

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Yes, the aims are excellent. However, the details of implementation are lacking so until these exist in greater detail it is difficult to say how effective this strategy will be. I support the ability for Neighbourhood Plan groups to work in partnership with SMDC on the implementation of this strategy and hope this will bring much needed support to work at this level. Little work has been carried out on GI outside of the main Churnet Valley area.</p>	<p>MRS ANGELA Turner</p>		<p>GI36</p>	<p>The Council will prepare an Implementation Plan to set a delivery framework for the GI strategy. This will include identifying gaps and new opportunities. The Council welcomes the role that neighbourhood planning can play in providing locally specific detail around provision of GI.</p>
<p>Yes, the aims are excellent. However, the details of implementation are lacking so until these exist in greater detail it is difficult to say how effective this strategy will be. I support the ability for Neighbourhood Plan groups to work in partnership with SMDC on the implementation of this strategy and hope this will bring much needed support to work at this level. This framework and the evidence contained within it provides a strong focus for funding to be directed to areas outside of the Churnet Valley so that the whole district will benefit.</p>	<p>MRS ANGELA Turner</p>		<p>GI24</p>	<p>Noted. And see response to GI36</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Yes. This is a detailed analysis. I'd like to see more explicit reference in the vision and values to encouraging young children (especially in early years settings) into green spaces. A recent Government report stated that of the 12% of children who had been into wild spaces, only 7% had done so with schools. It would be great if there was an expectation that schools took the children in their care to local spaces.</p>	Mrs Lorna Stoddart		GI32	Add additional text to chapter 4 (vision) to include reference to encouraging young children into green spaces.
<p>yes very much so. It seems to be ambitious which is good to see, although there are no measures or means of achieving the ambitions yet?</p>	Mrs Penny Anderson		GI2	The Council will prepare an Implementation Plan to set a delivery framework for the GI strategy.
<p>Yes, I support the broad vision as published.</p>	Mr Robert Turner		GI40	Support noted.
<p>I object to the housing numbers that have been allocated for Cheadle and Staffordshire Moorlands in general. The greenfield spaces within Cheadle town boundary are needed to prevent oversized blocks of housing and maintain the town's open and green character. The proposed development of CH001 would have the maximum adverse impact upon existing residents and so should be Visual Open Space. The existing green areas in Cheadle North East do more to enhance the settings of the existing neighbourhoods than any property development could do.</p>	Chris Bolton		GI49	The strategic GI Network identifies Cheadle town as area 10 and at paragraph 6.26 sets out that proposed priorities and actions are to protect and extend GI within Cheadle to improve access to green spaces within the town and links out to the surrounding countryside. Proposed development site CH001 is located within the town development boundary and was identified in the Core Strategy as a broad location for housing.

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Yes. The vision and overall aims sets out the importance of integrating effective ecological networks into GI and understanding the importance that this can place in allow connectivity for species across the Churnet Valley landscape. The point in the vision on promoting health and well-being could also reflect peoples access to nature and interaction with nature, which is well known to provide a multitude of health and wellbeing benefits. The economic potential could also consider the management of habitats for wildlife, for example newly planted woodlands managed sustainably for wildlife, whilst providing small scale economic income through the provision of woodfuel, may be a means of supporting their long-term management.</p>	Mr Mike Shurmer	Senior Conservation Officer RSPB	GI54	Add additional text to chapter 4 (vision) to include reference to the benefits of supporting people's access to nature. Also to expand on opportunities to develop the economic potential of GI, for example through provision of wood fuel.
<p>We are very supportive of a green infrastructure approach and welcome the preparation of this document. Where the evidence base is discussed in paragraph 3.5 we would recommend inclusion of historic landscape character studies that have been used to inform the document. We support the reference to the historic environment within the vision on page 15. We would recommend the inclusion of an aim for the historic environment that seeks to protect and enhance historic landscape character and heritage assets, within the list on page 16. We support the reference to the historic environment within the benefits section.</p>	Kezia Taylerson	Historic England	GI63	Amend the evidence base text to include the historic landscape character studies used. Aso add an additional aim at 4.4 to seek to protect and enhance historic landscape character and heritage assets. Invite Historic England to join Steering Group.

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
The Green Infrastructure Strategic Network for Staffordshire Moorlands Vision is in accordance with the NPPF and the White Paper for the Natural Environment and reflects local landscape-scale initiatives.	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council	GI68	Support noted.
Vision 4.3 Bullet point 3rd from the bottom – Improves flood and water management – mitigating the effects of climate change including through using green infrastructure for effective flood risk and waterways management”. Need to include reference to the need to maintain the waterways too. Lack of maintenance creates areas of stagnant water creating foul odour and an excessive fly population. Additionally particularly where there is no mains sewerage system serious consideration needs to be given to where surface water and the outflow created by septic tanks will flow too and the ability for that to be absorbed.	Sam Hughes	Rushton Neighbourhood Plan Group	GI73	Amend Aims and Benefits sections at paragraphs 4.4 and 4.5 to include reference to the need to maintain waterways and manage surface water flow.
Question 2 - Do you agree with the analysis of existing green infrastructure assets (described in section 5 of this report and mapped in Appendix A)?				

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>You have omitted the value of roadside verges - these can be some of the last vestiges of once flower-rich fields. Also the value of railway banks - disused or otherwise. Are there not areas of importance within school grounds as well, even if small? These need to be connected to the wider green/blue infrastructure as well. I don't think you have adequately linked your green/blue infrastructure into adjacent areas. Species need to be able to live or move along corridors, they take no notice of political boundaries! This is particularly so for the Peak District on your northern boundary. You need to know where the key habitat networks are in this area to tie in with them? The National Park is not all good habitat.</p>	Mrs Penny Anderson		GI3	<p>Consider inclusion of road side verges and railway embankments within evidence base relating to large-scale, linear infrastructure features. Talk to PDNPA about key habitat networks for the SMDC strategic network to link to.</p>
<p>Broadly I agree and support maintenance of any green assets. The distinction between existing and new green assets is not clearly drawn.</p>	Mr Peter Cowie		GI11	<p>The Council will prepare an implementation plan that will consider delivery opportunities for new assets and new connections.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>The Cheadle map is misleading. On previous maps the Council has shown the school playing fields at County Primary, Cheadle Academy and Painsley Academy as being green open space. This is not the case as the public has no right of access to use this land. It gives the appearance that green open space is weighted towards the west of the town which is not the case. The green open space is in fact located to the north i.e. Cheadle Park, east Churchill Road playing fields and the town's recreation ground. The council also wants to protect a piece of land along Glebe Road, who would want to have a picnic along the side of a road?</p>	<p>Mr Julian Baskeyfield</p>		<p>GI21</p>	<p>The illustration of school playing fields as open space on a map does not indicate public access, but shows protection under Core Strategy policy for open space. Grassland to the north east of Glebe Road has recreational and visual amenity value. The Council's evidence base supports its proposed designation as a Local Green Space in the emerging Local Plan.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>The Biddulph Valley Way should be included in Map A.2 - the long distance footpath connects to other habitats including those in Cheshire and Stoke-on-Trent. The whole length of the Biddulph Valley Way needs to be designated as Open Space - there seems to be a part in the middle missed out from this designation on Map A.1. Map A.4 highlights flooding hotspots in Biddulph. These are mainly from extreme rainfall events which are predicted to increase with climate change. The Biddulph Valley needs a specific focus on managing rainfall runoff and natural watercourse management to slow down the rain entering the streams. Tree planting schemes and wet meadow creation should be encouraged as part of the solution alongside SUDS. Map A.10 highlights how little of the Biddulph Valley and areas away from the Churnet corridor have been mapped. This work is urgently needed in order to identify and protect valuable habitats/species including semi-ancient woodland.</p>	<p>MRS ANGELA Turner</p>		<p>GI25</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of long distance footpaths and trails within the evidence base relating to large-scale, linear infrastructure features. The full length of the Biddulph Valley Way is designated as open space, this could be more clearly presented on Map A.1. Include further text relating to SuDS and making space for water within proposed priorities and actions for the Biddulph corridor. Consider gaps in evidence within the implementation plan and identify opportunities where further mapping can help to deliver the strategy.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>I would consider assets to also include Woodcroft Recreation Ground and other smaller wild spaces within Leek. Not only Brough Park, most of which is managed space.</p>	<p>Mrs Lorna Stoddart</p>		<p>GI33</p>	<p>Amend Map 7.2 to show Churnet Valley North corridor 3 including woodland and grassland west of Westwood College, Westwood High School and Woodcroft First School, with associated text in the proposed priorities and actions for Leek strategic area 2 identifying opportunities to link the schools and other areas of the town to nearby wild spaces.</p>
<p>Para 5.16 (green travel links) Add to key routes: The Churnet Valley Railway track east of Oakamoor, linking to East Staffs. There is a long distance horse riding route, the Sabrina way, passing through the east of the District (Waterhouses Parish area) which is not mentioned, suggest add to Para 5.17. Acknowledge that the Biddulph Valley Way, Churnet Valley track and Manifold Trail are key horse riding assets in addition to cycling. Agree with para 5.18 to the point where some rural roads are dangerous not just unsuitable as they are carrying increasing commuter and HGV traffic. Agree with para 5.19 but add require Staffordshire County Council to address its huge backlog of applications to upgrade existing footpaths to higher user rights.</p>	<p>Mr Robert Turner</p>		<p>GI41</p>	<p>Green Travel Links text to be expanded to include reference to the Staffordshire Way long distance footpath, and the multi-user Greenways from Leek to Rushton Spencer and Oakamoor to Denstone following the track bed of the former Churnet Valley Railway. Also to add the Sabrina Way - a long distance route and part of the National Bridleroute Network running through the District from Alton to Oakamoor and Waterhouses - primarily designed for horse riders but can be used by walkers and cyclists. Amend text to clarify that multi user trails include opportunities for horse riding. Support for paragraph 5.19 detailing opportunities noted.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Opposes development proposals for Cheadle north east that result in the loss of valued green space from existing built up areas. Proposed site CH001 is widely used by the residents directly bordering the field and also beyond. Cheadle does not have a housing crisis. CH001 features a gentle slope controlling and slowing the release of water into the adjoining brook. Increasing the impermeable surfaces of a development would increase the risk of flooding. When flooding occurs, what compensation is available to cover the increased insurance cost and who takes responsibility? Filling in every available green space is poor planning. The areas designated as Visual Open Space are few but the land designated for development is considerable. CH001 should be Visual Open Space instead of being used to connect the existing housing to form a continuous block of housing in Cheadle. All of the proposed sites around Cheadle north east should be considered Green Belt. Water voles live around the brook in CH001 and further downstream, this habitat would be destroyed by development. Supports CH168.</p>	Chris Bolton		GI50	<p>The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. New housing schemes (depending on their size) will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, in line with Local Plan policy. Local Plan Policy will also require that, wherever possible, development will promote the reduction of flood risk by the use of sustainable drainage techniques. All current Preferred Options sites have been subject to Phase 1 ecological surveys which set out ecological evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys / actions in the event of future development.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Planners do not understand the green areas allocated in the south west of Cheadle. The 'green areas' are not open recreation spaces but private school grounds not available to the public.</p>	<p>Mrs Jennifer C Moreton</p>		<p>GI52</p>	<p>Areas shown as open space on the Local Plan maps do not represent publicly accessible open space, but those areas of green space protected under Local Plan policy and this may include school playing fields.</p>
<p>Overall this seems to be a good summary of the existing knowledge of current assets. There are some gaps, in terms of the coverage of existing datasets based on available data. Perhaps it needs to be clearer that this is based on the best available knowledge, but that some important areas may have been omitted due to a lack of current information. We would also support the comments made by Penny Anderson regarding the importance of the other blue habitats and consideration of habitats outside of the area in the Peak District National Park.</p>	<p>Mr Mike Shurmer</p>	<p>Senior Conservation Officer RSPB</p>	<p>GI55</p>	<p>Add additional text to section 5 to clarify data limitations. Enhance text relating to blue infrastructure and linkages into the National Park.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>We support the reference to the historic environment in paragraph 5.1 on page 20. We welcome the inclusion of a reference to the historic environment on page 27/28. We would encourage the Council to consider if there is any heritage at risk that could be enhanced through this strategy. As well as citing non designated archaeology and historic landscape character within paragraph 5.48. We welcome the inclusion of mapping that assesses the historic environment and historic landscape character.</p>	<p>Kezia Taylerson</p>	<p>Historic England</p>	<p>GI64</p>	<p>Support noted. Consider if there is any heritage at risk that could be enhanced through the strategy. Amend paragraph 5.48 to include non designated archaeology and historic landscape character. Invite Historic England to join the Steering Group.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>We are satisfied that flood risk has been adequately covered throughout the document and that the potential opportunities identified for managing flood risk are appropriate. The report also has good coverage of the biodiversity issues in relation to watercourses. We do however, recommend integrating the following to section 5; "Where possible, opportunities will be sought to undertake river restoration and enhance natural river corridors as part of a new development in line with the Humber River Basin Management Plan (Water Framework Directive). -All development should be set back from all rivers and streams with an undeveloped buffer corridor in order to provide biodiversity migration routes, make space for water and provide additional capacity in view of climate change demands. -New developments should be designed to view watercourses as aesthetically valuable greenspaces which add value to the development by providing attractive areas for people to view nature."</p>	Miss Jane Field	Planning Specialist Environment Agency	GI67	Suggested text to be inserted as a new paragraph before existing paragraph 5.29.

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Some Staffordshire County Council Country Parks are missing from the s.5.5 list: Deep Hayes Country Park and Consall Nature Park (both mentioned in the woodlands section of part 5). The maps in Appendix A are at such a resolution that it is difficult to fully assess coverage but appear to represent the different aspects of green infrastructure. A simplified combined map might be helpful to give a comprehensive picture and help identify areas of deprivation, support assessment of ecosystems services provision and enable identification of priorities and of multifunctionality. Green space within or near built areas could also include Staffordshire Wildlife Trust Nature Reserves. Consall Nature Park – at present a SCC Country Park – does not appear to be included on the map. It is not clear why willow tit habitat mapping is included. It does not appear appropriate to include measures for a single species in such a strategy. Some sites are missing from maps. SCC owned and managed disused railways designated as local wildlife sites, are missing from the A.2 Large-scale, linear infrastructure features with potential for connectivity for biodiversity enhancement map. These are the Denstone-Oakamoor Disused Railway and the Rudyard Disused Railway (Leek – Rushton Spencer). These are well linked to other green infrastructure.</p>	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council	GI69	<p>A simplified, combined map to be prepared showing key assets drawn from across the evidence base. Deep Hayes Country Park and Consall Nature Park to be added to para 5.5. Staffordshire County Council Country Parks and Staffordshire Wildlife Trust Nature Reserves to be added to Map A.1 (where there is existing GIS mapping of sites available). Map A.2 to be amended to include Staffordshire Way, Biddulph Valley Way and the Greenways from Leek to Rushton Spencer and Oakamoor to Denstone. Zone identified as being important for willow tit is included as it is an example of the importance of supporting large scale linear features and the benefits to priority species of increasing connectivity between suitable habitats.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
Para 5.27. The River Dane runs through Rushton Spencer but is not mentioned in this section.	Sam Hughes	Rushton Neighbourhood Plan Group	GI74	Add a new paragraph following existing paragraph 5.26 to read "The River Dane is a tributary of the River Weaver that originates in the Peak District and forms the border between first Cheshire and Derbyshire on the west and east, and then between Cheshire and Staffordshire, flowing through Rushton Spencer.
Objection to Map A.6 Landscape setting and Green Belt which identifies Fradley Estate's site off Langton Court / Tregaron Court as being within "important landscape setting to settlement". On the basis of landscape and Green Belt assessment undertaken by Bright and Associates, contend that the Fradley Estate site should be excluded from the important landscape setting on Map A.6. Also proposes that Local Plan Preferred Options site (July 2017) WE003 should be added to the designation.	Grant Anderson (Hill Dickinson)	Fradley Estates	GI75	Map A.6 reflects the Council's current evidence base. If the Council's evidence is updated, the map will be updated accordingly.
Question 3 - Do you agree with the new opportunities that the strategy is expected to provide (set out in section 5 of this report)? If not, can you suggest what opportunities you would support?				

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
Suggest you add in making connections between schools and places where people work/learn into the green/blue infrastructure so that they can easily be reached. Can you increase green/blue infrastructure within view of hospitals and care homes - these would support health and wellbeing too? Also need to link educational facilities with greenspace for ease of reach for study and enjoyment/or green exercise. Have you any other LA premises to which this could apply too - making working spaces more attractive improves wellbeing and work output of those inside?	Mrs Penny Anderson		GI4	Add new paragraph after 5.15 - and an additional bullet point at 5.19 - to state that improving existing connections, and making new connections, between educational facilities, workplaces, hospitals and care homes and the green infrastructure network can provide valuable opportunities to help support people's health and well-being.
Same response as to question 2.	Mr Peter Cowie		GI12	See response to GI11.
Yes I agree with them. I await the implementation plan to see what will happen in reality.	MRS ANGELA Turner		GI26	Noted.
Please consider adding opportunities that specifically target connection early years to their immediate natural environment.	Mrs Lorna Stoddart		GI34	Add an additional bullet point to 5.19 stating: Seek opportunities to deliver connections within the GI network that help support access for those in early years education to their immediate natural environment.

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>The owners of the Mobberley Farm Strategic Development site welcome the suggestion in paragraph 5.19 that pathways should be provided along rivers because that has always been their intention as part of the development of the remainder of the site.</p>	<p>Mr T A J Campbell</p>		<p>GI38</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>I fully support the broad thrust of proposals in section 5. My primary interest is in green travels links and the enhancement rights of way for cyclists and horse riders in order to provide viable strategic routes away from the road network, instead of the present fragmented and very limited existing provision. Full opportunities should be made of s106 contributions when development is considered especially where that increases traffic materially. In establishing such routes consideration should be given to reinstating historic rights of way in order to support the historic landscapes and environment policies. Access by horse in particular causes less disturbance to wildlife as most species do not react to horse and rider combinations as they do humans alone.</p>	<p>Mr Robert Turner</p>		<p>GI43</p>	<p>Support for section 5 noted.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>In general this seems to be a very good reflection of the opportunities and we would support many of these. There are some additional considerations in terms of woodland, for example thinking about the opportunity for supporting sustainable woodland management across the Churnet Valley which could perhaps be better reflected. Additionally, we would suggest that care needs to be taken not to compartmentalize habitats, but to think about mosaics and transitions, for example between woodland and meadows. This is reflected in some elements of this section of the strategy, but could perhaps be repeated in the section on woodland.</p>	Mr Mike Shurmer	Senior Conservation Officer RSPB	GI56	Add an additional bullet point to 5.78 to read: Identify opportunities to support sustainable woodland management across the Churnet Valley. Add a further bullet to read: Improve, manage and create a rich mosaic of woodland and other habitats of conservation importance.
<p>Question 4 - Do you agree with the description of the GI Network at a strategic level as detailed in section 6 and illustrated on map 6.1?</p>				
<p>Yes - but see my comment above about connecting better into the Peak District National Park.</p>	Mrs Penny Anderson		GI5	See response to GI3.
<p>Broadly I agree. Why is SMDC committed to building huge numbers of houses at the expense of countryside?</p>	Mr Peter Cowie		GI13	The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate that need into a housing requirement.

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Under the heading Leek town in Section 6.10 the first bullet point is 'Protect existing green and open spaces used and valued by Communities etc' . However the Draft Plan seems to have ignored this point as no assessment or comment has been made about the amenity value of The Mount in terms of the number of people who walk or jog around it. If the housing estate is built and Mount Road becomes an estate road then the amenity is lost as many people will not want to walk along a busy road. A large number of people commented about this in their response to the 2016 Consultation but no assessment has been made! Why look to create new walking routes when the walk around the Mount is much valued with around 200 people per day using it. Don't destroy this route by building 317 houses!</p>	<p>Mr John Pigott</p>		<p>G119</p>	<p>The SMDC Local Plan policy DSL2 Land at The Mount, Leek has been amended to include a requirement for development to be subject to priorities and actions identified in the Council's Green Infrastructure Plan.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Yes, although some of the current names given to the corridors in Biddulph Valley are confusing and need to be renamed to avoid confusion. The main Corridor 5 - Knypersley Corridor has little to do with Knypersley. This should be renamed The Moor Corridor, with spur 5b The Knypersley Spur and 5a The Grange spur. The Biddulph Town corridor is a vital connecting network, made mostly of water courses and retained woodland. The area along the brook from the Moor and down to the leisure centre is especially important, as are key sites along the Biddulph Brook which connect with the Biddulph Valley Way.</p>	<p>MRS ANGELA Turner</p>		<p>GI27</p>	<p>Following further consultation with Biddulph Town Council, amend corridor names and references to them throughout the document as follows: 5: Knypersley Corridor to be renamed 5: Biddulph Moor Corridor; 5a Knypersley Corridor spur to be renamed 5a: Biddulph Moor Corridor: Grange spur and 5b Knypersley Corridor spur to be renamed 5b: Biddulph Moor Corridor: Knypersley spur. Text on page 50 under 8. Biddulph town to be amended to include additional text as supplied.</p>
<p>Broadly yes but with the additions outlined in my response to Q 2 above.</p>	<p>Mr Robert Turner</p>		<p>GI44</p>	<p>See response to GI41.</p>
<p>Overall, yes. The networks described seem to make sense at a strategic level. Perhaps there could be more consideration of what these link to outside of the area, for example in the Peak District National Park.</p>	<p>Mr Mike Shurmer</p>	<p>Senior Conservation Officer RSPB</p>	<p>GI57</p>	<p>Please see response to GI3 and GI55.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>The Borough Council notes that the Green Infrastructure Strategy Network document makes reference to the Blythe Bridge Opportunity corridor (paragraphs 6.27 & 6.28) which is supported. Nevertheless Map 7.11 on page 68 shows part of the Opportunity corridor within Stafford Borough's boundary and Green Belt area. Furthermore Map 7.12 on page 69 shows an extensive area of "potential new floodplain woodland" and "priority new riparian woodland" as new designations within Stafford Borough. However these proposed designations have no status in the adopted Plan for Stafford Borough nor as part of the North Staffordshire Green Belt.</p>	Mr Yendole	Forward Planning Stafford Borough Council	GI60	Support for the Blythe Bridge Opportunity corridor noted. The indicative boundary for the ecological network illustrated on map 7.11 can be redrawn to exclude land in Stafford Borough. The areas of potential and priority floodplain woodland are Environment Agency designations, SMDC to discuss with Stafford Borough how best to represent GI at the cross boundary level as part of Duty to Cooperate.
<p>I have attached a map of the village of Bagnall with two village greens marked with an orange arrow. As the village green at the southern approach to Bagnall has been "colour washed green" it seems to suggest that the two remaining greens should be similarly protected. Could you please give consideration to including these areas within the Local Plan Green Infrastructure Strategic Network for Staffordshire Moorlands.</p>	Denise Cooper	Bagnall Parish Council	GI61	These areas are considered to be part of strategic corridor 5: Knypersley Corridor.

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>As previously commented potentially Map 6.1 Strategic GI Network is misleading as it appears to indicate that strategic green infrastructure is linear in nature rather than being the actual complex network of habitat patches and linear sites. Use of washes covering the relevant areas rather than lines with arrows would be more representative. There is potential for a joint working initiative with East Staffordshire Borough Council and the County Council regarding grassland habitat connectivity and footpaths in the Cauldon and Weaver Hills area.</p>	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council	GI70	<p>Para 6.4 sets out that corridors are considered to have permeable edges. However text to be added to para 6.7 to clarify that "whilst illustrated as a linear network for simplicity of representation, it is acknowledged that strategic green infrastructure is in fact a complex network of habitat patches and linear sites". SMDC would welcome joint working with East Staffordshire Borough Council and the County Council on connectivity across boundaries.</p>
<p>Question 5 - Do you agree with the priorities and actions identified for each of the strategic corridors/ areas (as set out in section 6)? If not, can you suggest what priorities and actions you would support?</p>				
<p>Seems fine. I would like to see more about how you are going to action many of the ideas though. You need to be proactive, not just wait for and tie in with planning conditions etc. This costs time and resources. Good luck.</p>	Mrs Penny Anderson		GI6	<p>Comments noted. Please see response to GI36.</p>
<p>Corridors should not be used as a vehicle for built development.</p>	Mr Peter Cowie		GI14	<p>Vision for the GI strategy is set out at 4.3.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Yes I do. I welcome the inclusion and recognition of managing surface water in the Biddulph Valley and the opportunities that development can be creative in its' management using SUDS and natural flood management techniques. I also welcome the recognition that tree planting, river management and other habitat measures can assist in this. There is much work to do in order to accurately identify the ecological corridors within the Biddulph Valley in more detail, and I welcome the fact the the Neighbourhood Plan Group can assist with this.</p>	<p>MRS ANGELA Turner</p>		<p>G128</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Overall these seem to be good. They could be perhaps be tightened and improved in places.</p>	<p>Mr Mike Shurmer</p>	<p>Senior Conservation Officer RSPB</p>	<p>G158</p>	<p>Comments noted. SMDC will welcome the continued support of RSPB in helping to develop the GI Strategy.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Under section 6 - the key elements of the strategy we would be supportive of the inclusion of a paragraph relating to the historic environment and how the strategy is supportive of the aims and management of the historic environment. Page 41 begins to look at specific landscape corridors. We note in the example of the Churnet Valley Corridor that there is reference to heritage assets that could be affected, which we are supportive of. However, there is no reference to these assets and management opportunities within the list of bullet points following paragraph 6.8 on page 41. We would welcome a specific bullet point that recognises these heritage assets and how the green infrastructure strategy can assist. Additionally, page 42 discusses the Churnet Valley: Winkhill Spur and cites "heritage issues" yet there is no further discussion about what these are or how they can be incorporated into the green infrastructure strategy. The above comments are relevant to all of the green infrastructure corridors where there are heritage assets or historic landscape character and we would request to see the inclusion of a specific bullet point for the historic environment in all relevant areas.</p>	<p>Kezia Taylerson</p>	<p>Historic England</p>	<p>GI65</p>	<p>Add "including the historic environment" to the end of the first bullet point at paragraph 6.6. Also add an additional bullet point to paragraphs 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 6.21 and 6.26 to read: "Conserve and enhance the setting of heritage assets by supporting access to and enjoyment of historic landscapes and heritage assets for recreation, education, and lifelong learning and strengthen or restore historic links between heritage assets using green infrastructure."</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>S.5.19 objectives for development of new routes should take avoiding disturbance to sensitive wildlife and damage to heritage assets (e.g. of disused railways and plate-ways). The GI Strategy appears to have missed an opportunity to promote sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) with biodiversity built into design as part of GI to provide more than a flood alleviation function. The Green Infrastructure Strategy includes a requirement that development should be informed by and be sympathetic to landscape character and quality and contribute to enhancement and conservation of the landscape, and this is supported. The Strategy also, in the section on Priorities and Proposals, adopts a holistic approach to securing benefits for biodiversity water quality and flood risk, and landscape and this is supported.</p>	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council	GI71	Add a new paragraph following 5.18 to read: "It should be noted that where work is undertaken to provide or improve green travel links, care should be taken to avoid disturbance to sensitive wildlife and damage to heritage assets (e.g. of disused railways and plate-ways). Also amend bullet point 16 at 6.21 to read "... SuDS features with biodiversity built into their design as part of ..."
<p>Question 6 - Do you agree with the suggested routes and corridors as illustrated on the strategic network settlement maps set out in section 7? If not, can you suggest what corridors you would support?</p>				
<p>Better connections and linkages to and within the NP needed</p>	Mrs Penny Anderson		GI7	Please see response to GI3 and GI55.
<p>Dislike the term 'corridors'. Smacks of a desire to build.</p>	Mr Peter Cowie		GI15	Noted.

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>The existing walking route right round Rudyard Lake could easily be altered to make it an off road circular cycle route as well. Currently cycling round is discouraged and there is at least one gate to negotiate. There seems no good reason why it cannot be turned into a cycle route!</p>	<p>Mr John Pigott</p>		<p>G120</p>	<p>Suggestion noted.</p>
<p>Biddulph Maps: Map 7.5 Ecological corridor 6 (Map 7.5) should extend along the entire length of the Biddulph Valley Way to the south. Ecological corridor 5a (Map 7.5) should extend slightly northwards to include The Clough (near PH and Poolfold). Ecological corridor 5 (Map 7.5) should include the whole of "The Sprink" to the east of Biddulph Grange. The specifics of the town centre maps will need more work and it is welcomed that Neighbourhood Plan Groups can add detail to these maps at a more local level. Map 7.6 focuses on water management corridors in Biddulph. This strategy recognises the role that tree planting can play in managing surface runoff and it is excellent to see suggested new riparian woodland to the east of the Valley. However, it is absent for the west of the valley and this needs future consideration, especially as more development will exacerbate these problems rather than decrease them.</p>	<p>MRS ANGELA Turner</p>		<p>G129</p>	<p>The ecological corridors illustrated on map 7.5 highlight where there are key habitats that would benefit from being protected, connected and enhanced for the benefit of wildlife. Overlaying this with key green travel routes and water management corridors has helped to identify the strategic corridors shown in map 6.1. The whole of the Biddulph Valley Way constitutes strategic corridor 6 (The Biddulph Corridor) and "The Sprink" to the East of Biddulph Grange is shown on map 6.1 as within Spur 5a (Whitemoor to High Bent).</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
I would wish to add the former railway line north of Leek to the cycling/horse network as a priority to enable a convenient and safe route avoiding the heavily used A523. All references to improving footpath and cycling network to include horse riding as well.	Mr Robert Turner		GI45	See response to GI41.
Question 7 - Do you agree with the proposals for an Implementation Plan as described in section 8? If not, can you suggest what proposals you would support?				
You will need to emphasize the use of agri-environment schemes to get financial support for many of your ambitious ideas. HLF may be another potential funder. There are some grants for health and wellbeing works too.	Mrs Penny Anderson		GI8	Suggestions noted with thanks.
The stated principles are fine provided that they are not conveniently adjusted to fit a local plan for huge numbers of houses and other built development such as Moneystone Park.	Mr Peter Cowie		GI16	Noted.
Yes I do and I welcome the role that Neighbourhood Plans can perform in partnership with other bodies.	MRS ANGELA Turner		GI30	Noted.

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
I broadly agree with the Implementation Plan. A key partner will be Staffordshire County Council as by its actions and inaction much of the pre-existing higher rights network (bridleways, BOATS, unmaintained public highways etc) has been downgraded or lost. As an authority it is not undertaking its statutory obligations to deal with applications to upgrade these rights of way where proper evidence is submitted.	Mr Robert Turner		G146	SMDC will continue to work with Staffordshire Couty Council where appropriate.
We would request that the historic environment forms part of the implementation strategy in section 8.	Kezia Taylerson	Historic England	G166	Please see response to G165.
An implementation Plan will be essential to facilitate delivery of actions to achieve Strategy objectives.	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council	G172	Please see response to G136.
Question 8 - Do you have any other comments?				

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>In the section on ecosystem services you have omitted discussion on carbon - there is much more carbon sequestered in flower-rich grassland than in monocultural grassland, much more in other habitats not arable, more in mixed, diverse structural woodlands than in conifers, lots in water too - ponds are very good. Any soils that are carbon rich - peaty or heathy with a deep organic horizon - are really important for carbon stores. These need to be protected and the habitat on them enhanced to protect the organic layer and to help trap more carbon (heathland or wet gleyed soils for example). You can use these arguments in the wider value of carbon and reduced effects of climate change (lots of little things add up) as part of the value of your suggestions for ecosystem services. Good luck with the development, resourcing and support of this strategy. I will be interested to see how you manage to implement it. It will mean prioritizing many of the actions and sourcing finance etc to support it. It ties in nicely with the S W Peak HLF LP project in which I am involved. Hope you can use this to obtain funding to make more links with the NP.</p>	Mrs Penny Anderson		G11	<p>Add additional text to paragraph 2.16 to read: "Carbon rich soils, such as those that are peaty or heathy and habitats like ponds, flower-rich grassland and mixed, diverse structural woodlands are very good carbon stores. Protecting and enhancing these soils and the habitats on them can play an important role in trapping carbon and helping to mitigate the effects of climate change." SMDC would welcome any links with the SW Peak Landscape Partnership project.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>This website is far too unwieldy for Joe Bloggs to access. I have wasted hours of my time simply trying to register. Today I was in luck. I have made several phone calls to SMDC without success - some staff are not au fait with the site and I have received confusing advice and emails which have not worked. Registration alone is too challenging and unnecessary in order to gain productive consultation. Comments for planning applications do not require registration, password etc. So why does consultation on local plans which have severe impact on our environment?</p>	Mr Peter Cowie		G117	Noted. The Council produced a guide to how to make comments via the online consultation system. Responses to the Local Plan and this GI consultation can also be made by email and letter.
<p>There is also a plan to put in a bypass to the west of Cheadle from Team Road to Draycott Cross Road. This would not ease any traffic congestion in the town as if you were to travel from Tean to Blythe Bridge you would not use this road and it would not ease traffic heading for Alton Towers as it would still have to travel through the town. The traffic survey is also flawed as it was conducted during the autumn and winter months and does not capture the increase of traffic in the summer months.</p>	Mr Julian Baskeyfield		G122	Noted. Please also see G139.

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Natural England welcomes this Strategy and considers that it provides a valuable framework for the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure within the Staffordshire Moorlands. We are pleased to note that the benefits of GI have been clearly set out and welcome the analysis of existing green infrastructure assets. We will be happy to work in partnership with the local authority in the future to help implement the priorities that the strategy identifies.</p>	<p>Consultation Service</p>	<p>Natural England</p>	<p>GI23</p>	<p>Support noted and offer of continued partnership working received with thanks.</p>
<p>I await the detail of the Implementation Plan with interest.</p>	<p>MRS ANGELA Turner</p>		<p>GI31</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>I would welcome a conversation about how this strategy can help link young children in the area with their immediate natural environment. Recently I have been working to encourage carers and children into Leek's green areas. Our own survey asking people who attended why they came, how they benefitted, and why they wouldn't go alone revealed some interesting impacts on physical and mental health, a greater respect for the space and a strong connection to community as a consequence of joining our activities. Hope to hear from you!</p>	<p>Mrs Lorna Stoddart</p>		<p>GI35</p>	<p>SMDC would welcome a conversation to consider how this strategy and wider work of the Council can help to support connecting young children with their natural environment.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>The owners of the Mobberley Farm Strategic Development site have noted Mr Julian Baskeyfield's comments about the "bypass" with interest as the view that it will not aid congestion in the town centre reflects the earlier view of the Highways Authority. Irrespective if that a distributor road is going to be needed to serve 400+ houses and so it should be possible to combine both functions provided a route for the road and the dimensions it should have can be agreed soon.</p>	<p>Mr T A J Campbell</p>		<p>GI39</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The comments set out below are from the partnership as a whole and do not necessarily fully represent views of individual partners. The Churnet Valley Living Landscape Partnership (CVLLP) is a multi-sector partnership seeking to conserve and enhance the area's unique landscape and heritage for all to enjoy. The programme began in 2012 and with a grant of £1.89 million from Heritage Lottery Fund's Landscapes Partnership initiative and other funding it has helped deliver a range of projects run by local organisations and community groups to create long term environmental and social benefits for the area. These aspirations are in line with the stated aims set out in policy C3 of the Local Plan Preferred Options and the Strategic Green Infrastructure Network (SGIN) and it is welcomed that the special nature of the Churnet Valley is recognised. It is also welcomed that the CVLLP are seen as a key delivery agent for proposals within the GSIN. It is understood that an implementation</p>	<p>Mr Ian Wykes</p>	<p>Development Manager Churnet Valley Living Landscape Partnership</p>	<p>GI42</p>	<p>The Council is keen to work closely with CVLLP in considering how best to ensure effective implementation of the strategy.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>The strategy will only be of value if implemented. I hope that local, charitable and specialist interest groups will be encouraged to be involved. There is a potentially a wealth of enthusiasm and knowledge available and access to funding not claimable by local authorities.</p>	<p>Mr Robert Turner</p>		<p>GI47</p>	<p>Noted. Partnership with other organisations to help implement the strategy will be welcomed.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Agree more woodland planting to link existing woodlands. Also support circular path around Biddulph. "Knypersley Corridor" and spurs are badly named. Support improving the Biddulph Valley Way. This will require measures to ban its increasing use by motorbikes and quad bikes. There is also encroachment onto the Way by adjacent property owners. The allotments near to Biddulph Leisure Centre and near the Gardeners Arms Pub in Brown Lees village are missing from the map. Map 7.4 shows Long Lane and Brown Lees Road from HARRISEAHEAD to Brown Lees as a designated cycle network route. This is a dangerous lane and unsuited to a cycle route. Map A.4 shows flood risks, and Biddulph stands out as being a "hot spot" for flooding. However there are insufficient measures proposed to deal with this. Also the Sewage Works seems inadequate for the size of the population, as sewage floods regularly after torrential rain.</p>	Mrs Lesley Averill		GI48	<p>Support for tree planting and the proposed Biddulph circular route noted. Please see response to GI27 re naming of the Knypersley corridor and its spurs. The Council records three allotment sites in Biddulph, at: Moorland Road, Squirrel Hayes Avenue and Church Road Community Garden. Th flooding hotspots shown on Map A.4 use data obtained from Staffordshire County Council records of reports received from residents, district councils, fire services and other bodies of flooding incidents around the County. A number of the bullet points at paragraph 6.21 identify proposed priorities and actions in Biddulph to address flood risk as a consequence of the high number of incidents of flooding reported in the town. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support Local Plan proposals.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>CH001 - I believe that the Highways Department has raised serious concerns about the road system in Cheadle not being able to cope with additional housing. The proposed school would be accessed through CH001. CH001 - Potential for increased flooding and risk to existing properties, damage to Water Vole habitat. CH001 - This is the site of old mine workings, development has been avoided in this area in the past.</p>	Chris Bolton		GI51	<p>Policy DSC1 (Cheadle North Strategic Development Area) requires development to be subject to a comprehensive masterplan to include detailed investigation work in relation to the mining legacy of the site; site specific flood risk assessment and consideration of the impact of growth on the Cecilly Brook Local Nature Reserve, the ecological network identified on map 7.8 and the priorities and actions identified in this Green Infrastructure Plan.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Yes I do want to comment . I am sure you have made this web site so complicated on purpose, and the questions on paper are also very difficult for the average person to understand. You should realize that it is also the lives of many older people you are about to effect. I have had many conversations with people who do not know how to express themselves apart from breaking into tears. I am in total disgust of the way Cheadle has been treated, nobody has listened to all our comments over the years. I fail to understand how you people can dictate what happens to our town when the majority of you have not even been to Cheadle or experienced its problems, no way is this right. Even the signed petition of almost 1000 signatures in objection has made no difference. I am proud to say I am a fifth generation of Cheadle and I feel what you are doing is very wrong. In the future either the council or the residents will go down in history for the responsibility of what Cheadle has become - a congested poor sister of the Moorlands or thriving popular market town. Sadly by your choice I doubt it will not be the latter - you should think again!</p>	<p>Mrs Jennifer C Moreton</p>		<p>GI53</p>	<p>The vision for the GI strategy is set out at paragraph 4.3. Please also see response to GI17.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>Overall, the RSPB welcomes the Green Infrastructure Strategy. We are please to see that use has been made of existing datasets and mapping and the work of the Churnet Valley Living Landscape Partnership, to help to develop a coherent strategy. We would be keen to work with the local authority and other partners to help ensure that due consideration of the opportunities presented by this strategy to improve ecological networks for priority species and habitats are realized and that there is a net gain for nature. We would also encourage thought to be given of how this plans can be realized and additionally how they can be monitored and evaluated to ensure that objectives for improved ecological networks as part of this strategic approach are delivered effectively.</p>	<p>Mr Mike Shurmer</p>	<p>Senior Conservation Officer RSPB</p>	<p>GI59</p>	<p>Overall support noted. SMDC is grateful for the advice and assistance provided by the RSPB in the development of the strategy to date and welcomes the offer of further partnership working. The Implementation Plan will set out arrangements for monitoring progress and reviewing priorities.</p>

Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
<p>NFU has over 1600 farming businesses in membership in Staffordshire and thriving branches in Leek and Cheadle. Agricultural businesses invest in landscape management and enhancement works but this is not acknowledged. Concerned that strategy may add to the regulatory burden for farmers eg access already covered by Rights of Way Improvement Plans; landscape and biodiversity delivery is covered by cross compliance and agri-environment schemes. Agriculture, food production and farm businesses are not mentioned, a paragraph is needed on the role and importance of Staffordshire's farmers. Vision should include role and contribution of agriculture. Para 5.7 Impact of new urban development on surrounding farmland should be addressed. 5.13 Existing provision should be acknowledged. 5.19 farmers and landowners must be fully engaged with discussions on access. 5.29 This includes any new access to water. 5.36 Needs reference to green belt being maintained by agricultural businesses - farming businesses have an essential role in maintaining landscape. 5.64 and 5.75 This should recognise that many listed habitats are agricultural. 5.72 Much of the action proposed relies on farmers and landowners for delivery. Analysis is required of how this can be achieved via profitable farm businesses engaged in food production. 5.85 themes directly affect agricultural businesses, point 6 should include a focus on impacts on the rural economy and farm businesses. 6.3 Clarity is needed on how this would relate to wider farmland. NFU happy to discuss development of the strategy with the Council.</p>	Ms S Faulkner	Environment and Rural Affairs Adviser (West Midlands) NFU	GI62	<p>Helpful and constructive input from NFU welcomed. NFU to be invited to join Steering Group to ensure farmers and landowners are fully engaged. Add new paragraph following existing paragraph 2.16 under the heading "environmental stewardship". Add new text following existing paragraph 5.34 to read: "Sustainable agriculture is crucial for the development of rural economies as well as the rural landscape. Farmers are often considered the custodians of nature - their livelihoods depending on the wellbeing of their natural surroundings - as well as high quality natural environments providing multiple benefits that support sustainable agriculture, healthy and diversified food production and thriving farm businesses." 4.5 Add additional benefit to read: "Contribution to a healthy and diverse natural environment that is essential to food security, sustainable livelihoods, increased resistance to natural disasters and ability to recover from them, support for secure and sustainable food production and other long-term benefits from agriculture." Add a new bullet point to 5.64 to read: "Support high quality local environments that help under-pin sustainable agriculture by enabling appropriate nutrient cycling, pollination of crops, pest control, availability of water and flood control, as well as soil protection." 5.85 add new point to read: "Enhance the profitability of farm businesses and provide extra sources of income for rural communities."</p>

Summary of responses to GI Strategy consultation July 2017 with action taken				
	Column1	Column2	Column3	Column4
Question	Full Name	Organisation (where relevant)	Ref	Action taken
Question 1 - Do you support the overall vision and aims of the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council Green Infrastructure Strategy (set out in section 4 of this report)?				
Yes. I fully support the preservation of the SM countryside.	Mr Peter Cowie		GI10	Support noted.
I support all movement towards the promotion of matters GREEN and hope that decision makers at SMDC share this support and demonstrate this support through the avoidance of building development in the countryside.	Mr Peter Cowie		GI18	The GI strategy makes clear at paragraph 6.3 that the location of a site within or close to a corridor forming part of the strategic network is not in itself a barrier to development. The priorities and proposals set out in chapter 6 will provide a steer as to the habitat protection / restoration or GI enhancement / creation to be contributed to as part of a development proposal.