

Poynton Neighbourhood Plan 2018

Consultation Statement

This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan. The legal basis of the Statement is provided by Section 15 (2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:

- Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Poynton Neighbourhood Plan.
- Explain how they were consulted.
- Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted.
- Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Poynton Neighbourhood Plan.

The Poynton Neighbourhood Plan is a community-led plan and derives its vision, objectives and policies from the community and from engagement with local people. From the beginning, both the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Poynton Town Council were determined that the residents should be kept informed throughout and given every opportunity to inform the Steering Group of their views. Communication and consultation, in various forms, have played a major role in formulating the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan. The plan has been prepared having full regard to the neighbourhood planning process. Community aspirations are reflected in the content of the Plan.

Summary of consultations timeline

The Poynton-with-Worth Neighbourhood Plan was launched at the instigation of Poynton Town Council in January 2015 following confirmation from Cheshire East Council as local planning authority of the designation of the Plan area in October 2014.

Since the launch event on 17.01.15 there have been a series of consultations with the local community, the principal elements being:

- A programme of meetings with local clubs and societies.
- A major household survey (Jan-Apr 2015), reaching 10,000 households and with a response (paper and on-line) of 1,742 individual questionnaires completed.
- A programme of exhibitions, 'drop-in' sessions and other meetings to explain and explore the issues raised in the survey and to develop proposals for the plan.
- Publicity in all the local media.
- Qualitative research among residents and among business people.

A full timeline of consultation events and progress up to the Regulation 14 stage is set out at Appendix B1 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan went to Regulation 14 stage in October 2016, the consultation (paper and on-line) for which was concluded on 14.11.16.

Substantial modifications were made to the Plan which arose during the latter stages of the Cheshire East Local Plan, as a result of which it was decided to hold a further Regulation 14 consultation which was concluded on 20.03.18.

Results of the initial consultations

It was clear from the household survey that the majority of respondents were concerned about the potential negative impacts of major housing developments within the parish of Poynton and on its borders at Woodford and elsewhere. The key issues for residents can be summarised as:

- Preservation of the Green Belt and maintaining the geographical integrity of Poynton.
- Perceived lack of infrastructure (roads, utilities, etc.) provision prior to new developments and lack of planning for new infrastructure.
- Perceived pressure on other infrastructure such as sports facilities, healthcare, transport services.
- Traffic congestion and related impact including health impacts on the community.
- Planning of central Poynton to maintain the much-valued 'village feel'.

Additionally, the principal finding of smaller businesses operating within Poynton was that a more flexible property market was required to assist modest change and expansion.

The full reports can be found at Appendix B2 of the Plan, ref. PNP/C29

Regulation 14 consultations

There have been two Regulation 14 consultations for the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan – in November 2016 and again in March 2016.

The same procedure was followed in both consultations:

- A list of all regulatory bodies and statutory organisations was compiled and all were contacted by email and invited to respond.
- The mailing list comprised approximately 500 addresses.
- All developers known to have an interest in the Plan were also contacted.
- The Plan was made available on-line and in hard copy.
- Copies were available for public consultation at the Civic Hall and in the adjacent local library.
- The consultations were announced via local media, together with the Town Council's own mailing list and publicity.
- A questionnaire was made available on paper and online to assist residents with their responses.

Results of Consultation to Regulation 14 November 2016

There were 109 responses received from residents, 17 from statutory organisations and 8 from property developers. A complete copy of all responses can be found at PNP/C29.

Residents were generally supportive of the policies expressed in the Plan. The potential development of land at the Poynton Sports Club site adjacent to the town centre did arouse strong objections and concerns among some, as did the related development of replacement sports facilities at Glastonbury Drive.

Developers had detailed comments to make especially around policies for housing and there was a general concern that the Plan had in their opinion duplicated some policies unnecessarily from the Local Plan.

It was also considered that the policies could be even more specific to the Poynton area.

Results of the consultation to Regulation 14 March 2018

The list of consultees can be found in the folder referenced at PNP/C30 (Appendix B2 Supporting Documents).

There were 17 responses received from residents, 14 from statutory organisations and 16 from property developers. The full reports can be found at Appendix B2 of the Plan, ref. PNP/C30.

Every comment made has been carefully considered and policies revised where appropriate. In the tables that follow, all responses are summarised and the resulting action taken is also recorded.

The following 3 appendixes to this statement summarise the responses from:

App 1: Statutory and Official Bodies

App 2: Land Owners Developers and House Builders

App 3: Residents

Consultation Statement, App. 1: Statutory and Official Bodies Responses

Responses requiring no substantive changes or further action were received from:

Environment Agency
 Network Rail
 Historic England
 The Coal Authority
 National Grid
 Manchester Airport
 Derbyshire County Council
 Highways England
 Natural England
 Sport England
 Cheshire Gardens Trust

Responses requiring further considerations were received as follows:

Organisation	Comments	Response
Cheshire East Council.	EGB 1-4: clarification of policies regarding development in the Green Belt.	Policies reworded to show compliance with national guidance and the Local Plan.
	EGB 15: clarification of policy for landscape and key views.	The policy has been amended and a map added.
	EGB 16 Nature Conservation: clarify guidance available for planning applications.	The policy has been amended.
	EGB 7-21: organisation of the document.	Maps have been added to assist understanding. The contents list shows how the policies are grouped by theme where possible.
	EGB 21: retention of playing fields.	The policy has been reworded to make clear existing playing fields are to be retained.

Organisation	Comments	Response
	EGB 25: Listed buildings – clarification of guidance for planning.	The policy and EGB31 have been reworded.
	HOU 1: locations of future development.	The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the Local Plan strategic sites and seeks to identify additional sites to meet the overall requirement.
	HOU 3: phasing of development only supported if infrastructure required.	The Neighbourhood Plan argues that there are particular circumstances that support such a policy for Poynton.
	HOU 5: Higher Poynton boundary.	The Neighbourhood Plan now includes a map and detailed description for this policy.
	HOU 7-10: unnecessary duplication with the Local Plan of policies for strategic housing sites.	The Neighbourhood Plan provides additional detail which reflects resident’s concerns.
	HOU 11-14: support from Cheshire East Council.	No amendment.
	HOU 23-24: clarification required.	The policy has been reworded.
	TAC 1-11: these are community actions rather than land issues.	The policies reflect the consequences of land use changes on transport and connectivity. They are supported by evidence from an independent Movement Study and by saved policies from the Macclesfield Local Plan.
	TCB 3: definition of the town centre area is subject to review by Cheshire East Council.	The policy is based on local experience of users. It is expected the Neighbourhood Plan boundary will be complementary to proposals from Cheshire East Council.
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	EGB 12: suggests strengthening to include Ladybrook Landscape Character Area.	Landscape character assessments have previously been undertaken by the local planning authorities across Cheshire, the most recent in Cheshire East being published by the Borough Council in May 2018. Local assessment is not appropriate given the up to date nature of that document.
	EGB 13 and 17 are welcomed.	No comment.

Organisation	Comments	Response
	HOU 1: suggest rewording.	Wording has been amended to reflect comments of Cheshire East Council as local planning authority for the Plan area.
	HOU21: Questions legality and suggests rewording.	A planning obligation needs to be agreed by both the local planning authority and the applicants and is binding on the land, the subject of the planning application. The policy aims to encourage local self-build schemes in Poynton through the use of a planning obligation to which the prospective self-builder is a party.
	TAC 2: suggests rewording to strengthen case for cycle routes, esp. London Rd North.	Cycle routes were considered as part of the Poynton Movement Study and will be addressed through the implementation of the policy.
	TCB: suggests rewording re pressure on town centre from adjacent agreed and potential housing developments.	The Woodford Garden Village has planning permission for a substantial housing development which is currently under construction. Many residents seek local services in adjoining areas including Poynton town centre. The next round of consultation on the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework is expected in January 2019.
Cheshire Wildlife Trust	EGB 16: Re word policy on protection and/or improvement of habitats by tree planting.	Reword to reflect distinctiveness of individual habitat areas.
	HOU; CWT asserts that all new sites should be surveyed and their habitat importance identified.	Reword as appropriate.
Woodland Trust	Vision and Objectives: suggests referring to Local Plan policy SE 5 to strengthen protection of woodland.	Possible rewording adding in protection of diversity.
	EGB 13 and 14: Strengthen to improve protection of mature trees, woodland and hedgerows. Also suggests new trees should be required on streets at new Housing sites and in car parks.	Consider the re-wording of these policies to reflect this.

Consultation Statement, App. 2: Responses from landowners, developers and house builders

1 Local landowner

2 Urban Imprint on behalf of local developer

3 Mr Kingsley on behalf of family Estate

4 Persimmon Homes (Hazelbadge Road site)

5 Lichfields on behalf of Harrow (Woodford Aerodrome)

6 Hollins Strategic Land (Glastonbury Drive)

7 De Pol on behalf of local developer

8 Gladman (not site specific)

9 Jones Homes (Towers Yard Farm)

10 Jones Homes (Poynton Sports Club)

11 Hourigan Connolly (Sprink Farm)

12 Eden Planning on behalf of local developer

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
1. Estate of IJB.	Residents/ Landowners.	Request development of up to 7 acres of land at Lower Park Farm be considered for mixed housing scheme and seeks to set out the justification for this proposal.	Site is shown as being retained in the North Cheshire Green Belt in the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan July 2017. Site is shown as making a significant contribution to the Green Belt in the ARUP report prepared for the Local Plan. Development of this site would further reduce the gap between the towns of Woodford and Poynton and would therefore conflict with one of the main purposes of the Green Belt. Adequate access may be difficult to achieve off a private road and for a site of around 7 acres which may be capable of accommodating around 10 homes per acre if smaller properties are included as is proposed. Other constraints include a pond and site has been identified as of medium habitat distinctiveness in the Cheshire Wildlife Study for the Neighbourhood Plan. No change is proposed.
2. Urban Imprint.	Planning Consultancy on behalf of property developer Abode.	<p>Amend housing objective to make specific reference to the housing targets set out in the Cheshire East Local Plan.</p> <p>Amend bullet point 4 of Opportunities section to add the words “and promoting land”. Windfall and infill schemes are referred to.</p> <p>Need to rewrite policies EGB 1, EGB 2 and EGB 4 as drafted due to inconsistency within</p>	<p>This housing objective is for the Neighbourhood Plan and has been subject to full community engagement with the local community. In any event, the Neighbourhood Plan is also compliant with the Local Plan as confirmed by Cheshire East Council. No change is proposed.</p> <p>Add wording as suggested as windfall and infill schemes can contribute as suggested to meeting the town’s housing needs.</p> <p>Cheshire East as local planning authority have raised some concerns about consistency within EGB 1 to 4.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>the Plan and with the emerging Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD).</p> <p>Policies EGB 7 Open Spaces and EGB 22 should be amended and possibly combined to bring them more into line with para 74 of the NPPF. As written, there is contradiction within the plan. Including a list of particularly important grass verges is also suggested as part of the review of EGB 7.</p> <p>For EGB 15, need to identify key views by for example arrows shown on a map.</p> <p>For EGB 17, plan should give further details of the Wildlife Corridor map such as why these are important and which species are to be protected. Also consider appropriateness of mitigation.</p> <p>For EGB 24, a suggested re-wording is suggested to provide some clarity to the policy.</p> <p>Support is given in principle for policies EGB 28, 29 and 30, but more detail is required such as a list in EGB 29. EGB 30 could be omitted or combined with another.</p>	<p>Changes to these policies will be needed to address the policy points raised by respondents.</p> <p>Consider combining two policies and clarify alleged contradiction by additional wording. Consider need for listing important grass verges which contribute to local character.</p> <p>Consider introducing map of key views into Plan</p> <p>Further information is available in the report by Cheshire Wildlife Trust for the Neighbourhood Plan available as a background document to the plan.</p> <p>Rewording agreed as suggested.</p> <p>Review EGB 28, 29 and 30 to improve clarity and provide some or more examples.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>Page 23: Do not consider the town with a village feel is appropriate given its role as a Key Service Centre and this has affected the aspirations of the Plan.</p> <p>For HOU 1, concern that the policy may restrict smaller developers seeking to bring forward smaller development schemes within the Green Belt.</p> <p>HOU 2 is not supported as it conflicts with national and local policy. The three sites identified as proposed for development are all inappropriate and should not form part of the Plan. The policy does not meet the test of basic conditions for the Plan.</p> <p>HOU 3 is potentially useful for both developers and the community but concerns are raised about criteria D and G.</p> <p>For HOU 5, whilst the policy is welcomed in principle, concerns are expressed about the proposed boundary on map 9. Request is made to re-write the policy to support a previously developed site.</p>	<p>The plan is based on local community engagement which strongly supported the village feeling set within the larger town. The Key Service Role is acknowledged and now reflected in the amount of development proposed in the adopted Local Plan. The ambition is to retain that village feel, not to lose it. No change.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to minimise the further release of Green Belt land in Poynton and this is very strongly supported by residents. A sequential test which prioritises previously developed sites is therefore appropriate. No change.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is compliant with both the Cheshire East Local Plan and the NPPF. The housing needs of Poynton can be met through a combination of Local Plan sites, the Neighbourhood Plan sites and through brownfield and other windfall development. No change.</p> <p>Review HOU 3 in the light of these comments and other comments about HOU 3.</p> <p>Review HOU 5 in the light of these comments and other comments about HOU 5.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>For HOU 11, the Neighbourhood Plan approach is considered unacceptable. The preference is for one or two sites in the Green Belt of around 50 homes. Abode have promoted a site at Higher Poynton through the SADPD.</p> <p>On HOU 15 -17, concerns are raised as to the consistency of these policies in terms of density and house types.</p> <p>For HOU 19, whilst the policy is generally welcomed and supported, concern is expressed about the need to retain existing features on sites.</p> <p>Criterion 4 of HOU 22 is considered unreasonable though other aspects of the policy are supported.</p> <p>Regarding HOU26, the policy in its current form is considered counterproductive and should be referenced in other policies.</p>	<p>The justification for the allocation is clearly set out in the Neighbourhood Plan and includes sites proposed as part of the plan-making and community engagement. Proposed alternative site is in the Green Belt and is not as sustainably located as the proposed Neighbourhood Plan sites. No change.</p> <p>Review HOU 15 to 17 and check for consistency and impact against comments made.</p> <p>The presumption is that existing site features help to retain some existing characteristics of a development site. Consider review wording to respond to comment.</p> <p>Review HOU 22 and check for consistency and impact against comments made.</p> <p>Review HOU 26 as to relevance to Poynton and amend as appropriate.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
3. Estate of MKD.	Landowner on behalf of local landowner and Persimmon Homes.	<p>The views are in two parts: part 1 the views of the Estate, part 2 on behalf of Persimmon Homes. Part 2 content is the same as that submitted for Reg 14 in Autumn 2016.</p> <p>Concern is expressed about the proposed development of land to the north of Glastonbury Drive may be considered as a replacement site for Poynton Sports Club. Support is given to policy EGB 5 in respect of land at Glastonbury Drive.</p> <p>Objection is raised to the proposed allocation of land at Glastonbury Drive. An alternative site is suggested at Woodleigh, opposite the railway station.</p> <p>Concern is expressed about the content in policy EGB 13 referencing landscaping in the Lostock Hall Farm area.</p> <p>Regarding EGB 16 and EGB 17, their position is reserved as they were unable to access Poynton Neighbourhood Plan referenced documents.</p>	<p>The area to the north of Glastonbury Drive would remain in the Green Belt. Para 89 of the NPPF provides guidance as to the circumstances in which outdoor sport and recreation may be acceptable in the Green Belt. No change.</p> <p>If smaller sites are required to meet the local housing needs, the Glastonbury Drive site is supported on the basis of its access, sustainability and a sequential test. No change.</p> <p>The Lostock Hall area and adjoining areas have been identified within the Habitat study undertaken by the Cheshire Wildlife Trust as having a high habitat score and therefore worthy of retention and enhancement. No change.</p> <p>Noted. Both policies derive from specialist work of Cheshire Wildlife Trust and are based on national guidance including NPPF. No change.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>Objection is raised to EGB 20 as the site should be reserved for housing development. Other sites are suggested.</p> <p>Objection is raised to site PY09 within policy EGB 21.</p> <p>Support is given for EGB 22 and most of EGB 23 with suggested amended wording to 2 paras 4 and 6.</p> <p>For EGB 27, objection is raised to the name of the area which should be Lostock Hall, not Lostock Hall Farm. Other requests are made to change detailed wording of policy. Provides some explanation.</p> <p>At HOU 2, amended detailed wording is suggested at para 3.</p>	<p>Site lies within retained Green Belt from Cheshire East Local Plan. West Poynton is in need of allotments and there are two strategic housing sites to be developed. The need for more allotments is confirmed by Poynton Neighbourhood Plan work with local allotment groups. Other sites are identified in EGB 20. Some sites suggested in the comment are not in locations serving areas in need of allotments. No change.</p> <p>The site at PY09 has been identified as one of the sites to serve the growing playing pitch needs of West Poynton derived in part from the 2 strategic sites. PY09 is retained as lying within the Green Belt in the adopted Local Plan. Playing fields can be an appropriate use of land in the Green Belt to serve local needs. No change.</p> <p>Suggested amended wording to paras 4 and 6 of EBG 23 is acceptable so suggest amend accordingly.</p> <p>Review heading and other detailed changes and amend if satisfied policy objectives are met as set out.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to be pro-active in identifying sites which can be brought forward in sustainable locations. Other small schemes will also</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>Support is given to policy TCB 4 and the site at Lostock Hall farmyard is suggested as being given favourable consideration.</p> <p>Support is given to HEWL 4 with the proviso that favourable consideration be given to the site at Lostock Hall for siting the range of leisure facilities referred to in HEWL 4.</p> <p>HOU 11 Table 1 is referred to. Comment refers to strategic site allocations amounting to 416 homes not 450 so plan requirement should now be 234 to achieve 650.</p> <p>HOU 11 Table 2 is referred to. Comment suggests removal of reference to brownfield and replaced with sites to be allocated.</p> <p>Policy HOU 12 concerns former Vernon Infants School, Comments question whether the site is available and deliverable for</p>	<p>come forward which meet Local and Neighbourhood Plan criteria. No change.</p> <p>TCB 4 supports land to be developed for community purposes given the growth and development of the town over the plan period. Lostock is not in a central location nor has good access to the main Poynton community for such purposes. No change.</p> <p>HEWL 4 leisure community purposes given the growth and development of the town over the plan period. Lostock is not in a central location nor has good access to the main Poynton community for such purposes. No change.</p> <p>Table 1 is based on the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan. The Poynton figure is 650 homes. If less than 450 are delivered on the three strategic sites, more sites will be required through the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan, with Part 2 of the Local Plan or through windfall and brownfield schemes which accord with these statutory plans. No change.</p> <p>Brownfield is a common general term in common usage and meaning land with a current or former use. There is no reference to brownfield in Table 2. No change.</p> <p>Respond and review allocation of site and amend as appropriate.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>housing, Site should be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>HOU 13 concerns Poynton Sports Club. Comments question whether the site is available and deliverable for housing Site should be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>HOU 14 concerns land at Glastonbury Drive. Comments question whether the site is available and deliverable for housing Site should be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>Comment on HOU 17 suggests higher densities could be achieved around transport hubs (such as railway station) and policy amended accordingly.</p> <p>For HOU 20, detailed concerns are raised as to part of policy in terms of potential viability of schemes. Policy should be deleted.</p> <p>Policy HOU 21 for self-build should be deleted as not within guidance (not defined) and would act as an artificial constraint on development.</p> <p>Under the sub-heading “General submissions” in respect of the proposed</p>	<p>Respond and review allocation of site and amend as appropriate.</p> <p>Respond and review allocation of site and amend as appropriate.</p> <p>Review HOU 17 in context of increasing density at railway station.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans can provide for housing priority to be given to persons with a local connection. Many different definitions are in use reflecting local priorities. No change.</p> <p>Legislation introduced in 2017 supported the development of self-build as a type of housing delivery. Poynton Neighbourhood Plan (as is Cheshire East Council) is supportive of this ability to meet housing need in a different way. No change.</p> <p>Government is consulting on various changes to national planning policy and practice until May 2018.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>plan”, comments are made about emerging national proposals to assess housing need. The Plan is regarded as being too restrictive and inflexible.</p> <p>Under the sub-heading “Further submissions in respect of available alternative sites”, the Estate proposes 4 sites in its ownership to be considered for development. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lostock Hall Farm: up to 1,000 houses 2. Lostock Hall farmyard: 12 houses, business centre, hotel, swimming pool and spa 3. Woodleigh, 77 Chester Road: 40 flats and houses 4. Between Wigwam Wood and Poynton Brook at Lostock Hall Farm: New Sports club. 	<p>This Plan has to be assessed against current national policy and guidance and the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan which the Plan achieves.</p> <p>These sites all lie within the confirmed North Cheshire Green Belt following the adoption of the Cheshire East Local Plan (July 2017). Exceptional circumstances would be necessary to justify any or all of such development. There are also severe environmental and other constraints on development as confirmed by both the evidence base for the Local Plan and this Neighbourhood Plan. Given the up to date nature of the Local Plan, none of these sites would comply with the adopted Local Plan. If included in the Neighbourhood Plan, the sites would fail the tests set for Neighbourhood Plan making. No change.</p> <p>Previous comments can be found in the 2016 Regulation 14 consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
4. Persimmon Homes	House builder	<p>Refers to previous representations made by the company to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Considers there remain conflicts between the Plan and the adopted Local Plan in terms of housing supply and location of development. Poynton Neighbourhood Plan should seek to align its strategy with strategic policies of the Borough Council and the adopted Local Plan.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is the way local communities can influence the planning of their local area including a shared vision of their area, planning policies for the use and development of land. They are an important planning tool for local communities. It is agreed that a Neighbourhood Plan should conform generally with the Local Plan, but there is scope for local communities to plan their areas.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>Vision: general support is offered but suggested revision to include delivery of new homes and to maintain viability and viability and in recognition of town as Key Service Centre in Cheshire East.</p> <p>Objectives: supports the objectives in principle, but considers some objectives contradictory in achieving vision.</p> <p>Housing objective- Request greater conformity and closer alignment with Local Plan policies. Suggests revised wording.</p> <p>Transport Objective – request removal of first paragraph and sets out reasons for requesting this including national planning guidance, compliance with the Local Plan, Local Plan Inspector’s report, housing land supply within Cheshire East, and that three strategic sites have live planning applications being considered by Cheshire East.</p> <p>Town centre and business objectives- supported by the company.</p> <p>Formatting issues: requests some detailed changes (page 11) which are needed to reflect Local Plan</p>	<p>Consider whether any changes to Vision justified and amend as appropriate.</p> <p>Objectives have been subject to several rounds of local consultation appropriate for neighbourhood plan making. Neighbourhood Plan is serving a different purpose.</p> <p>Objectives reflect local priorities as appropriate to the Plan not wider Borough wide needs or development priorities of house building industry.</p> <p>Noted all points. Objective may need to be reviewed should Cheshire East grant and issue planning permission in the period before the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan is submitted to Cheshire East.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Amend as appropriate.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>EGB 1: General support but policy should also have regard to Cheshire East Site allocations process.</p> <p>EGB 2 Does not support policy and considers it is contrary to national policy and Local Plan. Request removal of reference to sequential approach to site selection and para referring to Green Belt development only being permitted after brownfield.</p> <p>EGB 3 Support is offered for policy.</p> <p>EGB 4 Company makes no comments on merits of release of specific sites from Green Belt. Notes that further release may yet be needed to meet confirmed housing requirement of 650.</p> <p>EGB 5: seeks review of policy having regard to national policy and emerging Cheshire East site allocations plan.</p> <p>HOU 1 General support but objects to brownfield first approach to policy.</p>	<p>Cheshire East SADPD is at early stage of development and a further round of consultation is expected in Autumn 2018. Not appropriate to include in any policy but suggest some reference in the Plan text to the progress of the Document.</p> <p>As a town wholly inset into the North Cheshire Green Belt, it is a priority for the town and its residents as confirmed by the public engagement on the Plan that brownfield development should be prioritised in the Plan. No change</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Position of house builder understood.</p> <p>Emerging change to NPPF may allow Neighbourhood Plan to redraw Green Belt Boundaries. Review policy in light of current NPPF consultation.</p> <p>As a town wholly inset into the North Cheshire Green Belt, it is a priority for the town and its residents as confirmed by the public engagement on the Plan that brownfield development should be prioritised in the Plan. No change.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>HOU 2 General support. Seeks amendment to maps to reflect strategic site allocations. Remaining housing requirements should be met from Part 2 of Local Plan and Poynton Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>HOU 3 Parts a) and b) are not supported as being contrary to national and adopted Local Plan policy. For part c) the maximum development site should reflect the Local Plan figure of 150 homes.</p> <p>HOU 4 is not supported nor any similar policy seeking to phase deliver of housing in Poynton. Raises concerns about accuracy of several points in items a), b) and d). Requests amendments to reflects concerns.</p> <p>HOU 6 Generally supports policy but such requests should not impact on scheme viability. Reference is made to para 204 of NPPF.</p> <p>HOU 9 Requests the information provided in the response is incorporated into policy</p>	<p>Poynton Town Council does not agree with the estimates for windfall made by Cheshire East and has provided higher figures based on what has occurred on the ground. Those figures are part of the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan evidence. No change.</p> <p>Items a) b) and c) of HOU 3 accurately reflect the priorities of the Poynton community especially in the context of the adopted Local Plan and the amount and location of development proposed. No change.</p> <p>For a), the response misinterprets the criterion in the policy. For b) the Town Council figures are derived from local knowledge of the sites. For c) two out of the three strategic sites are on the west side of the town with the other site closer to the southern entrance to the Relief Road off London Road. Evidence is formed by the experience of local residents as drivers and passengers, their contribution to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Poynton Town Strategy and the Poynton Movement Study of January 2018. No change</p> <p>Support noted including potential impact on scheme viability.</p> <p>Information is helpful in updating policy HOU 9 for submission to Cheshire East. Consider changes</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>HOU 9. Poynton Neighbourhood Plan should not seek to introduce further detailed policies on strategic sites as already part of Local Plan. Detailed comments are made concerning following matters: vehicle access, footpaths and cycleways, public transport, woodlands/hedgerows, housing density, affordable housing, housing mix, infrastructure and other issues.</p> <p>HOU 16 Support is given to mix of dwellings to meet needs but should be market driven and not restricted by policies.</p> <p>HOU 20 is supported.</p> <p>HOU 22 is generally supported, but concern raised as to item e) regarding inclusive design. National planning guidance is repeated. Doubts whether Poynton Neighbourhood Plan can set out design standards.</p> <p>TAC 8 Policy should be removed and the following justification sets out: would constrain housing development in Poynton considerably, contrary to national guidance</p>	<p>required and amend as appropriate. Application for site is to be considered by the Cheshire East Planning Board in late April 2018 so no officer report or recommendation is available. Need to monitor progress of application and amend policy as appropriate.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the priorities of the local community. Housing mix within the local area is a major concern which arises often from the preferences of the house building industry rather than seeking to meet the local housing needs of Poynton as policy HOU16 seeks. The criteria are clearly set out and justified in the Poynton context. No change.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Guidance and other Neighbourhood Plans support the ability of these plans to include policies about the design of local areas. No change.</p> <p>Two out of the three strategic sites are on the west side of the town with the other site closer to the southern entrance to the Relief Road off London Road. Evidence in support of TAC 8 is formed by the</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		about delivery of Local Plan site, lack of evidence in support, strategic sites will bring financial contributions to support Relief Road	experience of local residents as drivers and passengers, their contribution to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Poynton Town Strategy and the Poynton Movement Study of January 2018. No change.
5. Lichfields.	Organisation Planning Consultants on behalf of Harrow Estates.	<p>Site map on page 11 should include safeguarded land Local Plan Strategy site 52 and Adlington Business Park extension LPS site 51.</p> <p>Objection is raised to EGB 2 as it could prejudice the delivery of allocated and safeguarded land by prioritising brownfield over greenfield. Deletion is proposed.</p> <p>Objection is raised to HOU 1 as it could prejudice the delivery of allocated and safeguarded land by prioritising brownfield over greenfield. Deletion is proposed.</p> <p>Amended wording for HOU 2 is suggested to have regard to Safeguarded Land site LPS 52 at Woodford Aerodrome.</p>	<p>Only the eastern part of LPS 52 is within Poynton Neighbourhood Plan area, the remainder being within Adlington Neighbourhood Plan area. No part of site LPS 51 is within Poynton, the whole site lying within Adlington. Add that part of site LPS 52 onto Poynton Neighbourhood Plan for completeness. No change for LPS site as outside Poynton.</p> <p>As a town wholly inset into the North Cheshire Green Belt, it is a priority for the town and its residents as confirmed by the public engagement on the Plan that brownfield development should be prioritised in the Plan. No change.</p> <p>As a town wholly inset into the North Cheshire Green Belt, it is a priority for the town and its residents as confirmed by the public engagement on the Plan that brownfield development should be prioritised in the Plan. No change.</p> <p>LPS 52 is Safeguarded Land is land not allocated for development at the present time which includes the lifetime of both the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan. To include a specific policy allowing for development proposals for LPS 52 would be contrary to the adopted Local Plan and therefore likely to fail</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>Amended wording is suggested for HOU 3 to change item a) to give preference to allocated sites or Safeguarded Land and to delete items b) and c).</p> <p>For HOU 11, an amendment is requested which requests reference to Safeguarded Land as having some priority for development.</p> <p>HOU 16 refers to housing mix which the comment requests should be deleted from the Plan. It considers the criteria are over prescriptive.</p> <p>For HOU 17, the first sentence is requested to be deleted. It considers the content to be in conflict with the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy EGB 13 – an amendment to the policy is requested to make clear that planting</p>	<p>one of the basic conditions of Local plan policy compliance. No change.</p> <p>Items a) and b) of HOU 3 accurately reflect the priorities of the Poynton community especially in the context of the adopted Local Plan. No priority can be accorded to Safeguarded Land as this would be contrary to Local Plan policy LPS 52. No change.</p> <p>To include a specific policy allowing for development proposals for LPS 52 would be contrary to the adopted Local Plan and therefore likely to fail one of the basic conditions of Local plan policy compliance. No change.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the priorities of the local community. Housing mix within the local area is a major concern which arises often from the preferences of the house building industry rather than seeking to meet the local housing needs of Poynton as policy HOU 16 seeks. The criteria are clearly set out and justified in the Poynton context. No change.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans are intended to be locally led by the local community. Standards of space and density are a reflection of the existing settlement character. Higher densities may have an adverse impact and therefore the proposed density is considered appropriate. No change.</p> <p>Site LPS 52 is not proposed for development within either the Local Plan or the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>along the Woodford Aerodrome site LPS 52 would only need to be submitted as part of a planning application for development.</p> <p>Regarding EGB 17, a more detailed boundary plan of wildlife corridors is requested particularly along the north east boundary of site LPS 52 at Woodford Aerodrome. The corridor should not affect the development potential of LPS 52.</p> <p>TAC 8 should be deleted as there is no clear justification or evidence for using the impact of the Woodford Garden Village development as a reason for delay of the three strategic housing sites in Poynton.</p> <p>For TCB 8, the request is made to add to the end of this policy that the use of the Relief Road to serve future development will be encouraged.</p>	<p>Advance planting to define long-term boundaries is regarded as an appropriate solution to the future of this area as it remains part of the North Cheshire Green Belt. No change.</p> <p>Review whether a more detailed plan of either all proposed wildlife corridors or ones in specific areas can be produced. The corridors reflect national guidance in the NPPF and other planning guidance. The boundaries have been proposed by Cheshire Wildlife Trust as experts in this area. The corridors being of important natural features may pose a constraint on development in different parts of the Plan area. That is why they should be retained within the plan without amendment. No change.</p> <p>Two out of the three strategic sites are on the west side of the town with the other site closer to the southern entrance to the Relief Road off London Road. Evidence is formed by the experience of local residents as drivers and passengers, their contribution to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Poynton Town Strategy and the Poynton Movement Study of January 2018. No change</p> <p>The Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan do not rely on the construction of the Relief Road. Developments which accord with both these plans would clearly benefit from the Relief Road being open to traffic as would the local community. This is confirmed in the</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>Appendix B – Map 6 should be amended to reflect the status of all sites which are now either confirmed as Local Plan allocations for housing or employment or as safeguarded land.</p>	<p>Poynton Movement Study (January 2018). It is however premature to suggest that future development (in this case the reference is to site LPS 52) should be encouraged to use the Relief Road. The amount and location of such further development relates to periods outside the time horizons of both plans. No change.</p> <p>Review Map 6 and use terms deployed in adopted Local Plan regarding status of sites within and immediately adjoining Poynton town.</p>
6. Strategic Land.	Strategic land/housing developer.	<p>Welcomes identification of land at Glastonbury Drive as being the preferred Green Belt site for release in the Plan. Notes that emerging amendments to NPPF would allow neighbourhood plans to allocate sites in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Comments are made about compliance with the basic conditions and whether some of the wording of various policies could be improved.</p> <p>EGB 1 – it is noted that some clarification regarding planning status of the site at Glastonbury Drive may be required due to proposed national changes in the NPPF and Cheshire East progress with Part 2 of the</p>	<p>Support and change to NPPF noted. Potential for site allocation will depend on the final version of the revised NPPF and the progress of the Plan. No changes recommended at this stage.</p> <p>Suggested improvements to the wording of the Plan are welcomed provided they do not change the substance or intent of current text.</p> <p>National NPPF changes are due sometime Summer 2018. Cheshire East is to undertake further consultation on SADPD starting in August/September 2018. The submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan will need to take into account both documents.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>Local Plan (Site allocations and development management policies SADM).</p> <p>EGB 2 – suggested that the wording could be improved to better reflect NPPF.</p> <p>For EGB 19, it is noted that due to its proximity to Poynton Park, the Glastonbury Drive site can be developed without the need for on-site public open space (POS). Any on-site POS may limit the amount of housing which could be provided which may require a further release of Green Belt land. Suggests rewording to allow some flexibility for on-site POS.</p> <p>HOU 1 and HOU 3 – similar comments are made regarding strict compliance with NPPF para 17.</p>	<p>The brownfield first approach is a strongly supported component of the plan based on Poynton’s position as a town wholly inset into the Green Belt whilst needing to accommodate some growth and development. Any changes which would reduce this approach would not be supported. Review scope for minor changes but retain substance of policy EGB 2.</p> <p>It can be accepted that Poynton Park is a very close large public open area, but local access by pedestrians is across the main A523 road. Smaller children would need to be accompanied for play purposes. Consider amending wording to give some flexibility for older play use off site.</p> <p>The brownfield first approach is a strongly supported component of the plan based on Poynton’s position as a town wholly inset into the Green Belt whilst needing to accommodate some growth and development. Any changes which would reduce this approach would not be supported. Review scope for minor changes but retain substance of both HOU 1 and HOU 3.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>HOU 3 Reference is made to lack of provision for section 106 monies especially to contribute for doctor/dentist facilities.</p> <p>HOU 3 suggested improvement to require clear boundaries for part i.</p> <p>At HOU 4, an incorrect cross reference is noted regarding policy TAC 8.</p> <p>For HOU 14, it is suggested that part 1 of HOU 14 be amended to require housing to reflect the character of the area as opposed to adjacent development.</p> <p>Regarding HOU 15 and HOU 16, it is suggested the Plan be amended to clearly set out locally generated needs or how these would be confirmed during the application process.</p> <p>For TAC 8, it is noted that Cheshire East has granted planning permission for development of the three strategic sites in advance of the Poynton Relief Road.</p>	<p>Applications for the Local Plan strategic sites in Poynton have included s.106 contributions to health facilities. Clarify with Cheshire East how s.106 contributions infrastructure for sites allocated in Neighbourhood Plans should be set out in the Plan policy.</p> <p>Amend wording as suggested in comment.</p> <p>Clarify and amend wording as referred to and as appropriate.</p> <p>Consider amendment and revised wording.</p> <p>Clarify how prescriptive the plan should be in terms of locally generated needs, particularly whether such needs are specified as part of the plan or through planning application process.</p> <p>As of 9 April 2018, no planning permission have been granted for the three strategic sites in Poynton. Two sites are the subject of resolutions to approve but also subject to outstanding discussions for section 106 contributions. The third scheme is due to be considered later in April 2018. If planning permission is</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>The company set out reasons why the site should be retained as the preferred Green Belt site for residential development through either the Neighbourhood Plan and/or the Cheshire East Part 2 plan. An indicative site layout accompanies the submission.</p>	<p>granted, TAC 8 will need to be reviewed prior to submission to Cheshire East Council.</p> <p>Noted that the site is also being promoted through part 2 of the Local Plan and that the Borough Council has confirmed the site has potential for further consideration of around 35 homes.</p>
7. De Pol Company.	Planning consultancy acting for Walbury Commercial.	<p>EGB 2 and HOU 1 These polices should make it clear that there are previously developed sites within the Green Belt which could be developed for housing. The example given is a former car park on Middlewood Road opposite the former Clough works. The other sections of the submission seek to justify the development of a small housing scheme on the site. The proposal is for 4 x two-bedded starter homes (sold at 80% market value to first time buyers). Supporting information is presented asserting the brownfield nature of the site, the distance to local facilities and that the inclusion of the site in the Plan would contribute to meeting local needs and would reduce the pressure to release further greenfield sites.</p>	<p>Assess the site and apply site selection criteria. Although only a small site, there may be other examples of former industrial sites which may meet the NPPF (final bullet point of para 89) criterion of brownfield land needing to be re-used and could be treated as an exception to Green Belt policy.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
8. Gladman Developments.	Land and property developer.	<p>The first half of the submission appears to be standard information which the company provide in respect of their submission on all Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Reminds the Town Council that it is not the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan to determine planning applications; recommends the word “permitted” be replaced by the word “supported” in a number of places within the text.</p> <p>For EGB 15, comments are made that the evidence in support of the protection of key views (as per the policy) is limited and that as opinions can be subjective, there may be inconsistencies. They also suggest that a view should have some form of physical attribute.</p> <p>EGB 24 The comments repeat national guidance in NPPF and do directly reference Poynton.</p> <p>HOU 4 Comments express concern about criterion (d) which seeks to limit development in Poynton to 35 dwellings per annum until the Relief Road is open to traffic. Recommends deletion of policy due to lack of evidence, not supported by Local Plan or NPPF.</p>	<p>No response required as the material is background and contextual material for all Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>A number of Neighbourhood Plan examiners have suggested the type of change suggested here but practice does vary. Suggested that such policies be considered on their merits and amended as appropriate.</p> <p>The three views identified in EGB 15 are based on physical attributes Parish Church, National Park and Lyme Park and are well known and understood locally. Consider whether a diagram indicating the view would assist understanding of the selected sites in policy EGB 15.</p> <p>Policy has been written having regard to NPPF. No change.</p> <p>Two out of the three strategic sites are on the west side of the town with the other site closer to the southern entrance to the Relief Road off London Road. Evidence is formed by the experience of local residents as drivers and passengers, their contribution to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Poynton Town Strategy and the Poynton Movement Study of January 2018. No change.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>HOU 16 is very prescriptive and not in accordance with policy SC 4of the Local Plan. Considering mix on a site by site basis is the preferred approach so viability issues can be taken into account. Recommend that criterion (d) is deleted as it would put the viability of schemes in sustainable locations into question.</p> <p>HOU 22 is overly prescriptive and design should be considered on a site by site basis. The viability of schemes may be at risk due to this policy.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the priorities of the local community and housing mix within the local area is a major concern which arises often from the preferences of the house building industry rather than seeking to meet the local housing needs of Poynton as policy HOU 16 seeks. The criteria are clearly set out and justified in the Poynton context. No change.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans are intended to be locally led by the local community. Type and standards of design should be a reflection of the existing settlement character. Lower standards of design may have an adverse impact and therefore the proposed design policy is considered appropriate. No change.</p>
9. Jones Homes.	Housing developer in respect of Towers Yard Farm.	<p>Two documents are submitted: letter setting out views on the Neighbourhood Plan and delivery statement (March 2017) prepared to support the proposed housing allocation on land to the east of Towers Road as part of the Cheshire East Call for Sites for Part 2 of the Local Plan. The company have an option to buy the site from the existing owners.</p> <p><i>Covering letter:</i> Some policies repeat policies in other local planning documents.</p>	<p>Noted – both documents are responded to.</p> <p>All planning policies are to some extent time bound. So for example relevant Saved policies for the Poynton area in the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan may be superseded at Borough Level by Development Management policies in part 2 of the Local Plan. The Poynton community would wish those policies to</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>For EGB 1, reference is requested to be made to the Cheshire East Allocations Plan.</p> <p>For HOU 3, the suggestion of deleting reference to no more than 100 units is made and uses the example of the Tarporley Neighbourhood Pan as an example in which the Examiner deleted a similar policy.</p> <p>In respect of HOU 4, objection is raised to item (d) and the whole policy is sought to be deleted. It is suggested that the policy would delay housing delivery and frustrate the objectives of the adopted Local Plan.</p>	<p>continue to be applied so they have been adapted and then reworked for the Neighbourhood Plan. No change.</p> <p>The public consultation on the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan began in January 2018, having been drafted during 2017. At that time the timescale for the Site Allocations Plan was unclear as the Local Plan Strategy was only adopted in July 2017. Cheshire East are to undertake a further round of consultation on this Plan in in Autumn 2018. There is no emerging plan at this stage. Reference to it at this stage would be premature. No change.</p> <p>Poynton is a town wholly surrounded by Green Belt and subject to national policy of restraints on development. Tarporley does not lie within the Green Belt nor it is close to any Green Belt areas. No change.</p> <p>Two out of the three strategic sites are on the west side of the town with the other site closer to the southern entrance to the Relief Road off London Road. Evidence in support of HOU 4 is formed by the experience of local residents as drivers and passengers, their contribution to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Poynton Town Strategy and the Poynton Movement Study of January 2018. No change.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>Objection to and deletion of HOU 16 is raised concerning housing mix. It is stated that such a policy would not enable developers to meet fluctuating market demand. The policy is too prescriptive. Reference is made to some evidence supporting this policy and to the Tarporley Neighbourhood Plan as well as policy SC 4 of the Local Plan which promotes a mix of housing.</p> <p>Objection to and deletion of HOU 17 is raised concerning housing density. It is stated that NPPF states density should not be set and design should prevail. These issues should be dealt with on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Within HOU 20 it is suggested that another category of persons be added to the list of those with a local connection and that is through their work ie being employed in Poynton. Suggests adding a third category to support local employers/business owners to be eligible.</p> <p>For TAC 2 it is suggested that the words “where appropriate” be added at the start of the sentence as not all new developments would require this such as a sheltered housing scheme or one single infill house.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the priorities of the local community. Housing mix within the local area is a major concern which arises often from the preferences of the house building industry rather than seeking to meet the local housing needs of Poynton as policy HOU 16 seeks. The criteria are clearly set out and justified in the Poynton context. No change.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the priorities of the local community and housing mix within the local area is a major concern which arises often from the preferences of the house building industry rather than seeking to meet the local housing needs of Poynton as policy HOU 16 seeks. The criteria are clearly set out and justified in the Poynton context. No change.</p> <p>A positive suggestion and needing to be considered. Revised and additional wording would be needed to add a further category to HOU 20.</p> <p>A positive suggestion and needing to be considered. Additional wording would be needed to add to TAC 2.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>TAC 8 should be deleted as there is a funding gap for the construction of the Relief Road which developers may be expected to contribute towards. Also, the policy would not meet the Local Plan delivery targets for the area.</p> <p><i>Delivery statement for Towers Road proposed development site.</i></p> <p>The statement comprises a 20 page report seeking to demonstrate the suitability, availability and deliverability of this site for housing of around 30 units with infrastructure and a mix of housing types and degrees of affordability. It is acknowledged that a change to the Green Belt boundary would be required through the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>	<p>Two out of the three strategic sites are on the west side of the town with the other site closer to the southern entrance to the Relief Road off London Road. Evidence in support of TAC 8 is formed by the experience of local residents as drivers and passengers, their contribution to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Poynton Town Strategy and the Poynton Movement Study of January 2018. No change.</p> <p>The site has already been subject to the site selection process undertaken as part of Neighbourhood Plan preparation. It was not progressed as a preferred site for a number of reasons, principally its Green Belt location which still applies. The Borough Council will continue with its Part 2 Local Plan work to determine if further land for housing is needed in Poynton on smaller sites. No changes to the Plan arise.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
10. Jones Homes.	Housing developer in respect of Poynton Sports Club.	<p>Two documents are submitted: letter setting out views on the Neighbourhood Plan and delivery statement (November 2017) prepared to support the proposed housing allocation on land at Poynton Sports Club and relocation of the Club on land to the north of Glastonbury Drive, Poynton. The statement was made as part of the Cheshire East Call for Sites for Part 2 of the Local Plan. The company have an option to buy the site from the existing owners.</p> <p><i>Covering letter:</i> Some policies repeat policies in other local planning documents.</p> <p>For EGB 1, reference is requested to be made to the Cheshire East Allocations Plan.</p>	<p>Noted – both documents are responded to.</p> <p>All Planning policies are to some extent time bound. So for example relevant Saved policies for the Poynton area in the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan may be superseded at Borough Level by Development Management policies in part 2 of the Local Plan. The Poynton community would wish those policies to continue to be applied so they have been adapted and then reworked for the Neighbourhood Plan. No change.</p> <p>The public consultation on the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan began in January 2018, having been drafted during 2017. At that time the timescale for the Site Allocations Plan was unclear as the Local Plan Strategy was only adopted in July 2017. Cheshire East are to undertake a further round of consultation on this Plan in in Autumn 2018. There is no emerging</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>EGB 21 is supported as it recognises the need for playing fields. The reference to limiting built form to essential small changing facilities is not appropriate. Site PY 14 should be allocated for the relocation and expansion of the Sports Club and PY 14 deleted from EBG 21.</p> <p>Policy EGB 23 is also welcomed, but it is suggested the nominated site to the north of Glastonbury Drive be allocated as the Sports Club relocation site in the Neighbourhood Plan. Concern is expressed about the amount of detail in EGB 23 and the suggestion made that such details should be evaluated at the planning application stage.</p> <p>For HOU 3, the suggestion of deleting reference to no more than 100 units is made and uses the example of the Tarporley Neighbourhood Pan as an example in which the Examiner deleted a similar policy.</p> <p>In respect of HOU 4, objection is raised to item (d) and the whole policy is sought to be deleted. It is suggested that the policy would</p>	<p>plan at this stage. Reference to it at this stage would be premature. No change.</p> <p>The policy reflects guidance in the NPPF as the site lies in the Green Belt, more intensive forms of built development would need to be justified through any planning application as exceptional circumstances. Consider, review and amend EGB 21 to reflect comments on behalf of Poynton Sports Club and the partner housing developer.</p> <p>Consider, review and amend EGB 23 to reflect comments on behalf of Poynton Sports Club and the partner housing developer. The relocation of the Sports Club to the other side of London Road North would place the new club site wholly within the Green Belt, not the built up part of the town as now. Therefore, careful wording to both facilitate the relocation and to mitigate the impact of the new Sports Club on the openness of the Green Belt is required.</p> <p>Poynton is a town wholly surrounded by Green Belt and subject to national policy of restraints on development. Tarporley does not lie within the Green Belt nor it is close to any Green Belt areas. No change.</p> <p>Two out of the three strategic sites are on the west side of the town with the other site closer to the southern entrance to the Relief Road off London Road.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>delay housing delivery and frustrate the objectives of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>At HOU 11 the commitment to 100 units at Poynton Sports Club is welcomed. This should be supported by the allocation of the land north of Glastonbury Drive for the new Club without which the housing cannot be developed.</p> <p>For HOU13, deletion of points 2.3 and 4 is requested leaving only points 1 concerning housing mix as a development guideline. This approach is justified on the basis that the suggested criteria are too specific and more flexibility is required at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Objection to and deletion of HOU 16 is raised concerning housing mix. It is stated that such a policy would not enable developers to meet fluctuating market demand. The policy is too</p>	<p>Evidence in support of HOU 4 is formed by the experience of local residents as drivers and passengers, their contribution to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Poynton Town Strategy and the Poynton Movement Study of January 2018. No change.</p> <p>Noted and would refer to response to EGB 23 as given above.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the priorities of the local community. There are objections to the development of this site from some members of the community. The redevelopment of the site is a major concern for the community which arises in part from the preferences of the house building industry. The Neighbourhood Plan enables the local community to have more say over what type of development should be provided including some design guidelines which are not considered unduly onerous. The criteria are clearly set out and justified in the Poynton context. No change.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the priorities of the local community. Housing mix within the local area is a major concern which arises often from the preferences of the house building industry rather than</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>prescriptive. Reference is made to some evidence supporting this policy and to the Tarporley Neighbourhood Plan as well as policy SC 4 of the Local Plan which promotes a mix of housing.</p> <p>Objection to and deletion of HOU 17 is raised concerning housing density. It is stated that NPPF states density should not be set and design should prevail. These issues should be dealt with on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Within HOU 20 it is suggested that another category of persons be added to the list of those with a local connection and that is through their work ie being employed in Poynton. Suggests adding a third category to support local employers/business owners to be eligible.</p> <p>For TAC 2 it is suggested that the words “where appropriate” be added at the start of the sentence as not all new developments would require this such as a sheltered housing scheme or one single infill house.</p> <p>TAC 8 should be deleted as there is a funding gap for the construction of the Relief Road which developers may be expected to</p>	<p>seeking to meet the local housing needs of Poynton as policy HOU 16 seeks. The criteria are clearly set out and justified in the Poynton context. No change.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the priorities of the local community and housing mix within the local area is a major concern which arises often from the preferences of the house building industry rather than seeking to meet the local housing needs of Poynton as policy HOU 16 seeks. The criteria are clearly set out and justified in the Poynton context. No change.</p> <p>A positive suggestion and needing to be considered. Revised and additional wording would be needed to add a further category to HOU 20.</p> <p>A positive suggestion and needing to be considered. Additional wording would be needed to add to TAC 2.</p> <p>Two out of the three strategic sites are on the west side of the town with the other site closer to the southern entrance to the Relief Road off London Road.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>contribute towards. Also, the policy would not meet the Local Plan delivery targets for the area.</p> <p><i>Delivery statement for relocation of Poynton Sports Club to land to the north of Glastonbury Drive.</i></p> <p>The statement comprises a 40 page report seeking to demonstrate the suitability, availability and deliverability of this site for the relocation of the Poynton Sports Club and the allocation of its current site for housing of around 100 units with infrastructure and a mix of housing types and degrees of affordability. The statement was prepared for the Call for Sites for Part 2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan in November 2017.</p>	<p>Evidence in support of TAC 8 is formed by the experience of local residents as drivers and passengers, their contribution to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Poynton Town Strategy and the Poynton Movement Study of January 2018. No change.</p> <p>The two sites referred to have already been subject to the site selection process undertaken as part of Neighbourhood Plan preparation. The site north of Glastonbury Drive is now the Sports Club's preferred site for the relocation of facilities. The detailed contents of the Delivery Statement need to be addressed with a view to progressing the land north of Glastonbury Drive as the preferred relocation site. The Borough Council will continue with its Part 2 Local Plan work to determine if the two proposals are appropriate to be included in that Plan. Consider changes to the Neighbourhood Plan to reflect the Delivery Statement as appropriate.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
11. Hourigan Connolly.	Planning consultants on behalf of trustees of CEH and FF.	<p>Two parcels of land are referred to: Sprink Farm and Waterloo Road. Sprink Farm is the subject of a resolution of Cheshire East to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a section 106 agreement. The land at Waterloo Road is sited in the Green Belt in the adopted Local Plan. It is contended that the Neighbourhood Plan does not accord with the Local Plan or national planning guidance. It cannot contribute to sustainable development and cannot therefore be made as a Plan.</p> <p>Vision for Transport is objected to on the basis it does not reflect the planning conditions and obligations agreed in respect of Sprink Farm.</p> <p>Objection is raised to EGB 2 as being at variance with Local Plan policy SE2 and para 17 of the NPPF. It would also fail two of the basic conditions. EGB 2 should be deleted.</p> <p>Objection is raised to EGB 14 as being at variance with Local Plan policy SE5 which includes reference to mitigation where</p>	<p>As of 10.04.18, the outline planning application (17/4256M) for Sprink Farm remained undetermined on the Cheshire East website. Indeed, the latest correspondence listed was at the time of the Committee resolution (October 2017). There is no information on the public record as to the progress of the application since that time.</p> <p>As such conditions and obligations are not confirmed or on the public record, they cannot be taken into account in the current progression of this Neighbourhood Plan. If such conditions and obligations are clearly set out and on the public record, a review of the Vision for Transport may be required. In the meantime, no change is needed.</p> <p>As a town wholly inset into the North Cheshire Green Belt, it is a priority for the town and its residents as confirmed by the public engagement on the Plan that brownfield development should be prioritised in the Plan. No change.</p> <p>EGB 14 is a positive policy which seeks to recognise the high environmental character of the Poynton area. It is considered the policy complements Local Plan SE 5.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>features are to be lost. EGB 14 should be deleted.</p> <p>HOU 1 an amendment is requested which would remove reference to a brownfield first approach.</p> <p>At HOU 3, amendments are requested to remove reference to brownfield first. Criterion C (maximum development site of 100 units) should be removed as it would fail basic conditions and not comply with the Local Plan.</p> <p>HOU 4 should be deleted as it aims at restricting sustainable development from coming forward. It would fail some basic conditions and is not in general conformity with the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Cheshire East have raised no concerns about EGB 14. No change.</p> <p>As a town wholly inset into the North Cheshire Green Belt, it is a priority for the town and its residents as confirmed by the public engagement on the Plan that brownfield development should be prioritised in the Plan. No change.</p> <p>The Local Plan identifies three strategic housing sites for Poynton in different sectors of the town, each with up to 150 dwellings per site. Concerns have been expressed through the Neighbourhood Plan about the ability of local infrastructure to cater for a further large development. A large additional site would also almost certainly require a departure from Green Belt policy. No change.</p> <p>Two out of the three strategic sites are on the west side of the town with the other site closer to the southern entrance to the Relief Road off London Road. Evidence in support of HOU 4 is formed by the experience of local residents as drivers and passengers, their contribution to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Poynton Town Strategy and the Poynton Movement Study of January 2018. The criteria are based on data for housing delivery being linked to the capacity of infrastructure to deliver services. No change.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>HOU 6 and HOU 7 relate to infrastructure and strategic sites generally. Comment is made that the site at Sprink Farm will be dealt with through the outline planning application and associated section 106 agreement.</p> <p>HOU 10 concerns land at Sprink Farm, one of the 3 strategic sites in Poynton. Detailed objections and comments are made about differences between the current planning application and policy HOU 10.</p> <p>Policy HOU 11 is also objected to. It is considered that the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan figures are incorrect and that there is a potential shortfall over the plan period of at least 88 dwellings. All 3 Plan proposed sites are objected to.</p> <p>HOU 2A Vernon Infants School Objection is based as the site is not available, deliverable or developable, allocation would be contrary to para 47 of the NPPF and would fail one of basic conditions.</p> <p>HOU 2B Glastonbury Drive site is in Green Belt and Plan cannot change boundaries. Does not accord with a basic condition.</p>	<p>No information is in the public domain as to the progress of this application post Planning Board resolution.</p> <p>Policy HOU 10 may need to be reviewed as and when planning permission is granted in outline form for the Sprink Farm development. As at 10.04.18 the site remains subject to an outline planning application and a resolution to approve only.</p> <p>Tables in the Plan are based on Cheshire East and Town Council records. No change.</p> <p>The site is supported by Poynton residents as it would offer a sustainable location adjoining the town centre and is in public ownership. No change.</p> <p>Site is promoted by housing developer, is in a very sustainable and accessible location. Emerging NPPF guidance suggests Neighbourhood Plan may redraw Green Belt boundaries to allow needed development. No change.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>HOU 2C Poynton Sports Club There is no evidence that the Club is surplus to requirements. The Club is a green lung in the heart of the community.</p> <p>Regarding windfalls, there is comment made about the limited number of dwellings being completed in Poynton since 2010. The number moving forward is an overestimate.</p> <p>Objection to HOU 16 is raised as it is overly prescriptive of housing mix. Policy SC 4 of the Local Plan is not met. HOU 16 should be deleted. One of the basic conditions is not met.</p> <p>Objection to HOU 19 is made as it conflicts with HOU 17.</p> <p>For HOU 20 affordable housing at Sprink Farm has been agreed by Cheshire East.</p> <p>HOU 22 Design is objected to as it is not practical to provide electric vehicle charging points where dwellings do not have off road parking.</p>	<p>Site is promoted by housing developer, is in a very sustainable and accessible location. Replacement facilities will be required and are as set out in other EGB policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. No change.</p> <p>Figures for windfalls are disputed between the Borough Council and Town Council and have been over the last 5 years. The Poynton Neighbourhood Plan rate is based on the Town Council's assessment based on local monitoring of permissions and completions. No change.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the priorities of the local community and housing mix within the local area is a major concern which arises often from the preferences of the house building industry rather than seeking to meet the local housing needs of Poynton as policy HOU 16 seeks. The criteria are clearly set out and justified in the Poynton context. No change.</p> <p>Review detailed wording of HOU 17 and HOU 19 to check for consistency and amend as appropriate.</p> <p>No published details of any notice of permission or of section 106 agreement are on the public record. No change.</p> <p>Consider amending policy to recognise this limit on use of electric charging points. The policy should only apply to dwellings with off road parking.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>Re policies TAC 1 and TAC 2 again reference is made to the planning application for Sprink Farm as setting an example.</p> <p>For TAC 8, the policy fails to comply with the NPPF, the Local Plan and basic conditions.</p> <p>HEWL 1 No Health Impact Assessment was required for the Sprink Farm planning application.</p> <p>HEWL 7 There is reference to a section 106 agreement and a formula relating to financial contributions towards local healthcare. The formula is 2.8 multiplied by the number of dwellings generated by the development multiplied by £360 (totalling over £150K).</p>	<p>No comments can be made as no details are available of what has and has not occurred in granting planning permission. No change.</p> <p>Two out of the three strategic sites are on the west side of the town with the other site closer to the southern entrance to the Relief Road off London Road. Evidence in support of TAC 8 is formed by the experience of local residents as drivers and passengers, their contribution to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Poynton Town Strategy and the Poynton Movement Study of January 2018. No change.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. NHS GP practices in Poynton will benefit if this formula is set out in the completed section 106 agreement. Review whether this formula is to be applicable only to strategic sites only.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
12. Eden Planning.	Planning consultants on behalf of Crowstone Ltd.	<p>Client controls land to the south of 166 Dickens Lane within the existing settlement boundary of Poynton and bounded to the east by the strategic housing allocation at Sprink Farm.</p> <p>EGB 1 confirms that client's land is within settlement boundary of Poynton.</p> <p>EGB 3/EGB 4/EGB 5- reference is made to the potential release of the site at Glastonbury Drive. It would be premature to consider its removal from Green Belt in advance of Cheshire East Part 2 Plan.</p> <p>HOU 1 Reference to previously developed land goes beyond NPPF approach. Suggests amending policy to recognise contribution which could be made by non-developed sites within the Poynton settlement boundary.</p> <p>HOU 2 Glastonbury Drive site should be removed; two other sites referred could be more appropriate for development. Supports windfall references. Other non- developed land within Poynton should also be acknowledged as a source of housing supply.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Adopted Local Plan has redefined Green Belt in this area and this plot lies within the Poynton settlement. No change of Plan needed.</p> <p>Emerging NPPF guidance would allow Neighbourhood Plan to amend Green Belt boundaries as well as Local Plans. No changes.</p> <p>Brownfield first is a priority of the Plan and has been confirmed by local residents. Review status of non-developed sites within settlement boundary and amend existing HOU 1 as appropriate.</p> <p>Brownfield first is a priority of the Plan and has been confirmed by local residents. Review status of non-developed sites within settlement boundary and amend existing HOU 2 as appropriate.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>HOU 3 sustainable non-brownfield sites within the settlement boundary would be appropriate here also.</p> <p>HOU 4 Suggests a different approach to item (d) of HOU 4. Suggests development proposals should provide a transport statement which address the highway capacity situation in the immediate vicinity of the application site and the wider area commensurate with the proposed scale of the development. Link to TAC 8 is not clear as to relevant to grant of permission or built.</p> <p>HOU11 Remove Glastonbury Drive site and amend windfall allowance in Table 2 to 175. Amend text accordingly.</p> <p>HOU 15 and HOU 16 Mix of dwellings considered appropriate but reference to local connection is not supported. Suggest amendments to detailed wording of both HOU 15 and HOU 16.</p>	<p>Brownfield first is a priority of the Plan and has been confirmed by local residents. Review status of non-developed sites within settlement boundary and amend existing HOU 3 as appropriate.</p> <p>Presents alternative option to the current HOU 4 and TAC 8 which may be an appropriate solution as other developers have objected to these elements of policies. Review wording and possible changes.</p> <p>There is some support locally for development of the Glastonbury Drive site and it has been previously allocated for development until the 1970s when Green Belt boundaries were redrawn. No change.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the priorities of the local community. Housing mix within the local area is a major concern which arises often from the preferences of the house building industry rather than seeking to meet the local housing needs of Poynton as policy HOU15 and HOU 16 seek. The criteria are clearly set out and justified in the Poynton context. Evidence collected includes views and figures provided by local estate agents. No change.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
		<p>HOU 20, HOU 22, EGB 9, EGB 10, EGB 11, EGB 14, EGB 17</p> <p>These policies are all supported subject to some suggested minor changes to wording.</p>	<p>Review suggested changes to wording and amend as appropriate.</p>

Consultation Statement, App. 3: Residents' Responses

The same or similar concerns were raised by residents. These are dealt with below.

Criticisms of the Process

The plan is too complex and legalistic

- The modifications to the plan reflect the various consultations which have been carried out. The adoption of the Cheshire East Local Plan and its housing requirements has caused the biggest change to the plan. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to mitigate the effects of the new developments required in the Local Plan.
- It is a legal requirement to ensure compliance with Cheshire East and national planning regulations. The document must address these in some detail. Poynton being a community of over 15,000 people has complex needs.

Too many houses are planned for and potential brownfield sites at the industrial estates have been ignored

- The Plan must comply with the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan which requires 650 new dwellings over the plan period in Poynton as a minimum housing requirement. The Neighbourhood Plan has considered how the housing requirement additional to the estimated 450 houses provided on 3 strategic sites can be met. The Plan cannot progress through the final legal stages unless the strategic requirements of the Local Plan (including meeting the housing needs) are met.
- Any development on the industrial estates south of Poynton cannot be considered in the Neighbourhood Plan. These areas are within Adlington Parish. Adlington Parish Council is preparing its own Neighbourhood Plan.

Poynton Sports Club should be protected

- The Poynton Sports Club is a private club. Providing the sports facilities were to be replaced by equivalent or better ones, development could go ahead. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to mitigate the effects of any such development, as with all the other planned developments. The matter of covenants or any other legal issues concerning the Sports Club cannot be considered by the Neighbourhood Plan. Should the development not go ahead, then a further replacement site would be needed so as to meet the Local Plan requirements.

Potential sports grounds at Glastonbury Drive would invade high value Green Belt

- The proposed replacement sports grounds and facilities at Glastonbury Drive would be subject to detailed planning provisions, and the Neighbourhood Plan sets out the principal points that should be considered if and when a planning application comes forward. The importance of the Green Belt North of Glastonbury Drive is acknowledged.

Land at the junction of Glastonbury Drive and London Rd N should not be taken out of the Green Belt

- The plan highlights this land as being a potential site for future development if required. A suggestion is made for its potential 'leisure' use with public access, but this would be subject to further consultation.

Objection to the use of 'wild' and other Green Belt areas for other purposes

- National planning guidance provides a list of exceptions to Green Belt policy which may be treated as exceptions to the presumption against Green Belt development. Any change of use would require consent of the landowner whether for recreational use, for allotments or any other permitted purpose. The Neighbourhood Plan makes suggestions about how Green Belt land could be used in the future. Such uses would be preferable to more housing development, but the suggestions are not intended to override agricultural use.

The survey data for wildlife protection is out of date and there is not enough wildlife and environmental protection in the plan

- The importance of having up to date survey information for new developments is acknowledged and in any case is part of the formal planning procedure for new developments. The Neighbourhood Plan proposes a management plan for the Poynton environment and this should address concerns regarding the erosion of habitats and wildlife diversity.

Further Residents' Responses: Comments and Response by Policy Number

Environment and Green Belt

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of Correspondence	Action Y/N	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
EGB 1	North Cheshire Green Belt	David Lambert	R	Support for policy (but with reservations about allocating Glastonbury Triangle for development)	N	See above
EGB 2	Brownfield Development	David Lambert	R	Policy should follow definition of Brownfield as defined in NPPF. Sites indicated in Cheshire East brownfield register not included	Y	Review and include sites in Brownfield register if necessary
EGB 3	Development in the Green Belt	David Lambert	R	Inconsistent with preserving Green Belt as it introduces Glastonbury Triangle which makes a significant contribution	N	See above
EGB 4	Green Belt release of smaller sites	David Lambert	R	Justification for removing Glastonbury Triangle does not support taking this land out of Green Belt and reference needs to be made to statements on Page 56/57 as referred EGB 3	Y	See above
EGB 5	Site and Junction Glastonbury	Andrew Jolley	R	Suggests CWT have not been consulted and it is an important wildlife area	N	CWT carried out an assessment of Poynton. There was no specific reference to this area. See above
EGB 5	Site and Junction Glastonbury	Michael Bell	R	Plan should seek to promote for Housing	N	See above

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of Correspondence	Action Y/N	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
EGB 5	Site and Junction Glastonbury	David Lambert	R	Makes confusing comments about the site and previous policies	N	See above
EGB 6	Surface water management	Andrew Jolley	R	Flooding an issue in Poynton	N	Policy designed to address this
EGB 7	Open Spaces	Andrew Jolley	R	Why are you proposing a site referred to as a Historic Amenity as being proposed for development?	N	This is assumed to refer to the Sports Club. See above
EGB 8	Natural and historic environment	Andrew Jolley	R	Poynton Park is area for nature conservation but propose children's area and picnic spot so this contradicts policy	N	Plan allows for making best use of it and promoting area for more community space. No change
EGB 9	Access to the countryside	Andrew Jolley	R	Care should be given to not cause further disturbance to wildlife	N	No change. See above
EGB 10	Improving access to the countryside	Andrew Jolley	R	Observing rights of way should not be considered without considering the environmental impact	N	No change. See above
EGB 11	Landscape protection and enhancement	Andrew Jolley	R	View point should also consider the sports club	N	No change
EGB 12	Landscape enhancement	Andrew Jolley	R	Issues with playground being built by residents on Glastonbury Drive	N	Playground has backing of residents, PTC and Cheshire East
EGB 13	Woodland retention	Andrew Jolley	R	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan has done nothing to support felling of oaks for SEMMMS and screening of Park House Farm (His house)	N	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan not commenting on SEMMMS

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of Correspondence	Action Y/N	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
EGB 13	Woodland retention	David Lambert	R	Sports club relocation would make this policy nonsensical by any use of this land by Poynton Sports Club	Y	See above
EGB 14	Protection of rural landscape features	Andrew Jolley	R	Not following Policy and CWT do not support these proposals. Issue with Sports club relocating here. Claims to have consulted with CWT	Y	CWT have responded to the plan and their views carefully considered
EGB 15	Protection of views	Andrew Jolley	R	Not put brownfield first and contradicts own policy by developing sports club on Green Belt	N	Sports facilities (subject to restrictions) are considered and appropriate form of development in the Green Belt. See above
EGB 16	Nature conservation	Andrew Jolley	R	Dramatic change to wildlife since SEMMMS and recommends new CWT report	Y	See above comments re a management plan for the environment in Poynton
EGB 17	Wildlife corridor	Andrew Jolley	R	Issues with building sports club and affecting biodiversity	Y	See above re planning process and management plan for the environment
EGB 18	Management plan for the environment	Andrew Jolley	R	Putting cart before horse. CWT state further reports are required before suggesting Poynton Neighbourhood Plan could be adopted	Y	CWT argue that more detailed individual reports for each proposed development are required. This is built into the planning process
EGB 19	Development of additional facilities	Andrew Jolley	R	Issues with biodiversity affecting Poynton Pool and issues with Glastonbury playground	N	See above
EGB 20	Additional allotments	Andrew Jolley	R	Objection as land is for farming and no consideration given for impact on farming	N	See above

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of Correspondence	Action Y/N	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan response
EGB 21	Playing fields	David Lambert	R	Policy should be rejected as it is using exceptions to take land out of Green Belt which has a major contribution	Y	See above
EGB 22	Potential loss of outdoor sports facilities	David Lambert	R	EGD 21 and 22 can be interpreted for supporting a policy for taking land out of Green Belt and reallocation for Poynton Sports club. Also relation to HOU14 which supports housing on Sport Club	Y	See above. Sports facilities (subject to restrictions) are considered and appropriate form of development in the Green Belt
EGB 23	Replacement sports facility	David Lambert	R	EGD 21 and 22 can be interpreted for supporting a policy for taking land out of Green Belt and reallocation for Poynton Sports club. Also relation to HOU14 which supports housing on Sport Club	Y	See above. Sports facilities (subject to restrictions) are considered and appropriate form of development in the Green Belt
EGB 25	Listed buildings improvements and enhancements	Michael Bell	R	Duplicates national and local policy	Y	The policies add specific local requirements for listed buildings
EGB 26	Change of use of listed buildings	Michael Bell	R	Duplicates national and local policy	Y	ditto

Housing

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of correspondence	Action Y/N	Action to be taken
HOU 1	Location of Future Development	Mike Hopkins	R	Policies unsound and do not reflect policies in Cheshire East Local Plan or comply with Para 17 of NPPF	Y	See above. The locations of the strategic sites are specified by the Cheshire East Local Plan. The policy is compliant
HOU 1	Location of Future Development	David Lambert	R	Issues with what is Brownfield and isn't for Sports Club and Vernon	N	Sports Club is a matter for them to resolve and PTC have requested that Vernon be included in Brownfield register
HOU 2	Amount of Housing Development	Mike Hopkins	R	Policy is flawed and unsound. Treatment of windfall sites does not meet government guidance and approach taken in LP	Y	This is a Neighbourhood Plan with a local emphasis. Wording has been amended to align more with Cheshire East Council comments
HOU 2	Amount of Housing Development	Michael Bell	R	Plan should confirm 650 figure is a minimum and that Poynton Neighbourhood Plan is committed to exceeding this target to meet local need	Y	The Neighbourhood Plan agrees that 650 is the minimum requirement. There is no specific policy to exceed this requirement
HOU 2	Amount of Housing Development	David Lambert	R	What about using Poynton Business Park for Brownfield development? What attempt has been made to argue about 650 units being correct	N	Poynton Industrial Estate is in Adlington See above PTC has challenged the Local Plan. The Inspector agreed the Cheshire East Council number

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of correspondence	Action Y/N	Action to be taken
HOU 3	Criteria for assessing the suitability of Potential Housing Sites	Persimmon	D	Parts a) and b) not supported as contradictory to national and local policy. For c) maximum development site should reflect the LP figure of 150	N	a) b) and c) reflect priorities of residents. No change
HOU 3	Criteria for assessing the suitability of Potential Housing Sites	David Lambert	R	Queries against ability of Poynton Neighbourhood Plan to propose sites (none of which in his opinion are desirable)	N	Consultations with Cheshire East have taken place and they have allowed us to propose sites
HOU 4	Phasing of Developments	Mike Hopkins	R	Unsound. Gives information that planning permission granted for 393 dwellings in last two years and that we only need 107 dwellings up to 2030	N	PTC disagree with Cheshire East figures as well
HOU 4	Phasing of Developments	David Lambert	R	General comment that policy needs to be strong and that any development must provide essential infrastructure	N	Supports policy. No change
HOU 5	Higher Poynton	Eleanor Taylor	R	Agree with policy	N	
HOU 5	Higher Poynton	David Lambert	R	Supports policy for including Higher Poynton but (incorrectly states that their housing figures will be included in Poynton's)	N	No change
HOU 6	Infrastructure for Strategic Housing Sites	David Lambert	R	Supports policy and it needs to be robust as HOU4	N	No change

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of correspondence	Action Y/N	Action to be taken
HOU 7	Cheshire East Local Plan Strategic Sites	David Lambert	R	General comment on ensuring policy is pursued effectively to ensure all development contributes to necessary infrastructure S106 and CIL	N	No change
HOU 8	Land at Chester Road	David Lambert	R	Policies seem adequate in ensuring development is effective and desirable in terms of the benefits to residents	N	No change
HOU 9	Land at Hazelbadge Road	David Lambert	R	Policies seem adequate in ensuring development is effective and desirable in terms of the benefits to residents	N	No change
HOU 10	Land at Sprink Farm	David Lambert	R	Policies seem adequate in ensuring development is effective and desirable in terms of the benefits to residents	N	No change
HOU 11	Proposed Housing Allocation	Mike Hopkins	R	Based on HOU 2 being unsound as figures incorrect then HOU 11 is wrong	N	PTC disagree with Cheshire East figures as well
HOU 11	Proposed Housing Allocation	David Lambert	R	Poynton industrial estate and Armcon do not appear in new figures. Questions inclusion of 3 sites as potential units add up to 810 including completions and windfall	Y	These estates are not part of Poynton. See above

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of correspondence	Action Y/N	Action to be taken
HOU 12	Land at Former Vernon Infant School	David Lambert	R	Site not in previous plan. Concern with building on playing fields and moving playing fields to existing area as doesn't see options and consultation on this	N	Justification and options set out in previous consultation and 3 options put forward with moving brownfield and greenfield around being preferred option. No change
HOU 13	Poynton Sports Club	GA Aspinal	R	Object. Covenant, use land wisely, resident on Park Avenue, issue with land being developed	N	PSC has been contacted and confirmed site is available for development and Covenant issue has been reviewed. No change
HOU 13	Poynton Sports Club	Ann Aspinal	R	Object. Covenant, resident of Park Avenue	N	PSC has been contacted and confirmed site is available for development and Covenant issue has been reviewed. No change
HOU 13	Poynton Sports Club	Matthew Brundell	R	Object. Covenant, increase in traffic, using Park road as access, little green space left in Poynton. Resident of Park Avenue	N	PSC has been contacted and confirmed site is available for development and Covenant issue has been reviewed. No change

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of correspondence	Action Y/N	Action to be taken
HOU 13	Poynton Sports Club	John Cummings	R	Object. Loss of green space, covenant, Park Avenue being used for access, resident of Park Avenue	N	PSC has been contacted and confirmed site is available for development and Covenant issue has been reviewed. No change
HOU 13	Poynton Sports Club	Mags Cummings	R	Object. Loss of green space, covenant, Park Avenue being used for access, resident of Park Avenue	N	PSC has been contacted and confirmed site is available for development and Covenant issue has been reviewed. No change
HOU 13	Poynton Sports Club	Kathleen Robertson	R	Object. Loss of green space, covenant, Park Avenue being used for access, resident of Park Avenue	N	PSC has been contacted and confirmed site is available for development and Covenant issue has been reviewed. No change
HOU 13	Poynton Sports Club	Stephen Preece	R	Object. Sports Club relocation too far from centre and green space needs to be preserved in centre	N	PSC has been contacted and confirmed site is available for development and Covenant issue has been reviewed. No change
HOU 13	Poynton Sports Club	Barbara Morrey	R	Object. Loss of green space, Covenant, Park Avenue being used for access, resident of Park Avenue. Shortage of parking on Park Avenue	N	PSC has been contacted and confirmed site is available for development and Covenant issue has been reviewed. No change

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of correspondence	Action Y/N	Action to be taken
HOU 13	Poynton Sports Club	Ivan Robertson	R	Object. Loss of green space, covenant, Park Avenue being used for access, resident of Park Avenue	N	PSC has been contacted and confirmed site is available for development and Covenant issue has been reviewed. No change
HOU 13	Poynton Sports Club	Michael Bell	R	Policy should be explicit that permission for housing should not be given until sports club is relocated	Y	The timing and phasing of the schemes would be a matter for the Borough Council, landowners and developers to reach agreement either through planning conditions or a legal agreement
HOU 13	Poynton Sports Club	David Lambert	R	Objection as thought it had a restrictive covenant. States that site wasn't in previous Plan. Alternative for sports club is not identified. Various other objections	N	Site was in previous versions. PSC has been contacted and confirmed site is available for development and Covenant issue has been reviewed. No change
HOU 14	Land at Glastonbury Drive	Michael Bell	R	Support improvements to bridge but not reasonable to secure this improvement solely from site of 35 houses	Y	See above

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of correspondence	Action Y/N	Action to be taken
HOU 14	Land at Glastonbury Drive	David Lambert	R	Not in previous versions of Plan. States site plays significant contribution to Green Belt. Green Belt must be protected, Has been left to nature and should be managed. Loss of this land not significantly objected to in latest round of consultation noted on page 159. Believes CWT would require a new survey	N	See above
HOU 25	Side extensions to existing dwellings	Michael Bell	R	Overly prescriptive and should be removed. HOU 24 sufficient	N	This was created due to issues at Planning with terracing and needs to remain as it is backed up by Planning Policy
HOU 29	Planning for Traveller Accommodation	Michael Bell	R	Duplicates national policy and should be removed	Y	Correct. Policy deleted

Transport and Connectivity

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of correspondence	Action Y/N	Action to be taken
TAC 8	Traffic Volumes	Michael Bell	R	Policy is unjustified and should be removed	N	Evidence to support TAC 8 is formed by experience of residents, their contribution to the preparation of the plan, Poynton Town Strategy and Poynton Movement Study. No change
TAC 8	Traffic Volumes	David Lambert	R	Should the statement of putting 3 strategic sites on hold (P44) be applied to other sites?	Y	There is not enough evidence to support this
TAC 9	Traffic Calming and road safety	Michael Bell	R	Support extension to shared space and all roads should be 20mph	N	No change
TAC 10	Safety and movement	Michael Bell	R	Support Peter Brett study but cycle lane should be implemented asap	N	No change

Town Centre and Business

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident / Developer	Summary of correspondence	Action Y/N	Action to be taken
TCB 1	Town centre area	David Lambert	R	Vernon school is not in town centre and is accounted for elsewhere, therefore should be removed	Y	The school is shown on the map for reference. It is not within the proposed boundary of the town centre
TCB 3	Property uses in the Town Centre	David Lambert	R	Vernon school should not be included in here	Y	Ditto
TCB 5	Car parks	David Lambert	R	Statement about a multi storey car park has not been consulted on before. Not clear what is meant by the statement on P47. Which would be combined with new build community and other services needing a central location of Poynton as a key service centre (see TCB 4) Seems to link this policy with TCB 4 and if so should be clearly stated	Y	There is a potential future need for increased parking and further provision of land for community purposes. A plan would have to be brought forward for consultation. This is one suggestion

Health and Wellbeing

Policy	Title	Respondent	Statutory/ Resident/ Developer	Summary of correspondence	Action Y/N	Action to be taken
HEWL 1	Encouraging a Healthy Lifestyle	Michael Bell	R	Too onerous for applications to make Health Impact assessment. This should be limited to those sites allocated in Plan	Y	Significant new developments would include the three strategic sites allocated in Poynton. The Borough Council would determine whether other large sites would qualify for a health impact assessment on a case by case basis
HEWL 4	Sports and social activities for all	Stephen Preece	R	Sports club and 3G pitches could be relocated at High School	Y	This is a matter for the Sports Club
HEWL 7	Location of a central health hub	David Lambert	R	Supports policy	N	
HEWL 8	Poynton to become a non- charging clean air zone	David Lambert	R	New policy which should be supported	N	

General Comments

Respondent	Statutory/Resident /Developer	Summary of correspondence	Action Y/N	Action to be taken
Eleanor Taylor	R	Confused regarding inclusion of housing sites selected in particular Anson chicken farm	N	Farm was put forward as part of call to sites and has not been included as part of site selection
Mike Westbrook	R	Concerns put against each policy for issues with the Land at Chester Road	N	PTC have raised similar concerns and all been ignored by Cheshire East. This has been approved by Strategic Planning
Mike Westbrook	R	Concerns regarding inclusion of 3 storey houses	N	Poynton Neighbourhood Plan also addresses concerns and has policy in place. Persimmon want 3 storey plus roof in Hazelbadge site
Jacqueline Cassidy	R	No compromises should be made with developers	N	Agree. Noted
Andrew Jolley	R	Issues with screening process which he doesn't think was conducted appropriately.	N	Comments are factually incorrect. No change
Andrew Jolley	R	Requests that Poynton Neighbourhood Plan is rejected by Cheshire East as being out of time and not following legal consultation process	N	The Plan has followed due process
Andrew Jolley	R	Issues with moving the sports club to Glastonbury and development in Green Belt	N	See above
Andrew Jolley	R	Statement in intro stating seeking to retain the character of the Town as one surrounded by countryside and defined by Green Belt, contradicted by HOU 13 and 14	Y	Disagree. No change
Andrew Jolley	R	Identifying land which may be used to meet housing need of town done by Cheshire East Local Plan	N	Incorrect. Cheshire East Local Plan have identified 3 sites and allocated more than these figures for Poynton

Andrew Jolley	R	Designating green spaces around town which would be protected from development; HOU 13 contradictory to this statement	N	Sports facilities (subject to restrictions) are considered an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt. Covenant subject to legal issues and Poynton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have been informed that this is a site which is developable
Andrew Jolley	R	States Cheshire East Local Plan site in purple not Green	N	Clearly Green on map
Andrew Jolley	R	Full engagement with local community and one of strongest messages was for keeping Poynton a separate place with its own identity. Steering group consist of members of PTC and is not representative of original structure. With ex head of planning at Macclesfield SG now aligns itself with Cheshire East and no longer a Neighbourhood Plan	N	No change. SG constantly meet with Cheshire East to argue against Cheshire East proposals. The Steering Group drew members from the PTC and volunteers from the community
Andrew Jolley	R	Claims Poynton Neighbourhood Plan has adopted Brownfield 1 st approach but then identifies sites in Green Belt. Has issues with 650 figure and doesn't think that any further sites should be proposed	N	See above
Stephen Preece	R	Issue with communication from sports club (lack of)	N	Internal issue for Sports Club
Michael Bell	R	Plan should provide an infrastructure priority schedule for S106 and CIL monies	N	Agree and this is being carried out by Council Working Group
Michael Bell	R	Health and Wellbeing policies with the exception of HEWL 7 are aspirations and not policies and are duplicated. The thrust of other policies in the plan and should therefore be removed	Y	Health and wellbeing are an important component of life Poynton residents. Closer alignment at a local level between health and wellbeing and planning decisions is strongly supported locally
David Lambert	R	More should have been done to promote survey	N	No Change. Plan promoted in PUNs, Facebook, Notice boards, Poynton Post, Library and Civic Hall

David Lambert	R	Difficult in relating this Plan to previous and size of plan. Policy numbers have changed. Considerable amount of time needed to review. Supporting document mean difficult to engage. Tells SG how to set out document	N	No Change. Plan is to be read as separate document hence Regulation 14 for second time. Plan is long as it needs to conform to regulations
David Lambert	R	3 new sites have been included with resultant policies	N	The sites were in the last version and policies have been included to make the Plan more Poynton focused. No change
David Lambert	R	Plan seems to have lost its sense of purpose and is now an exercise in showing compliance with planning regulations to get it accepted by Cheshire East and should be redrafted to reflect residents needs	N	Neighbourhood Plan has been redrafted based on feedback from previous consultations. No change