



1 Springhill SHIFNAL Shropshire TF11 8FA

Tel: 07976 080813

Email: [andy@advance-planning.co.uk](mailto:andy@advance-planning.co.uk)

South Staffordshire Council

**Local Plans Team**

Council Offices

Wolverhampton Road

Codsall WV8 1PX

Our Ref: ALP/SDL/GW/SITE139/PO1

10 December 2021

Dear Sirs

**South Staffordshire Local Plan Review – Draft Preferred Options**

**Representations on behalf of Seabridge Developments Ltd – Re: Site 139**

**Introduction**

You will be aware that we represented Seabridge Developments Limited in respect of Site 139 during the preparation of the Site Allocations Document (SAD).

Our client continues to promote this site on behalf of the landowners and maintains a legal interest in the land. We are currently in the process of collating and updating all of the necessary information to support a planning application in due course.

**Local Plan Representations**

1. Great Wyrley and Cheslyn Hay are both Tier 1 settlements offering a good range of services and facilities and positioned in a highly accessible location between Cannock to the north and the West Midlands conurbation to the south with excellent links to the local, regional and national road networks and also a rail link. It therefore represents a sustainable location for housing growth.

2. In a District such as South Staffordshire, which is predominantly Green Belt, it is important to make best use of land that is not in the Green Belt. Site 139 was scrutinised and endorsed by the Council and the Inspector through the SAD process and it was subsequently removed from the Green Belt, placed within the Inset boundary for Great Wyrley and allocated for housing (minimum 35 units). Circumstances have not changed since the allocation, other than for the development of two bungalows on Green Belt land immediately to the west, which merely serves to consolidate it within the urban confines of the settlement. It therefore remains wholly appropriate that the allocation should be retained and carried forward in the emerging Local Plan (eLP). In the circumstances, we fully support the proposed allocation of Site 139, which remains eminently 'suitable', 'available' and 'developable' and will come forward in the near future.
3. We endorse the increase in the minimum capacity from 35 units to 46 units, which we are confident can readily be accommodated along with the required public open space.
4. We support the proposed open space requirement of 0.006ha per dwelling referred to in Policy HC17. We consider this to be a more reasonable requirement than the one contained in the existing Development Plan.

Concern is, however, raised that the emerging requirements appear to provide no flexibility with regards to a site's context. For instance, the requirement for open space to be centrally located is overly prescriptive and may not be appropriate when considering on-site constraints. It is suggested that the word 'centrally' should be replaced with 'appropriately' located. We note that the Local Planning Authority intends to prepare an Open Space, Sports and Recreation SPD in due course so further explanation may not be required in the Local Plan, but if the Council considers it necessary to elucidate on the matter, reference could be made to the location of open space respecting the principles of good urban design, accessibility and public surveillance, etc

Yours faithfully

*Andy Williams*

**A J Williams Dip TP, MRTPI**

**Director**