

Stockport Local Plan -How to respond to the consultation.

Respond By Portal <https://localplan.stockport.gov.uk/> From 6-November to 21st December.

OR email (local.plan@stockport.gov.uk)

OR Post: The Planning Policy Team; Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.4th Floor
Stopford House; Piccadilly Stockport SK1 3XE

Title	First Name:	Surname:
Postal Address:		
e-mail		

Comments – please include:

- Name and number of the chapter, policy, or paragraph(s) that you are commenting on.
- To what level you Agree OR Disagree with it:
 - o Strongly agree/ o Agree/ o Neither agree nor disagree/o Disagree /o Strongly Disagree

Section (e.g. 4.4)	Policy Reference (e.g.HOM-2.16)	Paragraph number (e.g. 270)
4.4	HOM 2.16 High Lane	SLP Local Plan; Appendix 3, - Addressing our development needs paper & Greenbelt Assessment
Level of response	Strongly Disagree	
Reason:	<p>1 Green Belt redesignation: The allocation of the High Lane site as grey belt not green belt is defined in Appendix 3 HOM 2.16. There is no clear and consistent approach in the Greenbelt Assessment to justify both the allocation (the ratings (table 4.1) and subsequent strongest contribution (figure 4.2) for HL 7 & 8. The final allocation of sites using an (overlay) (section 3.28) is not defined or transparent. This site and most others allocated appear aligned to current developer proposals which could imply a bias.</p> <p>2. Rural village - site allocated when urban gey belt has more infrastructure The Grey Bely rating and allocations map (Highest contribution to NPPF purposes A, B, C, D shows many sites with an equivalent (moderate), or lower (low) rating does not allocate, which adjoint urban areas including district centres (NPPF) with better infrastructure. Review re-allocating all or part of the 1,000 homes in High Lane (HOM 2.16) to these.</p> <p>3. Allocation sizes: 1,000 homes The scale of the proposed High Lane site (HOM 2.16) is disproportionate to the scale of high lane village at 40% of the existing homes. <i>NPPF 83 states that: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. This is not the case for this site.</i> This appears not to have been adequately considered in the impact Green belt impact assessment or the subsequent site allocations. There is a clear bias against rural areas in the approach applied by LUC consultants and adopted by SMBC.</p> <p>4. Transport – A6 traffic, busses & trains The proposed site will have 1,000 homes and therefore around 2,000 vehicles. The transport plan for earlier proposed developments suggested a staggered junction onto the A6 with traffic lights. This volume of additional traffic will significantly worsen the</p>	

	<p>congestion, delays, and air pollution. This has become much worse since the A555 development, and no effective alleviations are in place. Give greater consideration to: <i>NPPF 110 states: Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health.</i></p> <p>5. Infrastructure – Medical, schools etc The scale of development will mean a need for 40% local essential services which will exceed the current capacity for doctors, dental and pharmacy services & School spaces. It also needs to evaluate services for water and effluent treatment. These are already inadequate according to NWW & UU reports, with water tankered into the local reservoir in droughts and effluent spills into the High Lane discharge point off Andrew Lane.</p> <p>6. Site risks: Mines, Flooding, etc. The allocation of the High Lane site appears to have underestimated the risks from both mining hazards and site flooding. The Coal Authority report to HLVNF and the mines map resource clearly show the 67 site entrances in the High Lane area and zones of high risk. The review the SFRA2 findings (Appendix 3 4.3.2) clearly identifies the risk to the north of the sites for flood zones 2&3 plus the zone 1 risk to most of the area. The EA direction for a full “drainage strategy” will be required to prevent existing properties from flooding.</p> <p>7. Nature – Core green belt and habitat assessment & Cheshire Wildlife Trust The assessment of used for purpose C to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. This does appear to consider the following: The land south of A6 is core greenbelt and protects the ancient woodlands to the south. The land north of A6 in HL7 is potential scrubland not enriched farmland and so of much greater biodiversity, which is unassessed.</p>
What should be done instead	<p>1 Review the Green Belt Assessment and grey belt decision, rating as medium and justification for allocation of HL 7 & 8 for potential development. Apply greater consistency of rating and transparent of allocation.</p> <p>2. Rural village - site allocated when urban grey belt has more infrastructure Review the rationale and clarity for allocations. Move part or all the 1,000 homes to grey belt adjacent to urban areas outside our HLVNF Designated area.</p> <p>3. Allocation size: 1,000 homes Review the scale and impact of the allocated site so proportionate to the village and its sustainable growth.</p> <p>4. Transport – A6 traffic, busses & trains Review the impact of the site scale and A6 access on road users, the community health and the local economy through congestion, delays, and pollution. Consider NPPF 110 more closely in that decision.</p> <p>5. Infrastructure – Medical, schools etc Re-consider the scale of development and the impact of 40% more people on local essential services. If development is planned ensure these services are implemented first.</p> <p>6. Site risks: Mines, Flooding, etc. Review in detail the suitability of the site and parcels HL 7 & HL 8 for allocation and development based on clear risks evidence by both the Coal Authority report to HLVNF and the mines map resource. Also review the SFRA2 findings and EA direction of what any development would require, prior to implementation.</p> <p>7. Nature – Core green belt and habitat assessment & Cheshire Wildlife Trust Review the inadequate Habitat Regulations Assessment by WSP. Refer to both the CWT report annex and to the HLVNF Plan Policy NH2. The ecology and protection of habitats, amenities and</p>

Sign up at ourforum@hlvnf.org for more response information before the deadline.