

Handforth Neighbourhood Plan

Examiner's initial 10 Questions and Responses by the Qualifying Body

Q1. The Plan states that the plan period ends in 2030. Which year is the beginning of the period? The Cheshire East Local Plan (CELP) plan period is 2010 – 2030. Is the Handforth Neighbourhood Plan period the same?

No, the period of the Handforth Neighbourhood Plan will be from 2018 to 2030.

Q2. The CELP (Table 8.4) states that for Handforth (including the North Cheshire Growth Village) 2200 new homes and 22 ha employment land will be provided in the plan period. Paragraph 5.1.4 of the Plan states "In relation to Handforth this amounts to 22 ha of employment land and 2158 new homes." Please could the difference be explained? How many of the 2200 new homes planned for Handforth between 2010 and 2030 have already been permitted? Therefore, how many of the 2200 homes remain to be permitted between the start year of the Plan and 2030?

This is the difference in Appendix A of the CELPS between the development target 2200 and the predicted supply (allocations and commitments/completions) which is 2158. The latest published position on this is under review but, as of March 31st 2017, there 86 completions and 302 commitments alongside the 1750 in the allocated sites (total 2138). Since this data was prepared further completions and commitments across 2017/18 have taken place and whilst the authority has not formally published these figures, they are sufficient to ensure the development target for Handforth has been met.

Q3. CELP allocation LPS 34 (250 houses) is outside Handforth parish, albeit adjoining the parish boundary. It appears to be described as part of Handforth. Is LPS 34 part of the overall 2200 housing allocation for Handforth?

Yes, the 250 homes intended for LPS 34 are part of the overall 2200 housing allocation for Handforth. The approach of the CELPS to monitoring development is that where development is located within, adjoining, or in close proximity to a settlement, it is such that the development is generally attributed to that settlement.

Q4. The Plan states (page 36): "These allocations will generally be less than 5 ha in size (150 homes) but are unlikely to occur in Handforth parish". What is the justification for that statement?

The CEC Allocations and Development Policies Document forms the second part of the Local Plan. It states that it will "Allocate additional sites for development to make sure that the overall development requirements set out in the Local Plan Strategy are met. These allocations will generally be 'non-strategic' sites, less than 5 hectares in size (or 150 homes)." The LPA has not yet published its approach to the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD). This part of the Local Plan will allocate sites to ensure the overall development targets set out in the CELPS are met. Although the Council is not yet in a position to formally confirm that no further allocations will be necessary in Handforth, recent monitoring information suggests this will not be necessary. Should that position change the Council may allocate sites in the SADPD to ensure its overall development targets are met.

Q5. *Policy H1 1). How is “infill development” defined?*

In the context of the Handforth Neighbourhood Plan “infill development” is defined as house building on relatively small sites within the Handforth Original Settlement Boundary as shown in the Macclesfield Local Plan 2004 (Map 2). The steering group are aware that, in the wider countryside, “infill” has a specific meaning and is employed to define appropriate development within villages. Within our parish Handforth is the sole village.

Q6. *Policy H4. What is the justification for the inclusion of “The Paddock Square” as an Incidental Open Space (See Regulation 16 representation from The Emerson Group)?*

The steering group are aware that the “Paddock Square” is owned and managed by the Emerson Group. It comprises mainly paved areas with some smaller green areas. With the permission of the Emerson Group, it has often been used for public events such as Fairs and open-air Christmas carol services. Since the “Paddock Square” is already designated as existing open space in the Macclesfield Local Plan, its value as a community space is already recognised and the NP seeks to reinforce its role in this regard.

Q7. *Policy H9 2). Should “(A) above” be “(1) above”?*

Yes, “(A) above” should read “(1) above”.

Q8. *Map 3 is intended to show the Handforth Settlement Boundary identified in the CELP. Where is the boundary? Could the QB please provide a map with the boundary delineated more clearly?*

CEC have informed the steering group that there is no policy which establishes a settlement boundary for Handforth (this will be done through SADPD) and that the Green Belt boundary effectively forms the settlement boundary. The steering group have also been advised that CEC will provide a map to cover the examiner’s query.

Q9. *Should Map 10 include land east of the A34 as a Wildlife and Biodiversity Area (See Regulation 16 representation from Ms E Frearson)?*

The majority of Handforth parish land lying east of the A34 comprises the site (LPS 33) of the North Cheshire Growth Village (see map on page 39). The NP recognises that CEC are leading the plan making for the NCGV and expect that existing designated wildlife and biodiversity assets will be preserved as a masterplan for the site is developed. For example, the steering group have been informed that the NCGV will include a country park. We have also been informed that all existing ponds are to be retained and that new ponds are to be created in order to optimise the amphibian gene pool. However, the master plan of the NCGV has yet to be published. For these reasons we cannot specifically designate any land east of the A34 (i.e. land within sites LPS 33 and LPS 35; see maps on pages 39 and 42) as a Wildlife and Biodiversity Area.

Mrs Frearson is correct in stating that, in map 10, the eastern end of Hall Wood has not been designated as a Landscape and Biodiversity Area. This error should be corrected by shading (light green) the small parcel of land (almost bi-lobar) to the east of site 12. This parcel of land should also be labelled “12” to make it clear that it is part of Hall Wood.

Q10. *Paragraph 5.3.19 states that the parish has 10 buildings that are recognised as being of local importance, (non-designated Heritage Assets). Policy H10 then lists the same 6 buildings as in paragraph 5.3.19 and refers to Map 11 which shows the 6*

buildings (and St Mary's Church). Why are the remaining four buildings not included? Or are they included somehow as 28-36 Church Road, in which case, the phrase "these include" in paragraph 5.3.19 should probably be altered to "which are".

The phrase "28 – 36 Church Road" refers to a terrace of 5 cottages on Church Road that are numbered 28, 30, 32, 34 and 36 respectively. The steering group recommend that in paragraph 5.3.19 and in Policy H10 the phrase "23 - 36 Church Road" should read "nos. 28, 30, 32, 34 and 36 Church Road".

St Mary's Church does not currently feature in the CEC list of non-designated heritage assets for Handforth. However, the steering group feel that the external architecture of this 1872 stone-built church justifies its inclusion in the list. The internal architecture and décor of St Mary's Church also make it worthy of inclusion as a non-designated heritage asset. The steering group intend to apply to CEC for its listing as a non-designated heritage asset. In view of this, the steering group request that mention of St Mary's church be retained in policy H10 and in map 11. A brief illustrated history of St Mary's church can be provided if requested.