

OTHER SUGGESTED BIDDULPH SITES FROM PREFERRED SITES AND BOUNDARIES CONSULTATION APRIL 2016

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
IN DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY			
BD004	In the settlement boundary See RAG table for site details	<p><u>SCC Highways</u> Access off City Bank requires visibility over third party land. There can be no intensification of use of this access without a visibility improvement. Can this plot be combined with BD064 and BD138a?</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Possible contamination from former mill?</p> <p><u>Ownership</u> No certainty over owner – appears to be one individual for part of site but large part unregistered. Have written to him several times most recently 12/8/16 to establish whether he would be willing to release land for development or not? Awaiting reply.</p>	No
Chells Builders Merchants	In town boundary Existing employment use but business has been asked to move.	<p><u>Ownership</u> Landowner won't release (18/08/2016). Without owner support the land cannot be taken forward as an allocation.</p>	No
Land on east side of Biddulph Bypass (currently designated Visual Open Space)	In town boundary. <u>VOS Designation</u> Allocated as VOS in Biddulph Town Centre AAP. The Visual Open Space (VOS) next to Chells has been re-assessed along with all the other VOS designations as part of the Landscape, Heritage and Local Green Space Study as this	<p><u>Ownership</u> Landowner won't release (18/08/2016). Without owner support the land cannot be taken forward as an allocation.</p>	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
	is now an old designation which is not included within National Planning Policy Guidance. The NPPF allows Council's to allocate 'Local Green Space' which meets specific criteria within Local Plans. This particular site is not considered suitable for a Local Green Space designation as it does not meet the criteria so there is an opportunity to consider it as a development site.		
Brown Lees Chapel	Too small for an allocation. Could come forward independently from the plan as it is within the development boundary.		No
Jackson's Nursery BD108	See site pro-forma – already included as a proposed allocation.		Yes
Meadows Playing Field	Sport England would object and it would need to be replaced elsewhere, needed as open space for new housing.		No
Redundant and under-utilised buildings around Congleton Rd/Cross St/ Stringer St/ Walley St and Station Rd. (photograph attached)	<u>Supporter's Comments</u> This is a brownfield urban site which requires regeneration and redevelopment, existing businesses could be re-located within a mixed use development of affordable starter homes and business units, similar to the development in Fairfax Close opposite the site - this is an area of the town that is constantly referred to by Biddulph Residents as a reason to object to ANY greenfield development.		See response on mills – Yarn Mill, Minster Mill, Albion Mills, Gas Yard and Town Councils Masterplan.

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
BD101 Yarn Mill	Owner supports (email of 9/8/2016)	See RAG table for site details	Yes
BD102 Minster Mill	Owner supports (email of 16/5/14)	See RAG table for site details	Yes
Albion Mills, Station Road	<p><u>Planning history</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 93/00639/OLD – Change of use to gym and fitness centre APPROVED • SMD/2010/0777 – Demolition of existing building and construction of 9 town houses (outline) to include access and layout. REFUSED • SMD/2011/0783 - Demolition of existing building and construction of 9 town houses (outline) APPROVED (expired in 2014) • SMD/2013/0894 – Change of use to 6 self contained flats INVALID 	<p>Allocations need to be for a minimum of 10 dwellings in the towns. This is too small and could come forward independently of the plan as a windfall.</p> <p>Biddulph Town Council’s Masterplan is considering this area and this could assist in bringing the site forward. There is clearly developer interest as this is reflected in the planning history.</p>	No
Gas Works Station Road	<p>(Land is apparently up for sale)</p> <p>Gas works yard has had planning approval in the past for 2 dwellings SMD/2007/1063. A subsequent attempt was made for 4 dwellings also in 2007 which was refused.</p>	<p>Contamination</p> <p>Allocations need to be for a minimum of 10 dwellings in the towns. This is too small and could come forward independently of the plan as a windfall.</p>	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
Site adjacent Victoria Court, Brown Lees Rd, Brown Lees (photograph attached)	A small site that could mirror the Victoria Court Apartments on Brown Lees Rd which would have good links to A527, the BVW NCR55 and new primary school at Brown Lees. 	Allocations need to be for a minimum of 10 dwellings in the towns. This is too small and could come forward independently of the plan as a windfall. Owner intent - unknown Viability of apartments - unknown	No
IN GREEN BELT			
Former Quarry off Tunstall Road / Bemersley Road		Green Belt <u>Green Belt Review (Site 8 – 2016)</u> Not recommended for release reflecting the absence of an outer boundary, with no clear feature to contain development which would contribute to sprawl along the A527 Biddulph Road towards Brindley Ford. <u>Mining legacy</u> Statmap layers provided by Coal Authority show it's a high risk development area but no	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<p>mine entries are shown on the site. Coal Authority (general response – not site specific) “it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.” (Viability issue – investigative work required by developer).</p> <p><u>Owner</u> Unknown</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> May be an issue due to previous use.</p>	
Land East of Childerplay Road		<p>Green Belt</p> <p><u>Green Belt Review (Site 1 – 2016)</u> Not recommended for release because of the role of Green Belt in containing Biddulph, the scale and poorly bounded character of the site on its eastern extent.</p> <p><u>Mining legacy</u> Statmap layers provided by Coal Authority show that around two thirds of the site is a high risk development area but no mine entries are shown on the site. Coal Authority (general response – not site specific) “it is important to note that land</p>	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<p>instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.” (Viability issue – investigative work required by developer).</p> <p><u>Ownership</u> Unknown</p>	
<p>The old Bemersley Road council tip site adjoining Childerplay Road.</p>	<p><u>Supporter’s Comments</u> Childerplay Lane (photograph attached) This area, is the old industrial centre of Biddulph South, on both sides of the road straddle the old Whiston Slag Company, discharged with disposing and processing iron ore slag from Robert Heath's iron works and latterly on the south side, an opencast coal mine. As a consequence, the land quality is very poor. I would propose that the northern side of the road is utilised for open air business use - re-locating the hauliers from Wharf Road in Biddulph Town, whilst the southern side bordered by Bermersley Road from "The Matador" is used as a business industrial estate.</p>	<p>Green Belt</p> <p><u>Green Belt Review (Site 7 – 2016)</u> Not recommended for release reflecting its separation from the built edge of Biddulph and effect on openness.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Due to previous use.</p> <p><u>Mining Legacy</u> Statmap layers provided by Coal Authority show that vast majority of site is a high risk development area but no mine entries are shown on the site. Coal Authority (general response – not site specific) “it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new</p>	<p>No</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<p>development is safe, stable and sustainable.” (Viability issue – investigative work required by developer).</p>	
<p>Land North of Woodhouse Lane, between Woodhouse Middle School and Woodhouse Farm</p>	<p><u>Supporter’s Comments</u> A small but significant parcel of land about the same size as Newpool which has excellent connectivity to the A527 via Woodhouse Lane, local schools and shops on Smithy Lane/Congleton Rd. Considering the land lost off Pennine Way, this would be the only development within this sector of Biddulph North.</p>	<p>Green Belt. Considered in SHLAA but C Class due to potential impact on Registered Park and Garden and National Trust property. Was not a site option.</p>	<p>No</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
<p>Derelict farm buildings and Pottery on Mow Lane, Gillow Heath (photograph attached)</p>	<p><u>Supporter's Comments</u> This is small but significant site within the greenbelt, but consists of two areas of dereliction either side of Mow Lane, this would be ideal for an "Executive Home/ Barn Conversion to produce 8 - 12 quality units, the development of which would remove a crumbling eyesore, and allow for footpath instigation on this section of Mow Lane. The footprint of the plot would be within the "brown" land with current trees being retained as a screen.</p>	<p>Not suitable for allocation - In the Green Belt and open countryside – does not directly adjoin the town boundary.</p> <p>Could possibly be developed under existing NPPF policy if brownfield and new development not having a greater impact on openness of Green Belt than what is already on the site.</p>	<p>No</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
<p>Derelict farm buildings and Pottery on Mow Lane, Gillow Heath (photograph attached)</p>	<p><u>Supporter's Comments</u> This is small but significant site within the greenbelt, but consists of two areas of dereliction either side of Mow Lane, this would be ideal for an "Executive Home/ Barn Conversion to produce 8 - 12 quality units, the development of which would remove a crumbling eyesore, and allow for footpath instigation on this section of Mow Lane. The footprint of the plot would be within the "brown" land with current trees being retained as a screen;</p>	<p>Not suitable for allocation - In the Green Belt and open countryside – does not directly adjoin the town boundary.</p> <p>Could possibly be developed under existing NPPF policy if brownfield and new development not having a greater impact on openness of Green Belt than what is already on the site.</p>	<p>No</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
<p>Change of status from Mixed Use to Affordable Housing (photograph attached)</p>	<p><u>Supporter's Comments</u> This site was originally allocated to Mixed Use - business and housing, the close proximity to Victoria Row and Mill Hayes recreational area and the potential primary school nearby would render the site eminently more suited to 100% housing, this would be a far more acceptable proposition, with business being reallocated to the poor land at A036/A036a</p>	<p>Childerplay Lane sites are not considered suitable for Green Belt Release (see above) so employment could not be moved there.</p> <p>There is a demand for employment units in the town and this is considered to be the most suitable site to achieve this, having good road links and being adjacent to the Victoria Business Park as well as being considered suitable for Green Belt Release. The housing element on the site will assist with viability. Therefore, it is recommended that the mixed use allocation on this site remains.</p>	<p>Yes – retain as mixed use employment / housing site.</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
<p>ALTERNATIVE BROWN LEES SITE / Site Known as 'Victoria Colliery' (photographs attached)</p>	<p><u>Supporter's Comments</u></p> <p>This site was promoted during and after the opencast and subsequent land reclamation as mixed business and housing with a significant public open space together with an improved former railway trackbed into the Biddulph Valley Way NCR55 - little of this has happened. The fields within the SMDC boundary adjacent to the A527 can provide a significant number of housing, the BVW NCR55 could be metalled and made into a safer route to the town centre and Brown Lees, whilst servicing a Primary School built on land at A050/A051 below.</p> <p>This is a potentially large site with excellent access to Brown Lees Rd at the head of the BVW NCR55, leading up to Brook St, if the site incorporates the unmodernised farm and outbuildings at the western head of the site. The site is large</p>	<p>(SHLAA record says - FRA needed. SW floodplain and watercourses on site. Surface Water sewer seems to discharge to site)</p> <p>Mining legacy – former open cast mining area. Statmap layers provided by Coal Authority show it's a high risk development area (surface mining) but no mine entries are shown on the site.</p> <p>Coal Authority (general response – not site specific) "it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new</p>	<p>No</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
	<p>enough - especially with the potential of building a school and providing playing fields on NuL Administered Land adjacent to the site. Access could also be considered opposite Lyneside Road aside the Gardener's Arms Public House.</p> <p><u>Green Belt Review (Site 9 – 2016)</u> “Potential for release under Exceptional Circumstances but proposed outer boundary does not extend to the valley/brook boundary and careful master planning would be required to ensure sensitive modelling of the built edge of Biddulph in this location. Development would have an impact on openness but this is considered not to be significant in light of topography and vegetation cover. Extend town boundary.”</p> <p>Landowner – Willing to release land for development.</p>	<p>development is safe, stable and sustainable.” (Viability issue – investigative work required by developer).</p> <p>Highways – Brook St not acceptable as main access as there are already issues at the Brook St / Brown Lees Road junction but suitable as a secondary access. Primary access should be further towards Tunstall Road but can't achieve this without acquiring third party land. Only other option is to re-direct Biddulph Valley Way to achieve access there. This approach is ok with County Highways.</p> <p>Access not likely adjacent to Gardener's Arms PH as the land is under 3 different titles so multiple owners are involved.</p> <p>Location of site in relation to the town centre – on the southern edge.</p> <p>Site not recommended for taking forward into Preferred Options Local Plan due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An alternative Green Belt site exists adjacent to Wharf Road which will assist with bringing forward a large strategic mixed use regeneration site which is well related to the town centre and its key services and facilities. 	

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
BD109/118/ Land off Brook St - Alternative to BD063a?	See RAG table	GBR says not suitable for release.	No
BD144 West of Towerhill Road - Possible alternative to BD063a?	See RAG table	GBR says not suitable for release.	No
Larger part of BD063a	Owner supports - (see agents response)	<p>Green Belt</p> <p><u>Green Belt Review (Site 3 – 2016)</u> The site is on gently rising land to the rear of Newpool Road and as such presents relatively limited visual intrusion and hence limited impact on openness, but has no significant outer boundary with which to contain development. The site appears to seek to</p>	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<p>'round off' the settlement edge in this location between Tower Hill Road and Newpool Farm, but in so doing cuts across fields and in only one instance uses a recognisable field boundary. In addition, the site does not abut existing development off Meadowside, leaving a remnant field. Not recommended for release due to the absence of a clear outer boundary with which to properly contain development, thus preventing localised sprawl. More modest rounding-off to the east of the site could be considered, using a farm track as a boundary to development.</p>	
BD137	Owner supports	<p>Green Belt Review Parcel N7 (Land to North West of Biddulph) – Contribution towards the following GB purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • significant contribution to preventing neighbouring towns merging; <p>Contribution to checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built – up areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contribution to safeguarding countryside from encroachment; • Contribution to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns; <p>Permanence of GB – current boundaries are firm and largely logical. Sustainable patterns of development – “development would produce an over-extended linear settlement pattern with a limited relationship to Biddulph town proper.”</p>	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<p><u>SHLAA</u> “Eastern part of site (and north) affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3 due to stream. Blanket TPOs to northern part of site (Baileys Wood). This is also identified in PPG17 audit as natural and semi natural open space. Also historic earthwork here. BVW west” (c class)</p>	
BD083	See RAG table	<p>A meeting was held with the Green Belt Consultants and officers on 18th August 2016. Site BD083 was discussed at that meeting and the consultant’s view was that the site is on rising land, the sense of openness would be compromised by development and it is disconnected from urban area, (the Biddulph Valley Way separates it from nearby residential development).</p>	No
Land at Conway House off Harlech Drive	Owner supports if adjacent land is developed.	Same issue as ADD04 – impact on Heritage.	No
Land associated with 62 Mill Hayes Road	<p><u>Supporter’s Comments</u> Request that land associated with 62 Mill Hayes Road (your reference BD131 - see attached map) be considered for release from the Green Belt. The land extends to 6.35 acres and has a road frontage which would provide the best point of access into land north of Mill Hayes Road.</p>	<p>Green Belt. <u>Green Belt Review</u> Allows for release of the land if exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. <u>Other Issues</u> If developed alone appears incongruous – would have to be part of a wider development for this area. Close to a site of geological importance.</p>	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		An alternative site exists which will help to bring forward a key regeneration area in a central part of the town so land on this site is not needed.	
Underwood Farm, Gillow Heath, Biddulph	Owner supports	<p><u>Green Belt Review Assessment – April 2017</u> Not recommended for release. Development would be a clear intrusion into open countryside, without substantial boundaries with which it could be contained. A new built edge to Gillow Heath (and Biddulph) would be created which would be of a linear character and not constitute a logical rounding-off of the settlement.</p> <p><u>SHLAA</u> Part A – divorced from settlement. Not assessed in SHLAA Part B – Partial SHLAA assessment – BD123 (old coal yard only – divorced from settlement – may be NPPF compliant as it is brownfield?) C class in SHLAA. BD139 – “The whole of the site has been identified in the Landscape & Settlement Setting Study as being important to the setting of the settlement. Rural character of the area. Wedgewood Lane provides a strong edge to the settlement at this point. FRA needed.” – C class.</p>	No
Marsh Green Nursery off Well Lane Gillow Heath	Promoted by agent on behalf of owner.	<p><u>Green Belt Review Assessment – April 2017</u> Consider for release under Exceptional Circumstances. Notwithstanding the</p>	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<p>contribution of the land to the Green Belt in this locality, development would not cause significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt, reflecting the bounded nature of the site and the character of existing built form, combining both residential properties and the garden nursery. Of the two options, the smaller would be less damaging, being more closely related to the current built edge at Well Lane and limiting the interface with open countryside to the north west. However, there is no obvious significant feature between the two options which would serve as a reasonable long term boundary.</p> <p><u>SCC Highways</u> Marsh Green Road is poor and would really need some improvement before I could be comfortable with development using it as access. It would need at least widening but if sites BD068 and BD083 are still proposed, these would be significantly beneficial. All sites could then contribute to improvements at Marsh Green Road/Congleton Road junction. BD083 would be essential. The existing traffic generation of the existing use as nursery could be taken into account to offset against the proposed residential use. Transport Statement would be required. However, given the poor geometry and alignment of Marsh Green Road, some</p>	

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<p>improvement would be essential for any sizeable development.</p> <p>An alternative site exists which will help to bring forward a key regeneration area in a central part of the town so land on this site is not needed.</p>	
BD067a-c	See RAG table	GBR does not support.	No
BD138a and BD138b	See agent's comments (2 owners and 2 agents) See RAG table	GBR does not support.	No
Hurst Quarry, Hurst Road	<p>Owner supports – see agent's comments</p> <p><u>Recent planning application</u> SMD/2016/0127 - withdrawn</p>	<p><u>Green Belt Review:</u> Parcel N8 (Land to north east of Biddulph) – Contribution towards the following GB purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check unrestricted sprawl; • Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment; • Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. <p>Permanence of GB – Characterised by strong logical boundaries along inner and outer edges. Sustainable patterns of development – development not appropriate.</p> <p>Impact on Green Belt and unsustainable location. (Would have to argue on brownfield land NPPF policy)</p>	No
BD064	<p><u>Owner supports</u> Recent email from owner's representative.</p>	<p><u>Included at Site Options Stage</u> Not included at Preferred Options Stage because not recommended for release from</p>	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<p>GB in GB Review. See RAG table for site details</p> <p><u>Green Belt Review</u> “The land (including BD138a and BD138b) retains a clear open countryside character, development of which would create visual intrusion and compromise openness, notwithstanding the boundaries provided by Wedgewood Lane / Marshfield Lane/ and an unmade track to Congleton Edge Road”. Not recommended for release.</p> <p><u>Highways</u> The Highway Authority has no difficulties with this development from their point of view. Cumulative impact of several developments in this area would be assessed through a TA.</p>	
Newpool Rd Caravan site	Owner willing to release land for development.	<p><u>Green Belt Review Assessment – April 2017</u></p> <p>Consider for release under Exceptional Circumstances, reflecting no change in the built footprint of development in this location. The site is clearly bounded by the current extent of development, with no risk of sprawl or encroachment into the wider open countryside to the north, and is attached to development at Newpool Road.</p> <p>Difficult to justify exceptional circumstances for release from Green Belt of such a small</p>	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		site. An alternative site exists which will help to bring forward a key regeneration area in a central part of the town so land on this site is not needed.	
Forge Colour Works, Congleton Road	Has planning permission and developers are working to implement it – has contamination issues so have been talking to Environmental Health.	Significant contamination issues.	No
Land on the west side of Biddulph bypass at Woodside Farm	<p>Land available, next to proposed acceptable site, close to town centre, easy access via already proposed site. Needs investigation and consultation according to NP WP.</p> <p><u>Ownership</u> 2 owners – willing to release for development.</p>	<p><u>Green Belt Review Assessment – April 2017</u> Consider for release under Exceptional Circumstances. Development could be considered without significant damage to the wider Green Belt, although there would be an impact on openness given the location of the land. The site largely sits within low-lying land and is clearly bounded to the north and to the east. The south western boundary is problematic, however, comprising various insubstantial hedgerows as well as being arranged by field pattern and not a clear feature which would constitute a logical and permanent external boundary. This would constitute a new settlement edge which would have to be created, without which there would be a danger of sprawl into open countryside over the longer term.</p> <p><u>SCC Highways</u> Alternative access - crossing Biddulph Valley Way in central part of site and integrate with BD071 scheme is acceptable to County Highways.</p>	Yes

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<p><u>Biddulph Valley Way Crossing</u> There are covenants in place associated with crossing this former railway line to gain access and these are being investigated with Network Rail.</p> <p>(See site proforma for full details)</p>	
Former industrial site (formerly an old steel mill)	Located within the urban area. Part of Brown Lees Industrial Estate.		No
OUTSIDE STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT			
Brownfield sites in SOT e.g. Brindley Ford old minerals sites within Stoke and Newcastle.		Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle Borough Council have both been asked whether they would consider development on the old minerals sites within their boundary to meet Staffordshire Moorlands housing requirements. The feedback received in response to this has been negative. Also, circumstances have changed since last year and it is considered that the District can meet its own development needs without using land outside its boundary.	No

OTHER SUGGESTED CHEADLE SITES FROM PREFERRED SITES AND BOUNDARIES CONSULTATION APRIL 2016

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
OUTSIDE GREEN BELT			
Thorley Drive (Keepmoat) Nor submitted as part of consultation.	Suggested for housing . SMD/2016/0083 has outline for 60 dwellings. Land to south and west suggested as extension to existing planning approval.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to the setting of the settlement in the Council’s Landscape & Settlement Character Assessment. • Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Study consider that the site is of high sensitivity, unlikely that the site could be developed without adversely affecting the settlement pattern and encroaching on the wider countryside. Development of the site could also affect the rural approach to Cheadle as views of development • Wider site previously refused by Planning Committee. 	No – previously considered as options site.
IN GREEN BELT			
Harewood Grange Farm (Gregory Grey) PO7032	Suggested for housing. Close proximity to JCB employment site.	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that land in this area is vulnerable to urbanisation. Land identified as important setting to the settlement.	No – other non GB sites available.
Land west of Friars Close (Ken Wainman on behalf of Mr and Mrs Harrison) PO334	Suggested for housing. Sustainable location close to the town centre and of a relatively small size.	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that land in this area is vulnerable to urbanisation. Land identified as important setting to the settlement	No – other non GB sites available.

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
Park Lane (CH168) Ben Weatherley PO6934	Suggested for housing. Sustainable location close to the town centre and of a relatively small size (5 dwellings).	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that the overall impact of development on the purposes of Green Belt was considered to be significant and would create an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. Land identified as important setting to the settlement.	No – other non GB sites available
Park Lane (CH016b) Mrs Wilshaw PO99	Suggested for housing. Sustainable location close to the town centre and of a relatively small size.	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that land in this area is vulnerable to urbanisation. Land identified as important setting to the settlement	No – other non GB sites available.
Nursery Close (Gez Willard) PO6843 (Brown area)	Suggested for housing. Sustainable location close to the town centre and of a relatively small size (10 dwellings).	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that land in this area is vulnerable to urbanisation. Land identified as important setting to the settlement	No- other non GB sites available.
CH093 (John Wren on behalf of Mr Campbell) PO479	Suggested for housing. Land should be taken out of the GB.	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that the overall impact of development on the purposes of Green Belt was considered to be moderate. Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study identified land as high landscape sensitivity and would not fit in well with the existing settlement pattern and encroach into open countryside.	No- other non GB sites available.
Ms Harrison	Suggested for employment uses.	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to	No- other non GB

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
(3 areas) PO6936		<p>release these areas from the GB.</p> <p>Areas 1 & 2 fall within parcel S15 of the Green Belt review and there is some evidence of a role in helping to contain the various industrial intrusions.</p> <p>Area 3 falls within parcel S17 of the Green Belt review which comprises a complex parcel and is seen to check unrestricted sprawl and safeguard from encroachment.</p>	sites available.

OTHER SUGGESTED LEEK SITES FROM PREFERRED SITES AND BOUNDARIES CONSULTATION APRIL 2016

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
IN DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY			
Hughes Concrete/	<p>Outline planning permission SMD/2014/0750 on this site for housing and other uses.</p> <p>Could come forward independently from the plan as it is within the development boundary. Also area is identified as part of the Cornhill opportunity site in the adopted Churnet Valley Masterplan SPD.</p>	<u>No need to allocate – site has permission</u>	No – already has planning approval
Land at Barnfields Industrial Estate	Could come forward independently from the plan as it is within the development boundary	Existing industrial areas in use would not generally be allocated to other uses unless re-provision of equivalent or improved floorspace was involved.	No – existing industrial area
“Use disused mills in the town”	[Unspecified].	<p><u>Included in Large Site Windfall Allowance:</u> unidentified sites in the town boundary are already considered as part of the windfall assumptions in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Schemes arising upon such sites would be treated against relevant Development Plan policies on their own merits. No need to allocate.</p> <p>Note that the following urban mills already enjoy planning consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portland Mill- redevelopment for 35 dwellings (SMD/2015/0523) • London Mill (London St)- redevelopment for 93 dwellings (SMD/2015/0586) 	No – included within large site windfall allowance. Some urban mills already enjoy residential consent.

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • London Mill (Ashbourne Rd)- conversion for 21 light industrial units (SMD/2016/0113) • Big Mill/Shade Mill/Print Works (Belle Vue)- conversion to apartments across all three buildings [and subsequent consents for extensions].(SMD/2004/0254). 	
<p>“Unused land at Sainsburys”</p>	<p>9+ha site, mostly within town boundary; with 3.1ha lying in open countryside to north (1.5ha open space plus car parking and other areas).</p> <p>Major outline consent 10/00041/OMAJEI for supermarket, retail, business units, housing, petrol station and open space across entire site has been partially completed. The disused remainder could therefore be completed at any time. Applications for alternative schemes on the disused remainder would be assessed on their merits.</p> <p>A third party agent responded to 2016 consultation proposing entire undeveloped Churnet Works area be allocated for mixed uses including retail, employment, housing, hotel, leisure with a consequential amendment to the town boundary line to include this (including northern open space area).</p>	<p><u>Northern open space heavily affected by floodplain (FZ3+FZ2). Western parts of undeveloped area also affected by Floodzone2/3.</u></p> <p>Consent contained remediation conditions (ground gas).</p>	<p>No - Site already has mixed use consent.</p> <p>Town boundary to be amended at this location to north, to encompass entire area covered by 10/00041/ OMAJEI consent.</p>
<p>Churnet Valley Farm, off Macclesfield Road (LE002)</p>	<p>Flat fields/hockey pitch in NW of Leek.</p> <p>In FZ2 (Churnet River).</p>	<p>Site is <u>FLOODZONE 2</u>.The Council would need to justify pursuant to the sequential test set out in the NPPF, why this site in FZ2 was selected before other sites outside FZ2/3.</p>	<p>No - Floodzone</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<p><u>Landscape</u> Identified as important landscape setting to settlement.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> Unknown</p>	
Land off Westwood Park Drive (LE126a)	<p>Very steeply sloping site within development boundary. Adjacent to TPOs. Approx. 2.76ha.</p> <p>SCC Highways: The access track off Westwood Park Drive appears too narrow...Access off Davenport Close may be acceptable if the garages could be acquired and demolished (and replacement parking provided). Either access route would seem to need additional land.</p>	<p><u>Access</u> Site appears to be landlocked by existing development. Narrow agricultural access – insufficient for large scale residential development.</p> <p><u>Landscape</u> Identified as important landscape setting to settlement. Visually prominent site.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Potentially too steep to develop.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> Unknown</p>	No – topography / access (although some small scale windfall development may be possible.). No owner support.
Adams Foods (LE154)	Outline planning permission SMD/2013/0561 approved for 60 units lapsed November 2016.	Site has been sold for employment use.	No – Sold for employment
Bode Business Park (LE243)	Representation submitted by WYG on behalf of landowner. Suggest re-location of the Key Plant Automation Limited business and considers residential use is suitable. Considers that new employment land opportunities offer an oversupply and therefore loss of LE243 will have no detrimental impact.	<p><u>Employment Use</u> Loss of employment use. Site is of a good size 2ha and protected by CS Policy E2. Need to retain range of employment sites in Leek.</p> <p>Possible contamination</p>	No – retain for employment

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	<p>Site Area - approx. 2ha Capacity – approx 50 – 60 dwellings (WYG)</p> <p><u>SMDC Environmental health</u>: Some constraints on residential development: Contamination from industrial use, gas issues from adjacent fowlchurch tip</p>		
Former Working Mens Club and sports pitch, Ball Haye Green (LE259)	<p>Representation submitted by Steven Abbot Assocs on behalf of landowner.</p> <p>Access available off Ball Haye Green road.</p>	<p><u>Outdoor Sports Facility</u> Forms part of the supply of outdoor sports provision for Leek. Future balance of outdoor sports facilities (AMR) shows a shortfall for Leek. This is currently being reviewed (Playing Pitch and Open Space update).</p> <p>Sports facilities are protected by Core Strategy Policy C2 and Section 8 NPPF.</p> <p><u>Local Green Space</u> Landscape, LGS & Heritage Impact Study identified area as potential Local Green Space and will be protected from development.</p>	No – sports pitch and Local Green Space
IN GREEN BELT			
Land around Foker Grange, Macclesfield Rd, Leek (LE144)	<p>Agricultural fields abutting town development boundary and west of Macclesfield Road, before Foker Grange Farm access, in Green Belt.</p> <p>Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement</p>	<p><u>Green Belt</u> Green Belt review considers this parcel (N15) forms the northern gateway to Leek and is potentially vulnerable to urbanisation along the A523 with some evidence of this occurring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check unrestricted sprawl – significant contribution • Prevent towns merging – limited contribution 	No – Green Belt

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution • Setting of towns – significant contribution • Assist regeneration – limited contribution • Overall – contribution <p>Landscape Does not relate well to existing settlement and is at a higher level than the town. Prominent site on approach into town.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> Unknown</p>	
Land west of Macclesfield Road (LE103)	<p>Site abuts town boundary, in Green Belt, sloping down to the river Churnet with extensive tree cover along boundaries and NE part of site. In agricultural use.</p> <p>Site partially falls within important landscape setting to Leek in 2008 LSCA.</p>	<p>Land west of Macclesfield Road (LE103)</p> <p><u>Green Belt</u> Green Belt review recommends that this site not be released from the Green Belt for development as it has a ‘moderate’ overall impact upon the five Green Belt Purposes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • check sprawl= significant contribution • maintain separation=limited contribution • prevent encroachment=significant contribution • preserve setting =contribution. <p><u>Landscape</u> Identified as (partially) important landscape</p>	<p>No – Green Belt</p> <p>Site slopes down to the river Churnet with extensive tree cover along boundaries and NE part of site. In agricultural use.</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<p>setting to settlement. Sloping site, partial site screening, but partially visible from main road. Rural appearance.</p> <p>Small strip of site to south affected by floodzone2/FZ3 (River Churnet).</p> <p><u>Availability</u> Unknown.</p>	
<p>Land southeast of Mollatt's Wood Road, Ladderedge</p>	<p>Site suggested by Rob Duncan consultancy on behalf of landowner.</p> <p>0.57ha site lying in the Green Belt, approx 20m SE of existing Leek (Ladderedge) town boundary; accessed off Mollatt's Wood Road. Public right of way runs down road to Caldon Canal.</p> <p>Greenfield, relatively flat, appears to have some on-site trees. Open landscape to E/S.</p> <p>2006 consent for stable block at southern end.</p> <p>Does not form part of important landscape setting to Leek in 2008 LSCA.</p>	<p><u>Green Belt</u> Green Belt Review recommends that land parcel 'C3' which includes this land, not be released from the Green Belt for development as overall makes a 'contribution' to the function of the Green Belt, when measured against the five Green Belt purposes (including a 'significant contribution' to checking unrestricted sprawl).</p> <p>Site is not immediately adjacent to the Leek town boundary.</p> <p><u>Sustainability</u> Site on edge of Leek, approx 2.8km from edge of town centre.</p> <p>Mollatt's Wood Road is narrow cul de sac and unclear if adopted across entire length. Allowance would need to be made for public right of way users.</p>	<p>No - Green Belt</p> <p>Distance from town centre</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
		On-site trees, that would be the subject of protection (or compensation) under the Council's emerging Local Plan Policy NE2.	
IN COUNTRYSIDE (NOT GREEN BELT)			
Land at Milltown Way (LE057 and adjacent land to north and west)	<p>Site is adjacent to town boundary. Falls within Ladydale SBI. A number of TPOs lie within site. Leek Conservation area lies under 100m West.</p> <p>Approx 6.27ha site (accessed off Milltown Way)suggested by Gladmans Devts Ltd who argue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site sustainably located, and not in Green belt • close to public transport links • landscape and heritage impacts associated with previous refusals/appeal dismissals can be overcome with reduced development area • site available/deliverable/achievable • although within LSCA important landscape setting to Leek, this should not preclude allocation of site <p>Site has been subject to a number of unsuccessful residential applications (including dismissed appeals). The most recent SMD/2016/0413 reduced the number of proposed dwellings from 90 to 25 and set aside open spaces/planting within site to overcome the landscape and heritage impact reasons for the previous refusals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site falls entirely within an SBI (Ladydale) • TPOs across site (woodland/group/tree), particularly at NW. • Grade II listed Pickwood Hall and grounds lie around 100m south • Town conservation area 100m west <p>SMD/2016/0413 was refused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to setting of Pickwood Hall (after mitigation) • Harm to character of local landscape setting • Social and economic benefits of only 25 dwellings not substantial enough to outweigh harm 	No – landscape and heritage impacts; SBI impacts requiring compensation.
Kniveden Hall site (LE066), Mount Rd Leek	<p>Site located about 120m east of town boundary, across Mount Road.</p> <p>SCC LLFA Officer - FRA needed. No specific concerns.</p> <p>SCC Highways - Mount Road should be improved including</p>	<p><u>Ownership</u> Landowner SCC are still promoting this site for residential use.</p> <p><u>Landscape</u> Although screened, site is located beyond the</p>	Y – Site is closely related to other Mount sites, is a brownfield site with perimeter screening, with

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	<p>pedestrian links. Footway should be provided on frontage.</p> <p>SFRA – Nothing relevant.</p>	<p>ridge of Mount Road, which currently screens views of Leek from the PDNP. According to 2016 Local Greenspace and Heritage Impact Study, development within the site would be visually prominent. Site is of high landscape sensitivity.</p>	<p>owner support. Site-specific policy can specify landscape mitigation requirements.</p>
<p>Field at Pike Hall Farm, Mount Rd, Leek LE069</p>	<p>Former farmhouse with 2 vacant barns and agricultural field. Some perimeter trees to W and N. Relatively flat, slight slope down to High View Road.</p> <p>Area TPOs in field to immediate north.</p> <p>2014 ecological study of site concludes site has species poor grassland, hedgerows and scattered planted broadleaved trees habitats present on site which are particularly common in the UK, have low biodiversity value therefore site deemed to have a low ecological importance.</p> <p>Not in a flood risk zone but SCC Lead Local Flood Risk Officer refers to existing flooding problem downstream at Ashbourne Road and questions where surface water will go. A FRA is required.</p> <p>Listed building within 170m to west</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHLAA correspondence with agent 2015 confirming would consider releasing land possibly later in the development plan period; • agent Knights on behalf of Renew Land Developments responded to 2016 Preferred Options promoting LE069, LE127, LE128a, LE128b combined 	<p><u>Landscape</u> Site is of high landscape sensitivity in Landscape Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study. Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement. At a higher level than the houses on High View Road</p> <p><u>Amenity</u> Site within 270m of approved 34m wind turbine at Kniveden Farm to east.</p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal</u> Refers to site being inaccessible to existing areas of employment, and proximity to heritage assets, as being negative effects.</p>	<p>No – site of high landscape sensitivity. Site considered inappropriate due to visual impact, loss of openness and views over Leek.</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	<p>for housing allocation stating the land is being promoted by a willing landowner and a willing developer and is otherwise technically deliverable.</p> <p>During March 2016 Member workshops LE128 and LE069 were not considered appropriate due to visual impact, openness and views over Leek.</p>		
<p>Land west of Mount Road (southern part of LE128 ("LE128B"))</p>	<p>Undulating agricultural field, slopes down to High view Road. Some perimeter trees to W.</p> <p>Area TPOs in field to immediate south (part of site but excluded from net area).</p> <p>2014 ecological study of site concludes site has mostly low biodiversity value overall in terms of area as it consists solely of species poor improved grassland with one species poor hedgerow. Therefore the site has been deemed to have low ecological importance.</p> <p>Not in a flood risk zone but SCC Lead Local Flood Risk Officer questions where surface water will go. A FRA is required.</p> <p>Listed building within 200m to west</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2015 Site Options, C Kemshead acting on behalf of landowners confirmed all LE128 is available for development and that the owners are willing. Further reps stating this submitted to 2016 Preferred Options. • agent Knights on behalf of Renew Land Developments responded to 2016 Preferred Options 	<p><u>Landscape</u> Site is of medium landscape sensitivity in Landscape Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study. Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement. Site-specific landscape mitigation measures recommended include planting, landscaping, and limited building heights in the eastern half of the site.</p> <p><u>Amenity</u> Site within 230m of approved 34m wind turbine at Kniveden Farm to east.</p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal</u> Refers to site being inaccessible to existing areas of employment, and proximity to heritage assets, as being negative effects.</p>	<p>Y – Site is closely related to other Mount sites , with owner support. Site-specific policy can specify landscape mitigation requirements and the exclusion of the southern Area TPOs from development.</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	<p>promoting LE069, LE127, LE128a, LE128b combined for housing allocation stating the land is being promoted by a willing landowner and a willing developer and is otherwise technically deliverable.</p> <p>During March 2016 Member workshops LE128 and LE069 were not considered appropriate due to visual impact, openness and views over Leek.</p>		
<p>Land at Home Farm, Macclesfield Road, Leek (LE138)</p>	<p>Land parcels east of Macclesfield Road after entrances to Leek Cricket Club and Home Farm.</p> <p>Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement</p> <p>Not immediately adjacent to town boundary.</p> <p>SCC LLFA Officer - No significant concerns.</p> <p>SFRA - Nothing relevant.</p> <p>Environment Agency: No comment</p> <p>SCC Highways: use of the existing access adjacent to the cricket club would not be acceptable. Visibility towards Leek is very poor. A new access on the Macclesfield Road frontage would be acceptable subject to access design and visibility splay which should be achievable.</p>	<p>Owner of land around Home Farm submitted a SHLAA form for site "LE138" (roadside fields) only, not adjacent fields. Site attracted a 'C' rating in SHLAA so was not included in 2015 site options.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> A small area of the site is unregistered (owner unknown).</p> <p>The representative of the landowner for the majority (registered) part of the site confirmed they have no intrinsic objection to its inclusion in the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Landscape</u> The site is not well related to the existing town – isolated location. Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement.</p>	<p>No - The site is not well related to the existing town boundary – isolated location.</p>
<p>Land at Leek Cricket Club, Macclesfield Road, Leek</p>	<p>Land parcels east of Macclesfield Road before entrance to Leek Cricket Club.</p>	<p><u>Leek Cricket Club Outdoor Sports Facility</u> Although a private facility, forms part of the supply of outdoor sports provision for Leek.</p>	<p>No – sports pitch</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	<p>Leek Cricket Club is a private facility currently in use.</p> <p>SFRA - Nothing relevant.</p> <p>SCC Highways: A new access road has been proposed for the cricket club when previous housing applications etc have been considered...This would need to be provided to a greater spec than previously discussed and the internal access roads improved. Would residential development be instead of the cricket club? Or limited development and the cricket club remain open?</p> <p>SCC LLFA Officer: Leek Cricket Club has no flood risk issues. Just a matter of sorting a sustainable drainage system for the site. But there is no obvious discharge route for surface water from the site. [Refer to LLFA comments to application FRM/2017/043]. So this will need a bit more work to establish a drainage route, even at outline stage.</p> <p>Environment Agency: No comment</p>	<p>Future balance of outdoor sports facilities (AMR) shows a shortfall for Leek. This is currently being reviewed (Playing Pitch and Open Space update) but unlikely to be surplus.</p> <p>Sports facilities are protected by Core Strategy Policy C2 and Section 8 NPPF.</p>	
<p>Land east of Leek Cricket Club, Macclesfield Road, Leek (LE102)</p>	<p>Land parcel east of Macclesfield Road before entrance to Leek Cricket Club. Considered as a site option.</p> <p>Relatively small greenfield site, sloping down to the south. Mature trees along boundary of site. Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement.</p> <p>Suggested by owners in 2016 consultation.</p> <p>SHLAA: Capacity 20. Area 0.59 ha. Density 34 dph.</p>	<p><u>Landscape</u></p> <p>Site abuts development boundary and land to the north has recent planning approval (granted at appeal) for 11 houses. Not identified as being important landscape setting to settlement. Mature trees along boundary of site although site options concluded 'that there are topography issues due to the sloping nature of the site which makes its development undesirable'.</p>	<p>Y –small greenfield site surrounded by town boundary to N/E/S. Some potential but dismissed at site options stage - 20 dwellings. Landscape and amenity mitigation measures could be</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	<p>SCC Highways: Access should be gained off Bridge End with Bridge End reconstructed as far as proposed access. Additional access onto Macclesfield Road is undesirable.</p> <p>SCC LLFA Officer – no significant concerns.</p> <p>Environment Agency: No comment.</p> <p>SMDC Env Health - Some constraints on residential development: Possible industrial noise source as adjacent to Chemical works</p>	<p><u>Flood Risk</u> SFRA – shows “multiple historic flood records” centred on Macclesfield Road adjacent to this site. However, SCC LLFA Officer has not raised any concerns and it is not located in a floodzone.</p> <p>Adjacent to industrial chemicals complex to E.</p>	<p>considered at application stage.</p>
<p>Anzio Camp, Blackshaw Moor (OC038)</p>	<p>Complex of redundant MOD buildings in between Leek and Blackshaw Moor east of Buxton Road</p>	<p><u>Site has planning approval</u> Anzio Camp received planning consent for erection of extra care housing, live work units, ancillary social centre and facilities building and change of use to holiday park in November 2015.</p>	<p>No – planning approval</p>
<p>Land around Leek Edge Farm (LE143A), Buxton Road, Leek</p>	<p>Agricultural fields NE of Leek off Buxton Road.</p> <p>11.25ha site suggested as part of development masterplan in Preferred Options consultation. Report submitted by agent Hourigan Connolly on behalf of landowners, argues that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is well located to essential facilities within/around Leek (schools/education, retail, doctors, employment opportunities)– many within 2km walk/cycle. 2 bus stops nearby etc – all services stop at town centre • Access point feasible; pedestrian & cycle access and footways would be provided • Site lies within Natural England ‘South West Peak’ 	<p><u>Landscape & Heritage</u> Site does not immediately abut town boundary or adjacent development. Large area likely to have landscape impact. Site is also in close proximity to Edge End Farm – listed. Also potentially affects setting of Peak Park.</p> <p><u>Habitats Regulations Assessment</u> Proximity to European sites needs to be considered.</p> <p><u>SA</u> The SA refers to negative effects of heritage</p>	<p>No – site too separated from existing town boundary; large area likely to have landscape impact (including Peak Park). May also be heritage impacts.</p>

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	<p>character area; however does not form important landscape setting to Leek in LSCA, and does not lie close to significant public footpaths/important open space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site would be visible from Roaches, but negligible amongst surroundings. Site visible from short section of National park, but effects negligible (contours). Views from footpaths are distant • Eastern landscape screening; and screening facing listed building, would be provided on site • The visual relationship with the listed farm is obscured by intervening building. • Development would be economically viable • Part of site is brownfield • There are inherent highway safety deficiencies regarding highway access to the Mount sites <p>Small part of site identified as important landscape setting to settlement</p> <p>Listed 'Edge End Farm' complex 130m to NE</p> <p>SCC Highways don't object subject to provision of visibility splays; It would be preferable for access to be split, with part of the development being served from Thorncliffe Road and part from Buxton Road. Transport Assessment would be required which should include assessment of the accesses and of A53/Thorncliffe Road junctions.</p> <p>SCC LLFA Officer: Flood Risk Assessment needed. SW floodplain and watercourse on site. Consult EA and SCC.</p>	<p>impacts and of inaccessibility to services/facilities/employment. Site sits on road served by 'less frequent' bus route.</p>	

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	<p>Environment Agency: No comment</p> <p>SFRA - Nothing relevant.</p> <p>SA - The SA refers to negative effects of heritage impacts and of inaccessibility to services/facilities/employment. Site sits on road served by 'less frequent' bus route.</p>		

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
Alton		
Land at Battlesteads, Alton. AL013	The site was identified as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. Site identified in the L & SCA as being important to the setting of the settlement. Steeply sloping. Not considered suitable for development due to its location and relationship to the village.	No. Not well related to settlement.
Biddulph Moor		
BM008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 for employment and/or housing and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. .The Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisal 2016 recommended the site was not released 	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
Land off Farmside Lane opposite Broomfields (site is a smaller part of SHLAA sites BM021/BM030/BM031)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. .The Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisal 2016 recommended the site was not released due to the impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location and the unbounded southeastern edge of the site. 	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
Site off Chapel Lane opposite Cottage Lane (part of BM035)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is part of BM035 fronting the road. BM035 was in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and 	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<p>responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review 2015 considered it was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. The Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisal 2016 appraised the smaller area of BM035 and also recommended it was unsuitable for release due to the impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location and the unbounded western edge of the site. 	<p>removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.</p>
<p>Land off Woodhouse Lane Part of BM012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a small site off Woodlane that has not previously considered on its own. It forms a small part of SHLAA site BM012 which was classed C and was not considered suitable for development due to landscape impact and possible flooding issues. The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisal 2016 considered there was potential for release under Very Special Circumstances reflecting the enclosed character of the site, although a northern boundary is absent. Retain existing village boundary. 	<p>No Landscape impact/flooding issues. Green</p>
<p>Site off Chapel Lane opposite Cottage Lane (part of BM035)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is part of BM035 fronting the road. BM035 was in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review 2015 considered it was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. The Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisal 2016 appraised the smaller area of BMO35 and also recommended it was unsuitable for release due to the impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location and the unbounded western edge of the site. 	<p>No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.</p>
Blythe Bridge		
<p>Land at Heath Farm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to 	<p>No Green Belt site there are no exceptional</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Land at Uttoxeter Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
BB021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 for employment and/or housing and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • The Highway Authority advised that without major improvements access is only suitable to serve one or two properties, the existing access onto A521 is single width & adjacent to watercourse • The Phase 1 Ecological Study found site maybe suitable for SBI has potential floral diversity. Recommended whole site not allocated due to its intrinsic value & potential value to biodiversity in the area. 	No. Access and biodiversity issues.
BB87 Traveller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 for employment and/or housing and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • The Environment Agency advised the site is likely to be affected by flood risk and would require the support of the Sequential Test and a Level 2 SFRA. 	No. Potential flooding issues, landscape impact. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified the site as being important to the setting of the settlement. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	
BB027/ BB028	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. • The Highway Authority advised that the unadopted access road to the sites would need to be improved and ideally improvements to the visibility at its junction with Caverswall Road. Ownership of the road would also need to be established as would any access rights to the proposal sites. • The Phase 1 Ecological Study found there is a Biodiversity Alert Site immediately to the south of the site and recommended the creation of a buffer of planted trees/vegetation between the site and the BAS. 	No. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Access and biodiversity issues.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
BB40 & ADD10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site BB040 was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and site ADD010 was suggested during the 2015 consultation, neither sites were taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council’s website. • The Environment Agency advised regarding BB040 that previous land uses may have caused contamination and a Preliminary Risk Assessment would be required. Remediation and mitigation measures may be required and could impact on development potential. • The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified BB040 as being important to the setting of the settlement. • Both sites are within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that BB040 could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Environment Agency identified potential site contamination issues.</p>
BB044	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council’s website. • The Highway Authority considered access improvements would be required which would be difficult to achieve without third party land • The Phase 1 Ecological Study concluded that the site is an important UKBAP wet woodland and advise it should not be developed. 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Access would require improvements. Site has biodiversity value.</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
BB042 BB043	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. The site was identified in the L & SCA as being important to the landscape setting of the settlement it is considered the scale of site and landscape impact would make it unsuitable. 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Landscape impact.</p>
BB062	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. 	<p>No. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt</p>
Forsbrook		
land at Tater Lane.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside /Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the 	<p>No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt . The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	
Brown Edge		
BE032	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council’s website. • The Environment Agency informed the Council that the site has a culverted watercourse flowing beneath it which should be re-naturalised through redevelopment to contribute towards WFD (Water Framework Directive) objectives. They stated that this may take up space within the site, however it may be possible to divert the channel round the edge to create more developable space. The County Council’s Lead Local Flood Officer stated that “there is an existing significant flooding problem in this area, which SCC are suggesting a future project for. The problem leads to flooding of the southern part of this site.” Although it seems likely that this issue can be overcome, there is uncertainty at this stage as to how this will affect the capacity and viability of the site. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Potential flooding issues.</p>
BE056	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<p>the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. • The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified the site as being important to the setting of the settlement • The Highway Authority had concerns about the creation of a suitable access to serve the site 	<p>Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Access issues and landscape impact.</p>
BE060	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. • The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified the site as being important to the setting of the settlement • The Highway Authority had concerns about the creation of a suitable access to serve the site 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Landscape impact and access issues.</p>
BE044	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<p>comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified the site as being important to the setting of the settlement The Highway Authority had concerns about the creation of a suitable access to serve the site 	<p>considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Access issues and landscape impact.</p>
Rock Cottage Nursing Home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is in the Green Belt and is not well related to the settlement. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. The NPPF allows for limited development of brownfield sites in the Green Belt. 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
Cheddleton		
Staffordshire Farmers site CD030	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An application for residential development has been approved by planning committee (subject to conditions and Section 106 agreement) for the Staffordshire Farmers site (Jan 2017). 	<p>No. Site has existing planning permission.</p>
CD015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Landscape impact.</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<p>review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified the site as being important to the setting of the settlement 	
CD069a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. The Site Options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. The site is a small site within the village boundary and it was not considered that allocation was necessary as development could be classed as infill. 	<p>No. Allocation not needed for site to be developed is within village boundary.</p>
CD115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 for mixed use/alternative uses it was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt</p>
CD116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. Development would be a significant extension into the Green Belt The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	
Land alongside CD017 & CD019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sites are in the Green Belt and are not well related to the built up area. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Not well related to built up area.
CN01 at Ox Pasture, (proposed open space)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land is privately owned and therefore should not be designated as Public Open Space. The site has been assessed as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) (Site 29). It is considered that the site provides very attractive views from the footpath on southern boundary out towards wider countryside (including the church and roaches). It is also tranquil and there is wildlife value in hedgerows. It is recommended that the whole site is designated as LGS meaning that new development would have to demonstrate very special circumstances. 	No. Proposed LGS allocation.
Land at Cheadle Road Ox Pasture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See comments above 	
Land south of Caldon Canal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been assessed as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) 	No. Proposed LGS allocation
Cheddleton Heath		
Land off Cheddleton Heath Road/Basford Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area is within the Green Belt and is not within a defined settlement. The emerging Local Plan only seeks to allocate residential sites within the main towns and larger villages. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Not well related to existing village boundaries.
Checkley		

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
Land to rear of Red Lion public house and adjoining sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. 	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
CRESSWELL		
OC055.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> western portion of land with planning consent for development allocated 	No. Site already has planning permission
DILHORNE		
Land north of William Rose, Godley Lane, Dilhorne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside and Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line policy in the Local Plan. The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
land at School Close, Dilhorne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis policy in the Local Plan. The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to 	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	
Endon		
Park Farm Park Lane Weavers yard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is in the Green Belt and is not well related to the settlement. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. The NPPF allows for limited development of brownfield sites in the Green Belt. 	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Land at Briar Clough, Clay Lake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
EN030, land at Meadow Cottage,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. 	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt
Land off High View Road near	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of 	No Green Belt site there are

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
Endon Bank Farm	the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Clay Lake adjacent to the Grange.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is within the development boundary and can be regarded as infill, 	NO Infill
Leek Road EN024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • The Environment Agency advised the site is likely to be severely effected by flood risk. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Flood risk
EN092	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development • It is a large greenfield site in the Conservation Area with potential visual impact and impact on setting & long range views. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to 	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Impact on Conservation

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	Area and wider landscape.
EN108	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. • The site is in the Conservation Area and is undulating pasture. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Impact on Conservation Area and wider landscape.</p>
EN019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
EN101 High View Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<p>site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council’s website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. • The Phase I Ecological Study highlighted the TPOs on the site and the need for them to be protected unless the devolvement benefit clearly outweighs the loss of the trees 	<p>removal from the Green Belt. Possible impact on TPO trees.</p>
FOXT		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p>
FO008.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line policy in the Local Plan 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p>
MB Autos off Mount Pleasant, Foxt),	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan	
Hulme	•	
HU002 plus extension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan 	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
Ipstones		
Land off Belmont Road, Ipstones; (IP014a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. Environment Agency raised an issue regarding potential contamination due to historic landfill, may impact on site viability. Highway Authority concerned about pedestrian access to the village would need to be demonstrated this could be provided. 	No. Potential contamination and pedestrian access.
Far Lane Industrial Estate, Ipstones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is an existing industrial estate in the village boundary and in view of its current use it is not considered suitable for residential allocation. The Local Plan allows for the change of use of existing employment site to residential development in appropriate circumstances.. 	No. Existing industrial estate in village boundary.
Kingsley		
KG032	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Additional Sites Appraisal 2016 found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt in light of disproportionate impact on openness through extension of the built edge of Kingsley along the A52. 	NO. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
		considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
Former Youth & Community Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Additional Site Assessment March 2017 concluded the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. “Notwithstanding the size and current use of the site, development would constitute an extension the built footprint of the village into open countryside. Locally, this would also extend the built extent of the village towards Kingsley Holt, although there is no intervisibility between the two settlements.” 	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
KG005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council’s website. The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. 	NO. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
KG024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council’s website. The site is not available for development 	NO. Site not available.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
Part of KG019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council’s website. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>NO. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
Part of KG042	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council’s website. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. 	<p>NO. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.</p>
K Part of KG026a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The 	<p>NO. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<p>site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.. 	<p>removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.</p>
Kingsley Holt		
KH018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p>
Part of KH009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p>
Leekbrook		
LB003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p>
Longson		
Land west of School Lane at its	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
junction with the main road.	<p>Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
land north of School Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
LO007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<p>the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.</p>	
LO021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
Ridgeway House, Longsdon. .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
clusters of houses along Micklea Lane and Denford Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<p>settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
<p>land east of Sutherland Road, Longsdon</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
<p>Garden of High View Micklea Lane</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
Stanley Moor	•	
Land at Stanley Moor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No.</p> <p>The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p> <p>No exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
Stockton Brook		
Quarry House Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No.</p> <p>The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p> <p>No exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
Upper Tean		
Upper Tean UT041.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. 	<p>Current planning application decision pending.</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A planning application has been submitted for development on this site. 	
Part of Wentlows Cheadle Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been assessed as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) 	No
Upper Tean UT023 plus adjacent 3 fields to the north.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UT023 was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the 3 fields to the north is not considered appropriate development of this extent would be out of scale with the settlement and would not be well related to the existing pattern of settlement. 	No. Scale of development.
LT001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site has planning permission for residential development The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. 	No Has planning permission The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
LT009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. 	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
Werrington		
WE021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. Development would significantly alter the settlement edge and would be an intrusion into the open countryside. The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries 	Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<p>should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.</p>	Belt.
Former Builders Yard in Winterfield Lane,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. • The NPPF allows for limited development on brownfield sites in the Green Belt. 	Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Whitmore Avenue/Radley Way Public Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The southern part of the land is privately owned and therefore should not be designated as Public Open Space. • The site has been assessed as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) (Site 35). It is considered that the site has recreational value, clear paths and 3 points of public access. It is tranquil, away from roads and has some views out to the north. It also has wildlife value in the overgrown higher area. It is recommended that the site is designated as LGS meaning that new development would have to demonstrate very special circumstances. 	No. Site is proposed as a LGS
WE048	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. It is a sloping site with poor relationship to the existing built development. 	No Sloping site not well related to existing development.
Field at Ashbank Brookhouses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. • The Green Belt Review assessed this site as part of parcel C12 which it found makes significant contribution to maintain separation between settlements and safeguard the 	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	countryside from encroachment.	
Land off Tregaron Court/Langton Court, WE042 WE043	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. It was considered there was no suitable access to the site and the site was identified in the L & SCA as forming important landscape setting. It is understood access to the site maybe able to be achieved from Tregaron Court. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Additional Site Appraisals 2016 found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Linear development along Ashbank WE020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development would be visually intrusive and would increase the linear development along the Ash Bank Road. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. • The Green Belt Review assessed this site as part of parcel C12 which it found makes significant contribution to maintain separation between settlements and safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
The south of the housing estate on Chatsworth WE049 50 51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to south of Chatsworth Drive were assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and were not considered suitable for development. L & SCA identifies the existing residential development as forming a strong edge to the settlement development would be a significant encroachment into the open countryside. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of 	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	<p>the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.</p>	<p>Landscape impact.</p>
<p>WE063 adjacent Shepherds Lodge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>
<p>Land next to Sub 4 Ltd Cellarhead WE063/WE1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 as an employment site and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this 	<p>No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	
WE033	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WE033 is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Limited development can take place in the green belt provided it is in accord with green belt policy. 	<p>NO.</p> <p>Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.</p>
Wetley Rocks		
WR002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. The site is within the development boundary and can be regarded as infill, part of the site has residential planning permission. 	<p>No.</p> <p>Allocation not needed for site to be developed is within village boundary.</p>
Whiston		
WH002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. 	<p>No.</p> <p>The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p>
WH016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the polices in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the 	<p>No.</p> <p>The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.</p>

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan	
WH015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan 	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages
WH018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan 	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages