

| Consultee | Comments received | Proposed response/ action |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Whitmore Parish Council | 1. There is missing text from the 'what information is required' column of item 12 Lighting Assessment. In the 'what information is required column' it starts "The following information is required to demonstrate that" but does not say what must be demonstrated. | 1. There is text missing. The text should be as follows: <i>The following information is required to demonstrate that the right light, in the right place and provided at the right time is achieved.</i> |
| Minerals and Waste Planning Authority | <p>1. Reference to the need for a biodiversity survey and report in respect of proposals affecting quarries etc should be amended so that it refers to former quarries as proposals affecting existing quarries are a county matter.</p> <p>2. Indicate that an additional information items should be included requiring the provision of a mineral safeguarding statement.</p> <p>3. Indicate that an additional information items should be included requiring the provision of a waste management facilities safeguarding statement.</p> | <p>1. Agreed – the item will be amended so that it refers to 'former quarries' and not 'quarries'.</p> <p>2. Agreed – there are policy drivers that justify the requirement to provide a mineral safeguarding statement in certain circumstances in the NPPF and Development Plan. Such a statement will be required where development is proposed within Mineral Safeguarding Areas or on or near to mineral infrastructure sites where the development would constrain the existing or future mineral operations, other than the exemptions set out in the Minerals Local Plan, and will indicate the following under the heading 'what information is required':</p> <p><i>The statement, which shall be prepared by a specialist, shall demonstrate the implications of the proposals on:</i></p> <p><i>a) Permitted mineral reserves of mineral site allocations;</i></p> <p><i>b) Mineral resources in mineral safeguarded areas; and</i></p> <p><i>c) Mineral infrastructure sites.</i></p> <p>The same documents etc as the County Council provide within their validation requirements will be included under the heading 'where to look for further assistance'.</p> <p>3. Agreed – there are policy drivers that justify the requirement to provide a waste management facility safeguarding statement in certain circumstances in the NPPF and Development Plan. Such a statement will be required where development is likely to unduly restrict or constrain the activities permitted at an existing waste management facility or restrict the future expansion and environmental improvement to the facility and will indicate the following under the heading 'what information is required':</p> <p><i>The statement, which shall be prepared by a specialist, shall demonstrate the implications of the proposals on:</i></p> <p><i>a) The current operations being carried out at the waste management facility (eg in terms of the impacts from noise, vibration, artificial light, dust,</i></p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>4. Suggest that the same drivers/advice should be included as their recently updated requirements for Site Waste Management Plan/Waste Audit.</p> <p>5. Suggest the inclusion of the same drivers/advice as their recently updated requirements for Transport, Access, Parking and Travel Plan considerations.</p> | <p><i>odour and traffic.</i></p> <p><i>b) The future expansion/environmental improvement to the waste management facility; and</i></p> <p><i>c) The capacity of the waste management facility.</i></p> <p>The same documents etc as the County Council provide within their validation requirements will be included under the heading 'where to look for further assistance'.</p> <p>4. Agreed – the same drives/advice will be included for information item 'Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) for non-waste related development' (to be retitled 'Construction Waste Management Plan')</p> <p>5. Agreed – the same drivers/advice will be included for information items 'parking provision details', 'Transport Assessment' and 'Travel Plan'</p> |
| Maer and Aston Parish Council | <p>1. Confused as to the reason for the removal of reference to timber buildings from the biodiversity survey section requirement to provide an ecological survey for 'timber framed buildings (eg barn) or traditional farm buildings'.</p> <p>2. The addition of a section on light pollution is welcome.</p> <p>3. Would be interested to know what is considered 'affordable housing'.</p> | <p>1. The removal of reference to timber buildings has been made so that it is consistent with the local validation requirements of Staffordshire County Council which has been produced by the County Ecologist. It is noted that the County Environment Section comments (reported below) do not question the omission of the reference to timber buildings. Reversion back to the wording of the current LLVR is not, therefore, agreed.</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. This is not a suggestion as to how the LLVR should be amended. To clarify for the purposes of the LLVR affordable housing is as defined in the NPPF and the SPD.</p> |
| Keele Parish Council | <p>1. Applications should not be validated without an accurate postal address.</p> <p>2. Traffic management plans should be in place for large developments.</p> | <p>1. Whilst the importance of an accurate postal address is acknowledged this is not a matter that could be included in an LLVR as a validation requirement</p> <p>2. The information item with regard to Transport Assessments for all applications likely to generate significant traffic movements and requires details of proposed measures to mitigate transport impacts. As such it is considered that traffic management plans are already covered.</p> |
| The Coal Authority | <p>1. The Coal Authority provides an Exemptions list for the types of applications, or nature of development, which do not need to be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment. This list should be reviewed and the exemptions applied.</p> | <p>1. Householder development is the only exemption to the requirements to provide a Coal Mining Risk Assessment that is identified in the LLVR and as such it is agreed that an amendment is required. The text under the heading 'Types of applications and geographic location(s) that require this information' should be as follows:</p> <p><i>All applications) which fall within Coal Mining Referral Areas as defined by The Coal Authority and held by the Local Planning Authority other than the exemptions set out in the Coal Authority's Exemptions List.</i></p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | A link to the exemptions list will be provided. |
| Highways England | <p>1. The validation requirements for Travel Plans match the objectives laid out in the DfT Circular 02/2013.</p> <p>2. In determining the requirement for a Transport Statement (TS) or Transport Assessment (TA) the purpose and goals of a TS/TA should be outlined to a suitable standard in terms of explaining how it measures the impact of development upon the transport network and suggests the use of alternative forms of transport to reduce the effects of higher trip rates on the Strategic Road Network</p> <p>3. Correctly the now superseded 2007 DfT Guidance on Transport Assessments is not now referred to following its withdrawal. This has since been replaced by a Planning Practice Guidance on Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements.</p> <p>4. Paragraph 32 of the NPPF sets out that “<i>All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment...</i>” The PPG goes on to state that “<i>Local planning authorities must make a judgement as to whether a development proposal would generate significant amounts of movement on a case by case basis...</i>” Furthermore paragraph 23 of DfT Circular 02/2013 confirms the requirement to adhere to the NPPF.</p> <p>5. On the basis of the above they believe that the revised list is fit for purpose.</p> | <p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Noted</p> |
| The Crime Prevention Design Advisor | <p>1. The Institute of Lighting Professionals – ‘Lighting against Crime’ should be added to the ‘where to look for further assistance’ column on information item No 12 Lighting Assessments.</p> | <p>1. Agreed – ‘Lighting against Crime’ will be included</p> |
| County Council Environment Team | <p>1. Under the heading ‘what information is required’ of the Biodiversity survey and report information item the following could be added after the mitigation strategy section.</p> <p><i>It should be demonstrated that adverse impacts on important habitats and species have been avoided where possible and that unavoidable impacts have been fully mitigated or that, where mitigation is not possible, compensation is proposed that results in no net loss of biodiversity. Enhancements should be included in scheme where possible.</i></p> | <p>1. Agreed – the additional text will be added.</p> |
| Historic England | <p>1. Welcome the inclusion of a specific section for Heritage Statements and consider that this is a fairly robust list of what may be</p> | <p>1. Noted</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>required.</p> <p>2. Recommend the deletion of 'directly' from the first sentence in 'Types of applications' as this can be misleading and not take account of setting issues for example.</p> <p>3. Support the link to the evidence base being referenced and drawn to the applicant's attention.</p> <p>4. Under 'What information is required' recommend that all references are to heritage assets rather than historic assets.</p> <p>5. Recommend that there is a link to Historic England's 'Conservation Principles' document and the four values of significance (historic, evidential, communal and aesthetic). These values can help frame significance and ensure that heritage statements meet their aim of understanding how the significance of heritage assets will be affected through proposed development.</p> <p>6. Where archaeological assessments are referenced it should be made clear that field evaluation and trench surveys may be required and that all assessments should be carried out by a qualified professional.</p> <p>7. Welcome the reference to the need to consult Historic England and request that the term 'and Gardens' is inserted after Registered Parks.</p> <p>8. Would recommend that applicants are directed to Good Practice Advice Note 2 about significance and taking development management decisions and Good Practice Advice Note 3 considering settings and views as well as Conservation Principles which details how to assess significance. There can be a general comment about the wealth of advice available covering a wide range of issues.</p> <p>9. Welcome the wide range of additional resources sites. Would welcome the addition of Heritage at Risk register.</p> | <p>2. Agreed – the word 'directly' will be omitted</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. Agreed – all references to 'historic assets' will be changed to 'heritage assets'.</p> <p>5. Agreed – a link to Historic England's 'Conservation Principles' will be included.</p> <p>6. Agreed – that field evaluation surveys may be required and that all assessments should be carried out by a qualified professional will be added.</p> <p>7. Agreed – 'and Gardens' will be inserted after 'Registered Parks'.</p> <p>8. Agreed – links to Good Practice Advice Notes 2 and 3 will be included.</p> <p>9. Agreed – will include link to Heritage at Risk register</p> |
|--|---|