

# ASTBURY & MORETON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

## RESPONSES TO EXAMINERS QUESTIONS - DATED 02.May 2017

### **Question 1**

*Housing, Page 12, first bullet point: Having regard to the Infill Boundary Line (Congleton Borough Local Plan), what is the justification for limiting infill development to two dwellings? Should the reference to “infilling” be dropped bearing in mind that, under the proposed main modifications to the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy, the reference to infill would be deleted from Paragraph 8.34 (Policy PG 2 – Settlement Hierarchy) of that plan? (This also applies to Policy P1 – Greenfield within the Settlements)*

### **Response**

At the time that the Neighbourhood Plan was written the Main Modifications to the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy had not been published and the reference to ‘infilling’ picked up the policies in the Congleton Local Plan for areas such as Astbury and that wording was considered appropriate having regard to the scale and character of the area. It is accepted that the policy framework has moved on and that reference to ‘infilling’ should be deleted as recommended. We would however suggest that this wording should be replaced by ‘small in scale’ to reflect the character of the area.

### **Question 2**

*Housing, Page 12, fifth bullet point: “Local need” is defined in the final sentence. However, this definition appears to conflict with the references in Policy P2 to the latest parish needs survey or the most objectively assessed review of housing need. How would the qualifying body envisage addressing these differences (perhaps, for example, by referring to a single definition in the Glossary)?*

### **Response**

Yes we accept that there should be a single definition in the Glossary and that it should refer to the the most up-to-date objectively assessed review of housing need.

### **Question 3**

*Housing, Page 13, third bullet point (top half of page): Should the figure of 50 houses be included within the policy? Would the figure be better expressed as “about” 50 houses? Does the limitation apply to 50 houses over the Plan period? Should the provision be staggered in any way?*

### **Response**

Yes about 50 houses over the plan period. We have been previously informed by Cheshire East that any phasing of housing cannot be introduced into a neighbourhood plan as there is no means of monitoring through the NP process the delivery of houses.

### **Question 4**

*Policy P1 – Brownfield within the Parishes: Is there any intention to limit the scale of developments falling within this category?*

### **Response**

No we felt that because the quantity of brownfield land that may come forward over the plan period

is unknown it would be difficult to limit the scale of development within this category other than by reference to other policies in the plan which make reference to appearance and character.

### **Question 5**

*Policy P1 – Greenfield within the Settlements: What is the justification for “up to 4 houses”?*

### **Response**

4 houses was a figure referred to by the local community in consultation and is considered appropriate having regard to the scale, character and appearance of the existing settlements in the plan area.

### **Question 6**

*Policy P1 – Re-use of Buildings: First preference is, effectively, given to employment uses. What is the justification for this bearing in mind the survey results (“Little preference either way towards the need for additional employment opportunities”) and Para 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework where there is reference to the possible use, for housing, of redundant or disused buildings?*

### **Response**

This policy is not written to give preference to employment over any other uses. It is meant to indicate that buildings formerly used for employment purposes can be converted for residential use.

### **Question 7**

*Policy P2: “The local community would like to see...” Is this strong enough?*

### **Response**

We would suggest re-wording to say ‘the local community strongly support’.

### **Question 8**

*Policy P2, first paragraph, final sentence: As written, agricultural dwellings would also be subject to an affordable housing allocations policy. Is this intended / reasonable?*

### **Response**

No we agree and accept that agricultural dwellings are separate from any affordable housing allocations policy.

### **Question 9**

*Policy P3: What is meant by an element of low cost market housing?*

### **Response**

We would suggest that as part of any mix of housing that some low cost market housing should be included on each housing site. It is difficult to specify a number or percentage but if pressed we having regard to the small scale of development that will be acceptable in the plan area we would suggest at least 1 low cost market house on each development site.

### **Question 10**

*Policy P4: Does this policy just apply to Astbury (this should be clear)? Would similar design considerations apply to housing on brownfield sites (which are not limited to 4 dwellings)?*

### **Response**

No it applies to the plan area with specific reference to the historic character of Astbury. Any redevelopment of brownfield should also have regard to the character and appearance of the wider area.

### **Question 11**

*Policy P4, final bullet point: What is meant by sufficient garden space?*

### **Response**

Garden space should be commensurate to the size of the dwelling and provide for the needs of the occupants. For example a large 4 bed family home will require more outdoor space than a 2 bed bungalow. Amend to include "a minimum of 50% of the dwellings nett floor area"

### **Question 12**

*Policy P6 – providing opportunities for local employment and training: Given the likely size of the businesses in areas such as this, is this a rather onerous requirement?*

### **Response**

The majority of existing small businesses in the plan area employ some local people and usually provide on the job training. The use of local labour also helps to reduce commuting into and out of the area.

### **Question 13**

*Policy P8: Why is there no support for residential use (see Policy 1 – Re-use of Buildings) above?*

### **Response**

There is no reason why residential use cannot be included however we would not like to see this use take precedence over all other potential uses. This Policy to be cross-referenced with P1(d).

### **Question 14**

*Policy P11 – "countryside surrounding Astbury": Is this intended to cover the whole of the designated area?*

### **Response**

Yes.

### **Question 15**

*Policy P16, first paragraph: Why not a residential use (as stated above)?*

### **Response**

Yes but see response to question 13 above.

### **Question 16**

*Policy P17: How are the provisions of this policy going to be achieved? There would have to be a link to development projects.*

### **Response**

Yes agreed. The aim is to work with Cheshire Wildlife Trust going forward and commission further survey work.

### **Question 17**

*Policy P19: How are the provisions of this policy going to be achieved? There would have to be a link to development projects.*

### **Response**

Yes agreed via an Action Plan for relevant developments:- The PC works closely with Cheshire East PROW and Countryside Ranger to develop recreational footpaths and bridleways.

### **Question 18**

*Policy P20, "Where possible and desirable, additional ducting should be provided that also contributes to a local network for the wider community.": Is this a reasonable requirement where unconnected to the proposed development? The same comment applies to the subsequent paragraph of the policy.*

### **Response**

Accept and remove this sentence in both cases.

### **Question 19**

*Policy P26: Was it intended to provide a list of important views and vistas (in addition to those shown on the Astbury Conservation Area plan in Appendix B)?*

### **Response**

Yes, the reference should be to Appendix B - will be indexed to particular landscape/specific views.

### **Question 20**

Landscape and Environment, Page 20, second paragraph: "Gannister Quarry" – is the spelling correct?

### **Response**

*Gannister* is a silicious rock associated with coal beds, similar to quartzite. It is composed principally of silica (chemically SiO<sub>2</sub>) and has been used as a refractory material for lining

furnaces.

We found Internet references to *gannister* and *ganister* dating back to early 19C in US and UK legal records.

The **Concise Oxford Dictionary** does not define *Gannister* or *ganister*

The **Free Dictionary** - records *gannister* as a variant of *ganister*

**Merriam-Webster** - records *gannister* as a less common variant of *ganister*

**wiktionary.org** - records *gannister* as an alternative form of "*ganister*"

**thesciencedictionary.org** - defines *gannister*, *ganister* (both spellings) with no obvious preference.

Our NP document uses **gannister**, which we conclude is not wrong.

### **Question 21**

*Section 7, Page 27, second paragraph: "It is anticipated that the majority of the properties in the plan area will be able to access high speed broadband from 2015." We are now in 2017. What is the latest position?*

### **Response**

Broadband/Fibre is currently being rolled out through the Parishes, initially to Villages/Hamlets.

"Development applicants will be required to liaise with Suppliers to maximise coverage".

### **Question 22**

*Appendix A, first bullet point – "provide loss": What is this meant to say?*

### **Response**

Delete and replace with:

'Section 106 agreements are used to mitigate any adverse impacts of proposed developments by securing: contributions; services; infrastructure; affordable housing; and amenities either by undertaking specific works and/or a monetary contribution (commuted sum) to enable the Council (Cheshire East) to undertake the relevant works itself.'

### **Question 23**

*Appendix C, page 43: What is the meaning of the two asterisks after the entry "Fragment of Plague Cross to South of Number 7"?*

### **Short response**

The entry described as "Fragment of Plague Cross to South of Number 7" should be deleted from the Listed Buildings table in Appendix C, page 43.

### **Explanation**

The principal source for listed buildings was an old document held in Newbold-Astbury Parish Council records.

Since the list was light on detail it was checked in August, 2016 against two web sources indicated in the NP document (following the Listed Buildings table, Appendix C, p45).

This checking process revealed that the Plague Cross Fragment appeared in [www.britishlistedbuildings.co.uk](http://www.britishlistedbuildings.co.uk), but not in <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki>. The NP Editor added a note to the references to draw attention to the omission from Wikipedia, marked by using two asterisks to avoid confusion with Grade II\* buildings. That note was accidentally deleted from the final version - our apologies.

Subsequent checking in May 2017 before replying to your question reveals that the [www.britishlistedbuildings.co.uk](http://www.britishlistedbuildings.co.uk) website now also omits this entry.

However, a general search in the website for "Fragment of Plague Cross" does find an entry (below), but it is outside our parish boundary: in Congleton, not Newbold-Astbury.

### **Fragment of Plague Cross to South of Number 7**

"Number 7" in its title is a house number: 7 Newcastle Road Congleton. The Plague Cross is in the driveway - Latitude: 53.1549 / 53°9'17"N; Longitude: -2.2322 / 2°13'55"W.

An email to [britishlistedbuildings.co.uk](http://britishlistedbuildings.co.uk) asked for an explanation:

" Since we retrieved this information, you have moved your website to a new server ... [may we] please ask you the following:

1. On what date did you change to the new server ?
2. Was the Parish index regenerated at the same time ? "

The reply was prompt:

" From: "Mark Goodge" <admin@britishlistedbuildings.co.uk>  
To: "Donald Muir" <donmuir.brownlow@tiscali.co.uk>  
Subject: Re: Date of change to britishlistedbuildings website  
Date: Thu, 04 May 2017 13:53:01 +0100

The new site went live on 13th March this year. The parish index was regenerated at the same time; it had previously relied on the data supplied by English Heritage, which is not always correct, but now it looks up the latitude/longitude of the entry against the official local government boundary data supplied by the OS.

The current information may still be wrong, as sometimes the latitude and longitude supplied by English Heritage is itself incorrect. But, for the coordinates given, the parish is now always correct.

Regards  
Mark Goodge  
Administrator, BritishListedBuildings.co.uk "

Since our source has been corrected, this "Listed Building" should be erased from the table. A site visit today (4 May 2017) confirms it is about 50m North of our boundary.

### **Question 24**

*What is the response of the qualifying body to the suggested amendments / corrections put forward by Cheshire East Council (Regulation 16 comments)?*

### **Response**

P17 Policy P7 – in other neighbourhood plans within Cheshire East a period of 12 months has been accepted as a reasonable period.

P24 Policy 11 – accepted

P25 Policy P18 – accepted

P35 Policy 31 – see comments on Policy P7 above.

12th May 2017