There has been an inconsistent approach taken to the spatial distribution of sites and why the selected sites have been pursued above other reasonable alternatives.

South Staffordshire District Council also claims to be pursuing a strategy of growth around Tier 1 settlements but allocations are still proposed adjacent to less sustainable settlements. There is no justification provided as to why sites adjacent to less sustainable settlements have been pursued above more growth being directed to Kinver.

Barratt West Midlands set out site specific comments on their land interests to the north and south of Dunsley Road, Kinver (site references 549 and 550) in their Regulation 19 response to Policy SA3 which we have not repeated here.