

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?**

Taylor Wimpey has responded to points a), b) and h) below.

- 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.

SSDC 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 and that no development is proposed adjacent to the Black Country conurbation which is arguably more sustainable than the settlements within the District.

- h) The impact of the removal of the draft allocation at Cross Green (draft Policy SA2 of Publication Plan 2022) as a draft allocation has not been duly considered against the delivery of the Brinsford Park and Ride station and ROF Featherstone which are both noted as key projects in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (document reference CD11).

Taylor Wimpey set out site specific comments on their land interests at Cross Green and Linthouse Lane in their Regulation 19 response to Policy SA3 which we have not repeated here.