

High Lane Village Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Consultation Responses - Groups– R16 –March 2021

Consultee Ref. No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF's Consideration; Amendments to NP
1.Canal & River Trust	S/C	The Trust own and manage the Peak Forest Canal and Macclesfield Canal within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Only a very small section of the Peak Forest Canal on the eastern boundary of the Plan area between Strines Aqueduct and Bridge 23 Stanley Hall is within the area. The Macclesfield Canal passes through the middle of the Neighbourhood Plan area between Bridge 13 Bullocks Bridge and Bridge 6 Clough Bridge. Both canals are within conservation areas. We welcome the numerous references to the canal within the Plan and have the following specific points: see email for full response	<p>Consideration: Comments on policies R2, NH1 and HD1 and objective 10 all noted. HLVNF in agreement with point made on Design Code MC9 wording</p> <p>Amendments: 1) Objective no 10. Plan will change name from Canal and River Trust to Canal &River Trust as requested. 2) Design Code MC9 wording which starts: "there are a small number ... and finishing at "avoided in the future" to become: "There are a small number of private moorings created on the flank of private gardens and businesses along the canal. Any future private moorings should be well designed, avoiding large areas of hardstanding, solid fences and associated residential paraphernalia, which may harm the green vista along the canal corridor. Development which fails to achieve this will not be supported."</p>
2. Coal Authority	C	<p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas.</p> <p>Our records indicate that within the plan area identified coal mining activity has taken place and left a legacy at surface and shallow depth including; 68 mine entries, reported surface hazards and coal workings. However, it is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan document does not propose to allocate any sites for future development. On this basis we have no specific comments to make.</p>	<p>HLVNF is grateful for the valuable information supplied by the Coal Authority. It is very helpful to be aware of for the future re any potential developments</p> <p>Amendments: No change</p>

Consultee Ref. No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF's Consideration; Amendments to NP
3. Disley Parish Council	S/C	As a neighbouring parish, DPC is keen to encourage collaborative working wherever possible. DPC recognises that Disley & Newtown and High Lane share many common concerns, particularly in relation to transport and issues associated with the A6. Disley and High Lane also have several shared minor routes and residential streets. see email for full response	Noted. HLVNF is happy to share transport and housing information with Disley PC and we are in agreement that we have shared issues especially in the above areas. Amendments: No change
4. Highways England	C	Thank you for consulting Highways England regarding the High Lane Neighbourhood Plan Consultation. The boundary of the Plan area is some 6km from the nearest junction of the Strategic Road Network (M60 Junction 1), with the main conurbation in the Plan area being some distance beyond that. As such, it is unlikely that the Plan will have an impact on the amounts of traffic or the safety of the motorway network. Highways England will not therefore look to comment further on the proposals.	Noted Amendments: No change
5. Historic England		Thank you for consulting Historic England, the public body that advises on England's historic environment, on the submission draft of High Lane's Neighbourhood Plan. Having reviewed the submission we do not propose to make comments, considering that the planning and conservation staff at Stockport Council are best placed to assist.	Noted
6. Homes England		As a prescribed body, we would firstly like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the High Lane Village Neighbourhood Plan consultation. Homes England is the government's housing accelerator. We have the appetite, influence, expertise, and resources to drive positive market change. By releasing more land to developers who want to make a difference, we're making possible the new homes England needs, helping to improve neighbourhoods and grow communities. Homes England does not wish to make any representations on the High Lane Village Neighbourhood Plan. We will however continue to engage with you as appropriate.	Noted

Consultee Ref. No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF's Consideration; Amendments to NP
7. National Grid	C	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area. See email for full response	Noted. The HLVNF will add the National Grid to our data base for any further consultations Amendments: National Grid to be added to list of consultees
8. Natural England		Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made. Natural England does not have any specific comments on this neighbourhood plan submission	Noted
9. Peacock and Smith [KCS/Q Development]	S/O/C	These representations have been prepared by KCS Development and Q Developments, who are jointly proposing land at Buxton Road (A6) for a sustainable extension to High Lane. Up until the point when Stockport MBC withdrew from the GMSF this site was a draft allocation for approximately 500 homes. KCS Development and Q Developments support the aims and ambitions of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP), and appreciate the time and efforts that have been expended in its preparation. Our clients simply wish to raise a small number of specific comments where we believe minor changes to the wording of the NP will make it more robust and sound in respect of current national policy. See email for full response	<u>Consideration of Point 1:</u> Removal of "proportionate housing" and small scale" from the Vision The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared to be in general conformity with Stockport Local Plan and High Lane is inset within the Green belt. There will be an opportunity to review the NDP once the new Stockport Local Plan is adopted. Peacock and Smith are correct that NDPS should not be used as a vehicle to influence the housing distribution but the NDP has been prepared with a thorough and extensive process of public consultation and reflects local residents views on housing. The HLVNF will make representations to the new Local Plan when it is published for consultation. H1 gives some flexibility in relation to future strategic allocations. Para 2 says <i>"If proposals for major development in the HLVNDP area come forward in the future through the GMSF or Stockport Local Plan they</i>

Consultee Ref. No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF's Consideration; Amendments to NP
			<p><i>will be supported provided they meet the requirements set out in the policies in the HLVNDP."</i></p> <p><u>Consideration of Point 2</u></p> <p>Policy T1 Page 20 "without mitigation" to be added to the end of second paragraph to bring the Plan in line with Para 181 of the NPPF</p> <p><u>Response:</u></p> <p>Peacock and Smith are right that NPPF says:</p> <p>102 Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan making and development proposals so that: (a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed</p> <p>(b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure and changing transport technology and usage are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated</p> <p>(c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued</p> <p>(d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – <u>including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects</u>, and for net environmental gains: and (e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes and contribute to making high quality places.</p> <p><u>Consideration of Point 3</u></p> <p>The suggestion for continental design standards came from Sustrans.</p> <p><u>Consideration of Point 4</u></p> <p>Policy H1 page 39 "adjacent to the built up area" to be added to the second paragraph</p> <p><u>Response:</u> At the moment the area adjacent to the built up area is in the Green Belt so protected. Green belt boundary can only be</p>

Consultee Ref. No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF's Consideration; Amendments to NP
			<p>amended through the Local Plan. The area adjacent to the built up area is part of the village and part of the Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>Amendments:</p> <p>Point 1 Phrases “proportionate housing and “small scale” phrases to be retained. No change</p> <p>Point 2 Perhaps Amend T1 to : <i>Such proposals will be required to provide evidence that they would not lead to further deterioration in air quality in any areas of High Lane which exceed Air Quality Objectives for Nitrogen Dioxide(NO2) or other pollutants at the time of the development proposal. Development proposals will be resisted where they are likely to lead to exceedences of Air Quality Limit Values in the High Lane Village NDP area and <u>suitable steps have not been taken to incorporate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects</u></i></p> <p>Point 3: No change Point 4: No change</p>
10. Sport England	C	<p>Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>See email for full response</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The local cricket club is a Partner of the forum and has kept us informed of major developments and improvements taking place at the club over the last year which will hugely enhance the sporting and social provision for High Lane residents young and old. The Forum fully supports this initiative. High Lane has a popular tennis club and a Friends of the Park group have been working over the last 2/3 years to gain extra funding to provide more amenities for the local parks in order that young people and adults may enjoy recreation and exercise there</p>

High Lane Village Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Consultation Responses - Individual – R16 –March 2021

(personal details have not been published for individual responses)

Consultee Ref. No.	Support/ Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF's Consideration Amendments to NP
1.	S/C	<p>Although I welcome the plan and wish to congratulate the Forum on producing it, the intention to support 'small scale schemes' seems to be contradicted by the inclusion of references to: The GMSF / Allocation38</p> <p>"major developments "larger schemes"</p> <p>I am happy to support the plan provided:</p> <p>1) all references which refer to and accommodate the GMSF, 'Major Development' and 'larger schemes' are removed.</p> <p>2) 'small scale' developments are restricted to being within the built-up area and that the plan does not accommodate building on the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>1) The forum supports Stockport in favouring a brown field first approach and does not have the power to support building on Green Belt.</p> <p>2) "small scale" refers to developments of 10 or more houses</p> <p>Amendments:</p> <p>1) References to GMSF have been removed from the Plan</p>

Consultee Ref. No.	Support/ Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF's Consideration Amendments to NP
2.	S/C	<p>I would like to support in full the response and position taken by the High Lane Neighbourhood Forum.</p> <p>Any future housing development should be contained within the existing boundaries of the village. Any plans to build on green belt land should be rejected. There has been wide ranging research which indicates that green spaces have a positive impact on mental health issues. This has become an increasingly important issue so everything should be done to protect green spaces. Any larger scale building work will also have a negative impact on air pollution which in turn will have a detrimental impact on the health of the local community. It is reasonable to expect that, in future, legal claims might be made against any local authority who approve development in such a way that inevitably increases the risks of associated health problems.</p> <p>Any development should also protect and improve existing recreational amenities, the countryside and local wildlife.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Research on air pollution in High Lane is documented in the NP. The Plan supports the points you make on the importance of green spaces for mental health and the importance of protecting Green Belt land</p> <p>Noted</p>
3.	S/C	<p>I have read all of the plan. I think it is clear, thorough, comprehensive and drafted to a high standard and shows a fair balance. I would query the number of houses it seems to recommend as I thought the actual number from the various consultations was slightly less.</p> <p>However, I approve the plan.</p>	Noted
4.	S/C	<p>I fully support the HLVNDP, my only concern is any future housing development needs to be small scale considering the lack of infrastructure and possible increase in pollution that any large scale development would cause.</p> <p>I understand that all references to GMSF will be amended or deleted from the Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. The lack of infra structure and issue of air pollution are issues of concern in the NP.</p> <p>Amendments: References to GMSF have been deleted from the Plan</p>

Consultee Ref. No.	Support/ Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF's Consideration Amendments to NP
5.	C	<p>I have completed the online survey, however wish to make the following comments.</p> <p>Whilst I agree with the plan in principle, it must be noted that reference is made within the plan to the GMSF.</p> <p>Recently I believe Stockport withdrew from the GMSF, which leaves proposals in High Lane and for that matter I assume anywhere in Stockport up in the air.</p> <p>I must state that any development that takes place in High Lane should be restricted to the already built up area and proposals should not be implemented to build 500 houses to the West / North West of High Lane Village.</p> <p>This proposal would be unsustainable for all the reasons I outlined in the online questionnaire.</p> <p>Stockport was removed from the Spacial Framework late in the process, in consequence, I believe this leaves all areas including High Lane vulnerable, hence my comment above.</p> <p>It is my opinion that Stockport should consider rejoining the GMSF, although I acknowledge this is in the hands of the Councillors. My reason for that opinion is based on there being no apparent alternative proposal made by these Councillors and yet again this decision appears to have been made for political reasons without good foundation, this decision should have been made based on sound facts and reason not political whim!</p> <p>In the meantime may I thank all the people responsible for producing the High Lane Neighbourhood Development Plan, which I am led to believe was produced by local residents in their own time for the benefit of all High Lane Residents.</p>	Noted

Consultee Ref. No.	Support/ Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF's Consideration Amendments to NP
6.	C	<p>As an avid horse rider I, and many others, enjoy nothing more than accessing the beautiful routes around the area, namely the Middlewood way. Users of the Middlewood way are always courteous of each other and it is a pleasure to be able to access this green space. The difficulty, however, faced by myself and fellow riders is the increasing volume of traffic using the A6. I fully appreciate it is a main artery for access to Buxton and other areas but, as lockdown restrictions loosen the traffic volume has increased greatly. Luckily for me my horse is reasonably sound in traffic but over the last few weeks I, and many I know, have been placed in positions of danger by weight of traffic as well as the attitude of road users. I always ensure I am visible and keep to the left as much as I can. When out riding this morning I was subjected to a number of potentially dangerous situations, cars and lorries passing far too quickly, sounding their horns at me in frustration as well as shouting verbal abuse. It was so bad this morning that I actually had to dismount and walk back on foot with my horse along the A6 back to Mill farm as my horse was so traumatised.</p> <p>I, and many others, would welcome the development of additional bridleways linking access to the Middlewood way and the Macclesfield canal. This would ensure safety for riders, cyclists and walkers and allow car users to travel freely without hinderance. I am surprised there have not been reports of more injuries and accidents on the A6 involving theses groups of people. I for one, am not easily phased but today was very traumatic for both myself and my horse</p> <p>Many thanks for your time in considering my comments</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The forum entirely shares your concerns which are registered in the Plan in Policy R1and highlighted in Point 6.31.</p> <p>There is a Walk Ride Group in High Lane headed by a local councillor which is looking into the whole issue of improving /creating walkways and bridleways. With your permission we will forward your comment to them</p> <p>Amendments: No change</p>
7.	C	<p>In my view the ' speed bumps' between Andrew Lane and the canal bridge on the way to Hawk Green serve no useful purpose and should be removed. I think you will find from police records that there have bee...</p>	<p>We think this was in answer to SMBC consultation on traffic calming measures on Windlehurst Road.</p> <p>The comment was in the subject section of the email not the main body.</p>

Consultee Ref. No.	Support/ Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF's Consideration Amendments to NP
8.	S/C	<p>I would like to support in full the response and position taken by the High Lane Neighbourhood Forum.</p> <p>Any future housing development should be contained within the existing boundaries of the village. Any plans to build on green belt land should be rejected. There has been wide ranging research which indicates that green spaces have a positive impact on mental health issues. This has become an increasingly important issue so everything should be done to protect green spaces. Any larger scale building work will also have a negative impact on air pollution which in turn will have a detrimental impact on the health of the local community. It is reasonable to expect that, in future, legal claims might be made against any local authority who approve development in such a way that inevitably increases the risks of associated health problems.</p> <p>Any development should also protect and improve existing recreational amenities, the countryside and local wildlife,</p>	Noted
9.	S/C	<p>I refer to the consultation in relation to the High Lane Village Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I welcome the plan and agree with the vision set out for High Lane. I generally endorse the plan and its draft policies, subject to the following comments.</p> <p>The plan currently makes reference to large scale development which was the subject of the draft Greater Manchester Spatial Framework, but which is now no longer applicable. I would wish to see any such references removed. As a point of principle I do not agree that any large scale development would be suitable for High Lane and/or the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The prevailing issues in relation to transport, infrastructure, congestion and air pollution coupled with issues relating to impact on the environment, ecology and need to protect the existing local Green Belt, together with the absence of any demonstrable housing need of any large scale in this area, are all overwhelming reasons why large scale development should not</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The NP supports a brown field first policy and believes development where there is adequate infra structure and employment is the way forward</p> <p>Amendments:</p> <p>All references to GMSF have been removed from the NP</p>

Consultee Ref. No.	Support/ Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF's Consideration Amendments to NP
		<p>happen in the Neighbourhood Plan area. I believe this argument to be supported by the policies set out in the Neighbourhood Plan in any case and that is the basis for my support.</p> <p>Therefore I confirm my support to the Neighbourhood Plan subject to (a) the removal of all references to GMSF, (b) the removal of mention of provision for 'large scale developments' which may be taken to mean they could be considered, and (c) clear statement that any new development should be 'within the existing built up area' and NOT encroach on Green Belt.</p> <p>I would like to express my thanks and appreciation for the work done by the team at High Lane Village Neighbourhood Forum. The unique position and issues affecting High Lane make it a very clear case as to why planning decisions that affect a community should be informed by and taken at the most local level, which is a key driver of Localism and the need for a Neighbourhood Plan here in High Lane.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to give my views and comments on this matter and I hope SMBC will welcome and endorse the plan subject to the points above.</p>	