

James Chadwick
Economic Development and Planning Policy
Wedgwood Building
Tipping Street, Stafford, ST16 2DH
Telephone: (01785) 276643
E-mail: james.chadwick@staffordshire.gov.uk
Website: www.staffordshire.gov.uk

14 June 2019

Robert Ranger
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Your Ref: TR050005

Dear Mr Ranger

Deadline 4 Submission

Further to the hearing sessions we have the following points to raise in line with the published Action List.

Action List – Environmental Matters Hearing 6 June 2019

Agenda Item	Action	Response
8 – Heritage	Applicant and SCC to confirm the common ground on the prospect of a significant archaeological find and the implications for variation to the written scheme of investigation	It has been agreed that: <i>Based on the archaeological evaluation undertaken (ES Chapter 8 and ES Technical Appendices 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4) SCC and FAL agree that the presence of an archaeological asset of major significance is a low possibility. The Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (ES Technical Appendix 8.5), which has been agreed with SCC, describes mitigation measures which include preservation by record. This approach is consistent</i>



		<i>with primary planning policy for the site, including paragraph 5.142 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks. However, in the unlikely event that an archaeological asset of major significance is identified, and if possible within the development proposals, an option to mitigate by preservation in-situ will be considered (for example within areas of green infrastructure).</i>
--	--	---

Action List – DCO/DCOb Hearing 6 June 2019

Agenda Item	Action	Response
5 – Schedule 2 (Annex 4)	Applicant and SCC to give consideration to SCC's desired amendments to the requirements and amend if necessary	<p>We believe the general principle is acceptable to FAL however there has not been time to agree revised wording to R3.</p> <p>We seek two additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A formal commitment to engage in pre-application discussions prior to the development of any phase. This would be to discuss interpretation and application of the DAS principles for that particular part of the development. We feel that this could be achieved either by appropriate wording in R3 or an update to Section 7 of the DAS setting out the undertake a process of discussion prior to submission of detailed design plans etc for approval. 2. Provision for a periodic review of the DAS. Given the scale of the proposed scheme and the time period for build out we feel it would be prudent to build into the process a review of the DAS. This would allow for reflection on what had been built, how it had been received and any lessons learnt etc. <p>Given the Phasing is yet to be fixed it is suggested that the trigger for the review be set at completion of 187,000sqm of floorspace to align with other existing trigger points. Part of the review process at that</p>

		point could be to set out whether a further review is needed and agree a timeframe or development quantum for when it should fall due.
--	--	--

We will continue to engage with FAL on the Draft DCO and DCOB to make progress for Deadline 5.

Yours sincerely

James Chadwick
Planning Policy Officer