

**HAUGHTON PARISH COUNCIL**

**2 Ashmore Drive, Gnosall, Stafford, ST20 0RP Tel: 01785 824749**

---

**Clerk's Report – Special Meeting 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015**

Proposed Housing – Questionnaires

56 responses received

- 50 ticked the “strongly disagree” box and four of these responses had a comment written on saying the response was from 2 people.
- 3 ticked the “slightly disagree” box
- 1 ticked the “neither agree or disagree” box
- 2 ticked the “strongly agree” box

I am not sure how many were delivered but if it was around 200 and 56 responses received, this is a pretty good response rate.

There were several comments written on the slips:

Comment from those who ticked “Strongly Disagree”

1. Gnosall Surgery will be unable to cope. Village School will be unable to cope. Traffic on Newport Road increased. Suggestion of more houses is illogical and profit motivated. Please show responsibility and refuse.
2. For your information if visual evidence can be provided to confirm the fact that Great Crested Newts inhabit the field and this evidence is presented to Ted Manders at SBC Planning Dept, it may result in the field being classed as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). If this classification is applied to the field, any future planning application may be refused. It would be useful to send this evidence to TED ant SBC as soon as possible.
3. This village is in dire need of a doctor's surgery. Since all the new housing arrived in Gnosall it is much more difficult to book an appointment at Gnosall surgery. A number of the residents are finding Newport a better alternative. Even more new housing in Haughton would worsen the situation. In view of the aging population, serious consideration should be given to their needs to that they can remain in the village. Regarding starter homes, younger people would not welcome living in a quiet village where there are few facilities. A number of them have remarked that they would rather live where “there is more life” easily available without having to drive too many miles

4. Not enough provision for first time buyers and lower income families
  
5. I think that two bedroom bungalows or a retirement apartment development would be more beneficial in the village rather than more houses. Many people want to downsize but do not want to leave the village. When is phase 2 going to be proposed as it is obvious from where these houses are placed that this is phase 1. Who will maintain and pay for maintenance of the tennis courts and allotments?
  
6. Could we please be kept informed of anything we can do to prevent this atrocity going ahead and also the parish council's decision as to their opinion?

Comments from those who ticked "Slightly Disagree"

1. Opposed to more traffic, larger class sizes, do not agree with allotments or tennis courts. However was most offended by the term "new comer" referred to in Chair's speech. Very ignorant and insular attitude, would question his attitude if he is the most appropriate person to lead the parish council with such ignorant, old fashioned views.
2. I feel the proposed development is too big. Should not go behind Hawthorn Close but if it has to then I believe that those properties should be bungalows. There are still not enough bungalows to allow older residents to remain in the village. I am also not in favour of a footpath from Station Rd to Brazenhill Lane, across four fields (financial upkeep). Please leave the fields alone.

Comment from someone who ticked "Neither disagree nor agree"

1. Unable to attend meeting. Would like to reserve judgement until application gets to committee

Comment from someone who ticked "Strongly agree"

2. Bring it on

Following a conversation with Ted Manders recently, he was unaware of this proposal and Mr Seabridge, who he knows well, had not been in touch with him. However a planning agent, Mr John Heath had approached SBC and had been told the application is unlikely to be supported. I asked Mr Manders where, in the approved Local Plan, are the policies that could be referred to during this interim period we are in now (ie with no approved settlement boundary). He advised we look at policy SP 7 which is backed up by policy C5

I also spoke to Abbey Brough in the Forward Planning team who said SBC has pretty much hit the target and there is no requirement to allocate more land for houses. It is highly unlikely to be supported by SBC. SBC is not proposing any changes to the settlement boundary in Haughton following the parish council's comment in July.