

**SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE COUNCIL – LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – 2018 - 2037**  
**SPATIAL HOUSING STRATEGY & INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY – OCTOBER 2019**

**LAND AT REAR OF MELWOOD - COVEN ROAD/TINKERS'S LANE -BREWOOD – ST19 9DE**

**Mr D. CONN**

---

1. I refer to the above consultation and confirm that I act for the owner, as above, of the land identified on the **attached plan**.
  
2. The land concerned has been put forward for consideration previously and categorised as “*potentially suitable*” in the SHELAA, under ref. **616**. The commentary with the SHELAA entry is generally endorsed. In particular, it is agreed that the “*..site does not read as physically isolated from the rest of the village*”. A public footpath in the highway verge is also provided along Coven Road to and beyond the junction with Port and Tinker’s Lanes providing safe pedestrian access to the village centre.
  
3. It is noted that the Green Belt Assessment concludes that the release of land in this Parcel (S32L) would result in “**moderate-high**” harm. From the Study, this assessment is primarily due to separation from the village by The Pavement Road and the watercourse. However, this assessment is contradicted by the commentary in the SHELAA regarding this particular parcel of land, as above. This is as a consequence of Parcel SL32L extending to some 71 hectares, making it impossible to distinguish between more discrete areas. Any harm to the Green Belt from built development on my clients’ land will, in our view, be negligible.

4. It is also noted that the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (Area Ref.SL75s1) adjudges overall sensitivity of this landscape area to residential development to be **“high”**. This is stated to be *“..due to the combination of historic field patterns present, which are important to landscape character and contribute to scenic quality and biodiversity, its small scale, occasionally intimate character with relatively strong rural perceptual qualities, and the strong visual and historical relationship with the adjacent edge of Brewood, which includes parts of its Conservation Area.”*
5. However, as above my client’s land is clearly distinguishable from the remaining 95 has., within the Parcel concerned, by the fact that it exhibits different characteristics from those described above. Any visual harm from built development on my clients’ land will be negligible.
6. From the published documentation, it is clear that within all the options put forward which can actually meet the housing requirement as stated, some area or areas of land will need to be removed from the green belt (either as allocations or future areas of safeguarded land) in Brewood, to meet some of the housing needs and the identified infrastructure need.
7. My client, therefore, considers that his land should be allocated for future housing development in the Review, particularly in view of how it *“reads”* as part of the village; the minimal harm to Green Belt considerations that would result from built development, and its limited visual sensitivity.

8. An indicative built development scheme for the land is shown on the attached. This particularly shows how a development would consolidate development in the locality. On site Public Open Space will improve such provision in the village.
  
9. It is confirmed that the land is available for development without any ownership or known technical constraints.
  
10. It is considered, therefore, that the site should be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan Review.

**oOo**