

Statutory Consultee	Comement Date	Statutory Comment	Persimmon Homes Comment	Information Submitted
Trees (Steve Massey)	29/07/2022	The detailed planning layout for Phase 2 reflects the general indicative layout shown on the outline masterplan. The AIA report shows several mature trees within the hedgeline along the north-east boundary of the Phase 2 site, along with several groups of trees (mostly off-site) along the Cecilly Brook following the application site’s south-east boundary. However, due to the undeveloped buffer and screening strips proposed along these edges, the proposed development in terms of roads, dwellings, school etc would have no adverse impact on these trees and would allow for their retention. Similarly, the existing field hedgerows bounding the Phase 2 site would also be retained.	Noted	n/a
		There is an existing NW-SE aligned hedgerow separating the 2 fields which form the Phase 2 site. This is denoted H17 in the AIA report. The SE part of this hedge would be retained (appropriately within open space areas, rather than as private garden boundary) whilst the NW part is, mainly of necessity, shown to be removed to accommodate the proposed layout – which overall is considered acceptable, and this loss would be mitigated by new planting. However, the westernmost 25m or so of H17 would follow the boundary of the proposed school site and should be retained to minimise biodiversity losses	Layout has been revised to accommodate the retention of a greater extent of hedgerow H17 adjacent to plot 209 and the proposed school boundary.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Detailed Planting Plan Sheet 4 of 11 (Ref: 8060-L-17 Rev C)
		It is noted that the front elevations of Plots 126 – 129 have been set back (compared with as previously indicated on the outline masterplan layout) and now follow the front elevation “building line” of Plots 121 -125 on the approved Phase 1 layout – this responds positively to the comment raised at hybrid application stage, and now provides consistently greater clearance from the existing mature grown out hedgerow/treeline (G43 in the AIA report) along the southern boundary.	Noted	n/a
		Initial pre-app discussions highlighted the need for a substantial screening buffer (min 15m wide) along the NE and SE boundaries of the Phase 2 site in order to mitigate for the visual impact of a major new development expanding out into open countryside, and a further 15m buffer along the Cecilly Brook at the SE boundary for habitat protection and enhancement associated with the watercourse corridor. The detailed layout plan now submitted for the Phase 2 reserved matters application for the most part makes spatial provision for these buffers (which are denoted on the “Planning Layout Phase 2” Drg. No. ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev G) and shows an undeveloped corridor of open space within/along these site boundaries. However, the exception to this is the cul-de-sac and turning head adjacent to Plot 143, which encroach to within 8m of the watercourse and does not leave space for any structural screen planting at this point which is close to where Public Footpath Cheadle 39 enters the SE corner of the site which would give intrusive unscreened/unfiltered views of/into the development. It is considered important to make spatial provision to accommodate structural screen planting, so this area would benefit from amendment to achieve this	Layout has been revised to increase area of open space between developable area and watercourse, and to ensure development does not encroach within 8m of the watercourse and provides opportunity for structural planting to the south west of the site to provide a visual screen of the development from Public Footpath 39	Detailed Planting Plan General Arrangement (Ref: 8060-L-13 Rev C); Detailed Planting Plan Sheets 1 to 11 (Ref: 8060-L-14 Rev C to 8060-L-24 Rev C);
		In addition to remaining undeveloped, the 15m buffer strip along the Cecilly Brook needs to remain largely free of new tree/shrub planting, and be enhanced/managed as rough grassland for the particular benefit of the Water Vole population (protected species). However, the detailed landscaping proposals submitted with this reserved matters application specify continuous native woodland planting belt immediately alongside the watercourse and grassland with scattered trees inside (i.e. west of) the woodland belt – this is exactly the opposite to what is required! I note that SWT’s consultation comments also pick up on this point. This needs to be amended to show 15m grassland buffer alongside the watercourse with little if any new tree planting within this grassland – perhaps an odd bit of scrub here and there. And then a substantial screening buffer to the east of the grassland to address the visual impact issues noted above.	Planting plans have been revised to provide a 15m wildflower meadow buffer to Cecily Brook with native scrub and tree planting beyond to act as visual screen.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Detailed Planting Plan General Arrangement (Ref: 8060-L-13 Rev C); Detailed Planting Plan Sheets 1 to 11 (Ref: 8060-L-14 Rev C to 8060-L-24 Rev C);
		Whilst it was always recognised that the 15m screening buffer to the NE and SE edges of the Phase 2 site may not in practice require solid 15m width of continuous woodland planting all the way along, the objective is to establish substantial screening to mitigate for the visual impact on open countryside beyond. I note that in places along the NE boundary the proposed width of woodland planting belt is down to only 3m wide (eg in the vicinity of Plot 174) and only 2m wide (eg opposite the turning head adjacent to Plot 148) – this is substantially deficient to provide effective screening, and structural/screening planting proposals need to be significantly increased along this NE boundary. It really needs to be of the order of 10m wide to be worthy of the name “woodland”. This same approach should be applied to the SE boundary, after allowing for the 15m grassland buffer adjacent to the Cecilly Brook.	Layout has been revised to increase the extent of open space along the north eastern boundary to ensure a circa 15m buffer on this boundary.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Detailed Planting Plan General Arrangement (Ref: 8060-L-13 Rev C); Detailed Planting Plan Sheets 1 to 11 (Ref: 8060-L-14 Rev C to 8060-L-24 Rev C);

Statutory Consultee	Comement Date	Statutory Comment	Persimmon Homes Comment	Information Submitted
		The native woodland belt is shown immediately adjacent to the existing field hedgerow along the NE boundary (denoted H25, H29 & H30 in the AIA report). I note that SWT comment that this is a species-rich hedgerow and planting alongside it should be avoided so as not to shade out the hedgerow flora and compromise its on-going management, and I would generally agree with this.	Planting scheme has been revised to remove the proposed continuous woodland planting alongside the existing hedgerow which has been replaced by areas of scattered tree planting to support the filtering of views	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Detailed Planting Plan General Arrangement (Ref: 8060-L-13 Rev C); Detailed Planting Plan Sheets 1 to 11 (Ref: 8060-L-14 Rev C to 8060-L-24 Rev C);
		The above two paragraphs point to the need for a re-think about the approach to planting within this buffer strip along the NE boundary, and there may well need to be some compromise between screening/visual impact mitigation and habitat enhancement/management objectives. I'd suggest that the potential views of/into the development from the NE (eg along Public Footpath Cheadle 40 and occasional glimpses from Lockwood Road in the vicinity of Olde Thornbury Hall Farm) would be less prominent and less critical (with fewer footpath users on this route) than the comparative views from the SE along Public Footpath Cheadle 39 and the Cherry Lane direction, so some relaxation of the nominal "15m screening buffer" to the NE boundary may be acceptable to better support biodiversity considerations. Again as SWT suggests, this could perhaps include more distinct copses rather than continuous woodland, together with use of individual scattered trees including orchard species. Nevertheless the screening/filtering/softening issue remains	As above	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Detailed Planting Plan General Arrangement (Ref: 8060-L-13 Rev C); Detailed Planting Plan Sheets 1 to 11 (Ref: 8060-L-14 Rev C to 8060-L-24 Rev C);
		On a point of detail in relation to the proposed species mix for the native woodland belt given in the planting specification on "Detailed Planting Plan Sheet 1 of 11" Drg. No. 860-L-13 Rev B, <i>Taxus baccata</i> (Common Yew) is not characteristically native to this area and also given that it is poisonous and there may be children playing unsupervised it would be better omitted from the planting schedule – I would suggest it is replaced by Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>). In addition, <i>Ligustrum vulgare</i> (Common Privet) is also not characteristic of our woodlands here, and I'd request that it is omitted and replaced by Silver Birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>)	Amendments made to the planting schedule.	Detailed Planting Plan General Arrangement (Ref: 8060-L-13 Rev C);
		The proposed new native hedgerow planting along the far NW boundary (Hammersley Hayes Rd frontage north of Silver Street) should be extended along the full length of this frontage boundary to meet the existing field hedgerow along the NE boundary of the site and provide better habitat connectivity.	Planting plans have been revised to extend the hedgerow along the full extent of Hammersley Hayes Road to meet the existing field hedgerow along the NE boundary.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Detailed Planting Plan General Arrangement (Ref: 8060-L-13 Rev C); Detailed Planting Plan Sheets 1 to 11 (Ref: 8060-L-14 Rev C to 8060-L-24 Rev C);
		On-plot planting proposals are par for the course and generally acceptable. However, the Tulip Tree (<i>Liriodendron</i>) is not considered suitable for the plot frontage and streetscene positions indicated, and although it is acknowledged that the 'Fastigiata' variety is specified, this being a more compact and narrow/upright-crowned form, it is still a fast-growing tree potentially capable of achieving 15 – 20m in height at maturity which would be overly-dominant in the onplot streetscene positions it is proposed, as it would be anticipated to lead to premature removals and repeated substantial crown reductions. This should therefore be replaced by a more compact species eg Scarlet Hawthorn or Amelanchier.	Amendments made to planting schedule.	Detailed Planting Plan General Arrangement (Ref: 8060-L-13 Rev C);
Highways (David Plant)	16/06/2022	A number of plots don't meet current local plan parking standards.	Please refer to parking schedule. Layout has been revised to include alternative housetypes and ensure each plot is provided with policy-compliant parking including 6x3m integral and detached garages.	Parking Schedule Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Housetype drawings
		Detached garages are below the minimum dimension of 6m long x 3m wide to count as a parking space. Garages to house types 'Strand' (Not dimensioned but scale at 5.1m long x 2.7m wide with a build out which further reduces size); 'Harley' (Not dimensioned but scale at 5.1m long x 2.7m wide with a build out which further reduces size); 'Fenchurch' (double garage, not dimensioned but scales at 5.2m long x 5.4m wide) do not meet minimum standards to count as a parking space.	Layout has been revised to introduce new housetypes with 6x3m garages.	Parking Schedule Rev A Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Housetype drawings
		Drawing SGD-01 entitled 6x3 single/double garages is included in the application. 6x3 appears to refer to external dimensions. Parking standards require internal dimensions of 6mx3m to be counted towards parking provision. Internal piers are shown which reduce available space.	Detached garage has been replaced by a larger garage.	Garage Plans and Elevations (Ref: Ga1.1_MA_R21 201 Rev A)
		Plots 129, 130, 134, 140, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167 – 185 are each short of one parking space.	Layout has been revised to include alternative housetypes and ensure each plot is provided with policy-compliant parking including 6x3m integral and detached garages.	Parking Schedule Rev A Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Housetype drawings

Statutory Consultee	Comement Date	Statutory Comment	Persimmon Homes Comment	Information Submitted
		Plots 250 and 251 are shown as 1 space each, but there is space to the rear to allow tandem parking.	Layout has been revised so plots (now plots247-248) have 2 no. spaces each.	Parking Schedule Rev A Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Housetype drawings
		Some plots could increase parking relatively simply – remove garages to plots 129, 147 and replace with open parking space. Or increase size of detached garages. Dwellings with integral garages will need more consideration.	Layout has been revised to provide larger detached garages.	Parking Schedule Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Garage Plans and Elevations (Ref: Ga1.1_MA_R21 201 Rev A)
		Swept Path of 9.86m long refuse vehicle has been produced ‘at the request of the highway authority’. It is not clear where this has come from. Maximum size 11.9m refuse vehicles are used by SMDC waste collection. 11.2m refuse vehicle was tracked for technical approval of phase 1. This should be used for phase 2.	Swept path analysis has been revised to reflect 11.2m refuse vehicle.	Swept Path Analysis (Ref: 2002-SP04 Rev A)
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (Kate Dewey)	14/04/2022	Policy NE1 in the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Adopted September 2020, expects that ‘all development where possible seeks to deliver a net gain in biodiversity proportionate to the size and scale of the development. In circumstances where adverse impacts are demonstrated to be unavoidable, developers will be required to ensure that impacts are appropriately mitigated, with suitable compensation measures towards loss of habitat used only as a last resort where there is no alternative’ Although there are areas of green space, the majority of the site would be developed and it would appear that the proposals will result in a net loss of biodiversity. The Ecological Assessment dated March 2018 by TEP, carried out for the outline application SMD/2018/0180, was based upon Illustrative Masterplan ref. 8060-L-07 Rev A, rather than the later Rev M plan that was approved under the outline permission. The currently submitted Planning Layout is also slightly different to the approved outline plan, and it appears that roadways encroach further into the green spaces in some areas. In order to judge the overall biodiversity impact, and inform the landscaping design and possibly layout, a Biodiversity Impact Assessment using Defra metric 3.0 is required.	BNG Assessment has been completed and SWT have confirmed that they will seek a 10% BNG. Separate correspondence sent to case officer seeking meeting in view of viability issues arising from increased financial obligation. <u>Meeting to be arranged to discuss.</u>	
		Habitat priorities in this location are grassland, wetlands, hedgerows and small woodlands. There will be an overall loss of grassland habitat from the site, so retained areas should provide species-rich grassland as much as possible. Most is shaded as amenity grassland – all the open spaces should be species-rich meadow, which can be cut short alongside paths. The brook should not be planted with woodland planting, as this will shade the banks and make the habitat less suitable for water voles. The landscaping should include features to dissuade dogs and cats from entering the brook corridor. Some woodland copse planting would be appropriate in corners of the site, and around the central/southern hedgerow as this is a very sparse line of bushes. However woodland planting is not appropriate against the northern boundary hedge as this is species rich, and would compromise its ongoing management. Scattered trees within meadow grassland would be more suitable. Orchard trees would be appropriate in some areas. Losses to the internal hedgerow should be minimised- a further section might be kept alongside the school boundary. Retained hedges should be enhanced with additional local specie and standard trees where possible. Any felled woody material and stumps should be retained to form habitat piles within the green areas.	Planting plans have been revised to provide species rich wildflower meadow in areas of public open space in place of amenity grassland. Planting around brook has been revised to provide species rich wildflower meadow around the brook. Planting has been revised on the site's north eastern boundary replacing woodland planting with scattered trees set within wildflower meadow. Additional extent of existng hedgerow to be retained along school boundary and adjacent to plot 209. Retained hedgerows enhanced with additional trees and wildflower meadow.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Detailed Planting Plan General Arrangement (Ref: 8060-L-13 Rev C); Detailed Planting Plan Sheets 1 to 11 (Ref: 8060-L-14 Rev C to 8060-L-24 Rev C);

Statutory Consultee	Comement Date	Statutory Comment	Persimmon Homes Comment	Information Submitted
		No detailed surface water drainage plans have been submitted. The FRA for the outline application was assessed with against a different layout, and is also now 4 years old. Conditions 31 and 32 of the outline permission required drainage plans to be submitted for each phase. Although these are pre-commencement conditions, the drainage needs of the site are directly related to the layout, and greatly impact the landscaping scheme. Due to the the impeded drainage of the land, proximity of the Cecilly Brook, and the presence of a legally protected water vole population on the site, water management is a key element which needs to be considered at the reserved matters stage. The sustainable drainage proposals could be better integrated into the overall landscaping, by making use of the existing ditches within the hedgerows onsite, which currently drain the land. Roadways on the northern edge may be able to discharge water to the northern hedgerow ditch, via small balancing features, which would then run naturally into the brook. Likewise, the central hedgerow supports a ditch which carries water to the brook in wet weather. Both drainage pathways are visible on the surface water flood risk maps. Adapting and feeding into these existing features, using them as swales, would spread the water volumes between two discharge points, and could negate any need for an artificial outfall to the brook. Two or more smaller balancing basin features may be more appropriate than one deeper feature. Any balancing ponds could be designed to benefit water voles, with some sections of steeper banks.	Balancing pond has been reconfigured to create 2 no. ponds.	Proposed Drainage Layout (Ref: 10-01 Rev P3)
		The submitted CEMP does not include the information regarding biodiversity, ecological clerk of works etc. required under condition 17 of the outline permission.	Updated CEMP to follow.	CEMP (to follow)
		Survey were carried out by TEP in May and September 2021. No otter signs were found, but there was evidence of a good population of water voles on the brook. Any impacts to the brook banks, such as drainage outfalls, may require a licence. Natural drainage features and avoidance of any artificial outfalls or construction within 8m of the brook is therefore strongly recommended. Water voles require grassy vegetation and wetland plants to feed on – therefore the brook banks need to remain unshaded by additional planting, and existing trees will need to be appropriately managed through pollarding, thinning and scrub control in the long-term	Updated CEMP to follow.	CEMP (to follow)
		A survey was carried out by TEP in May 2021. No badger signs were found. However the report states that if no works on site commence within 12 months of the date of survey then an updated badger survey will be required to ascertain status of badger on site. This should be included in the CEMP.	Updated Badger Survey to be updated prior to commencement of works on-site.	CEMP (to follow)
		While most properties are orientated with a roof facing south, many are not, or have shaped roofs that would not allow maximum use of solar panels. As this is an increasing concern and need, consideration should be given to ensuring all homes have suitable roof design and orientation. The design is quite car-dominated, with a large area of roadways- this should be reduced as far as possible to maximise green space	Layout has been revised with plots orientated where possible. Amendments made to seek to reduce dominance of car parking on streetscene. Appropriate planting used in front gardens to break up areas of frontage parking.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Detailed Planting Plan General Arrangement (Ref: 8060-L-13 Rev C); Detailed Planting Plan Sheets 1 to 11 (Ref: 8060-L-14 Rev C to 8060-L-24 Rev C);
Waste (Jason Taylor)	05/01/2022	No issues regarding waste collections. Note: Bin collection points look ok as the vehicles don't go over block paving.	N/A	N/A
Environment Agency	24/12/2021	The Environment Agency has no objections to the submission of Reserved Matters.	N/A	N/A
Natural England	22/12/2021	Natural England has no comments to make on this application.	N/A	N/A

Statutory Consultee	Comement Date	Statutory Comment	Persimmon Homes Comment	Information Submitted
Staffordshire Police (David Elkington)	17/12/2021	Generally the road network has been designed to reduce vehicle speeds within the development to aid safety generally and reduce the potential for nuisance to residents. However, the north-east facing development edge will contain a comparatively long straight section comprising alternate vehicle lanes/private drives and highway hammerheads (as seen opposite). Between this and the site boundary is a cycle/footpath looping near the outside of the site. The concern is whether this could result in some vehicles using this straight line rather than the regular road network as presumably intended. This could have safety implications for pedestrians/cyclists coming out of individual drives onto this route and pedestrians/cyclists cutting across this route from elsewhere in the development to access the looped footpath/cycle path.	The layout has been revised to introduce a break in private drives to reduce the extent of straight road. Removable bollards have been incorporated into the layout to prevent long expanses of straight road.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M)
		The Crime Prevention section of the DAS states that the development will embrace the guiding principles of Secured by Design guidance, albeit it references New Homes 2014 rather than the current Homes 2019 design guide. One of the bullet-points states ‘Restrict public access and opportunities for access to the rear of buildings’. It is noted that a number of rear access paths will be included to serve the rear access to mid-terrace dwellings. Unfortunately the Boundary Treatments drawing (see extract opposite) does not show these as gated meaning that anyone could access them potentially making the rear of the dwellings more vulnerable to burglary as well as increasing the opportunity for anti-social behaviour. The Homes 2019 (Paragraph 13.2) states ‘It is preferable that footpaths are not placed to the back of properties. If they are essential to give access to the rear of properties they must be gated. The gates must be placed at the entrance to the footpath, as near to the front building line as possible, so that attempts to climb them will be in full view of the street. Where possible the street lighting scheme should be designed to ensure that the gates are well illuminated. Gates must be capable of being locked (operable by key from both sides of the gate) ...’ Consequently it is recommended that appropriate amendments are made to incorporate such gates, full recommendations about which can be found within Section 13 of the Homes 2019 design guide.	Gates have been added to rear access paths.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M)
		A footpath is indicated between the new school site, and plots 233/260. The side garden boundaries of those two plots bordering this footpath will comprise a 2m high acoustic fence. While there will be natural surveillance over the footpath area directly in front of each house, the acoustic fence section of footpath will not be well overlooked. Anything that could be done to improve this should be considered. Potentially this run of not well overlooked fencing could attract graffiti. Elsewhere within the development, planting has been used to help protect rear garden boundaries that will abut public space, which is another positive feature. There is a strong case to provide some defensive hedging on the outside of this acoustic fence as well. This could serve a number of purposes: improve security for the respective dwellings; substantially reduce opportunity for graffiti; push anyone likely to loiter/gather there out onto the path and potentially subject to greater view; soften the appearance of the fencing; and provide ecological benefits.	Hedgerow planting added alongside 2m acoustic fence to provide additional security and reduce opportunity for grafitti.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Detailed Planting Plan General Arrangement (Ref: 8060-L-13 Rev C); Detailed Planting Plan Sheets 1 to 11 (Ref: 8060-L-14 Rev C to 8060-L-24 Rev C);
		Secured by Design Homes 2019 guidance recommends “Where parking is designed to be adjacent to or between units [as will be the case in places here], a gable end window should be considered to allow residents an unrestricted view over their vehicles”. There would be scope to make improvements within this development in this regard. For example, the side parking for plot 143 (circled) does not appear to be subject to such overlooking.	In some instances, plots have been orientated to provide additional surveillance to parking areas. Otherwise, windows are provided to provide surveillance.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Housetype Drawings
		The footpath/cycle path that will loop around just inside the outer edge of the site will meet a lane at the northern edge of the site. It may be worth considering the likelihood of motorbikes using this access point, which could be a nuisance and pedestrian danger. If there is some likelihood then the incorporation of some form of appropriate barrier and robust adjacent boundary treatment might be worth considering	1.2M barrier added to proposed footpath at Hammersley Hayes Road to prevent vehicular access.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M)
Coal Authority (Chris McArthur)	17/12/2021	In terms of providing comments in relation to this planning application, it is noted that the submission is a reserved matters application in respect of outline planning approval reference SMD/2018/0180. On the basis that the only coal mining legacy issue applicable to this part of the wider site was addressed at the outline stage (i.e. the mine entry 401344-003 stabilised) and that the proposed built development layout has been designed around it and a further off-site mine entry, the Coal Authority has no objection to this planning application.	N/A	N/A

Statutory Consultee	Comement Date	Statutory Comment	Persimmon Homes Comment	Information Submitted
Severn Trent Water	15/12/2021	I can advise, having discussed this site with Senior Evaluation Technician of this office, we have no objections to the discharge of the drainage related condition, based upon the proposals as outlined in the FRA (ref: 881287-R1 (02) FRA). Please note for the use or reuse of sewer connections either direct or indirect to the public sewerage system the applicant will be required to make a formal application to the Company under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991.	N/A	N/A
Severn Trent Water Asset Protection Team	09/08/2122	As the proposal has minimal impact on the public sewerage system I can advise we have no objections to the proposals and do not require a drainage condition to be applied.	N/A	N/A
Sport England	14/12/2021	Sport England note the sports pitch contribution triggers set out in the Planning Contributions Summary which are welcomed and should, if not already, be earmarked for projects identified within the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy. In relation to the specific reserved matters Sport England raises no comment.	N/A	N/A
Local Plan	24/08/2022	The application should bring the housing stock closer to the SHMA recommendations. The 2021 ward data is not yet available from ONS".	The SHMA recommends a housing mix of 60% 1 and 2 bedroom properties and 40% 3 and 4 bedroom properties, although also recommends that Officers take a flexible approach to apply the advice when dealing with housing applications in the District, as relatively lower levels of housing viability in urbanised parts of the District could be compromised by an unsuitable housing mix. The mix proposed has been informed by the maximum number of units consented under the outline permission and the impact of scheme viability if proposing a mix weighed in favour of smaller housetypes. The Company has raised our concerns of scheme viability in view of the requirement to provide a 10% BNG, and this issue would be exacerbated if the mix was revised closer to the SHMA recommendation and the average dwelling size and total square footage was reduced.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M)

Statutory Consultee	Comement Date	Statutory Comment	Persimmon Homes Comment	Information Submitted
Affordable Housing (Kate Hall)	24/08/2022	My understanding is that as there is an existing s106 agreement in place, the introduction of the requirement to provide First Homes would not be applicable in this instance. The developer would be required to deliver the mix as previously agreed. The S106 agreement dated 20.11.2022 includes the bedspace criterion which requires that the affordable units be built to the following specification: 1b2p, 2b4p and 3p5p. I note from the developers proposal that the 1b2p houses (Almouth 59.7sqm) would meet this specification but the 2b3p (Danbury 75sqm) would not. You may recall we experienced the same issue on phase 1 SMD/2018/0180 and agreed with the developer that the study (room 3) would be removed and the property presented as a 2b4p unit. Having reviewed the layouts for this application, the removal of the study for the affordable units does not appear to have been included. It would not be acceptable for the affordable Danbury unit to be delivered as currently presented as 2b3p including a study. As previously agreed in phase 1, the same changes to the layout of the Danbury units would be expected in phase 2, that the property be presented as a 2b4p unit. The location of the affordable units is split into several large clustered areas across the site which is acceptable”.	The affordable housing proposed comprises a mix of 1B2P and 2B4P houses in accordance with the s106 agreement. The affordable mix has been revised to replace the Danbury housetype with the Danbury+ housetype.	Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH2 Rev M) Affordable Housing Scheme Rev A
Staffordshire County Council Flood Risk Management	09/08/2022	As no additional drainage detail or flood risk information has been submitted for review at this stage and since this has already been conditioned as part of the associated outline application, we have no additional comments to make or conditions to add at this time. We will want to see the full details of the proposed drainage strategy prior to any approval on flood risk or drainage grounds.	N/A	N/A