

## Summary of Consultation Responses – High Lane Village Neighbourhood Plan

From 27<sup>th</sup> January to 14<sup>th</sup> March 2021, the Council invited responses on the draft version of the High Lane Village Neighbourhood Plan, in accordance with regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The consultation was published in the local press, online on the Council's web site, and was communicated by email/post lists of organisations as required by schedule 1 of the regulations above, and to individuals and organisations who have expressed a wish to be consulted on matters relating to the local plan for Stockport. The High Lane Village Neighbourhood Forum undertook additional publicity, including posters and banners. Copies of the proposed plan and accompanying documents were available at council offices and nearby libraries. The consultation took place during a period of Covid restrictions and in accordance with relevant guidance given at the time.

Responses were received by post, email, and the online consultation system on the Council's web site.

The responses received by email and post have been compiled in a separate document accompanying this summary.

Responses submitted via the online consultation system have been compiled separately. The compilation is in a separate Excel file accompanying this summary. If you are unable to access Excel files, please contact us at [planning.policy@stockport.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@stockport.gov.uk) to discuss your requirements. Meanwhile, however, this document summarises the online consultation responses.

Consultation submissions and responses were submitted to the independent examiner who subsequently considered them in his assessment and recommendations for the Plan.

## Summary and Consideration of Online Consultation Responses

This summary relates to responses that are tabulated in a separate spreadsheet file accompanying this summary.

### Questions

Respondents were invited to respond to each of the following policy areas by scale response (Strongly Agree, Tend to Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Tend to Disagree, Strongly Disagree) and by free text comment box:

- T1 – Mitigating Local Traffic Impacts of Development and Improving Air Quality
- T2 – Liveable Neighbourhoods and Sustainable Travel
- H1 – Housing Scale and Mix. Subject to other policies in the HLVNDP, proposals for new housing development will be supported within the existing built up area of High Lane Village where schemes are for small to medium scale housing developments of up to 9 units of market housing (not major development)
- R1 – Protecting and Enhancing Parks and Recreational Areas
- R2 – Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding
- NH1 – Protecting Local Landscape Character in the High Lane Area
- NH2 - Protecting Important Views and Vistas
- NH3 - Protecting and Enhancing Local Wildlife
- HD1 – Protecting Built Heritage Assets and their Settings
- HD2 - High Quality Design and Design Codes
- Do you have any other views about the proposed policies, the High Lane Village Neighbourhood Forum have suggested? [Free Text Comments only]

There were 32 online responses.

While popularity is a mark of public acceptance of the proposed Plan, greater consideration should be given to whether the comments amount to grounds in Planning terms to amend the Plan. Some comments appear either to misinterpret a policy statement, or to address issues outside the remit of the proposed policy. Many comments appear to be supportive of principles in the Plan, without making proposals for amendment.

Every scale question had a predominantly positive score (Strongly/Tend to Agree). Written comments tended to support the tenor of the Plan.

#### *T1, Mitigating Local Traffic Impacts of Development and Improving Air Quality:*

Comments are mostly concerned with traffic and air quality. One comment mentions point 2, asserting that increased distances would increase vehicle use. In this case, the policy point is about creating distance from the road, not separation between housing; it is not clear how this would increase vehicle use nor whether the alternative is preferable. Another comment refers to non-committal language of point 6 (“where appropriate”). The application of policy must be assessed for its suitability, and whether it is appropriate to provide links to active travel will depend on the proposal before the planning decision-maker.

One comment states that EVs will be obsolete and advocates caution in specifying charging standards. The Independent Examiner also has concerns about specifying standards relating to duplication of policy, and this policy has been simplified regarding EVs. Another comment refers to proposals for development to the west of the village. It should be noted that, since the withdrawal of the last GMSF proposed allocations and of Stockport from the GMSF process, no proposal exists at this time, and the Neighbourhood Plan does not include policy for allocations of land.

#### *T2, Liveable Neighbourhoods and Sustainable Travel:*

The policy area with the highest score in disagreement was T2, with 12.5% of responses disagreeing to some extent (2 strongly disagreeing; 2 tending to disagree). The comments that disagree are split between statements that provision for cycling should not inconvenience motor traffic (both ‘tend to disagree’) and statements that cycling provision does not go far enough.

Many comments discuss transport policy. Since the neighbourhood plan does not make any proposals or allocations for development, it cannot propose transport development as part of the plan. Policies T1 & T2 have subsequently been revised following comments from the independent examiner.

#### *H1, Housing Scale and Mix (support for development up to 9 units within the built-up area):*

Comments were overwhelmingly concerned with the need to limit the scale of development and to protect green belt and the character of the village.

Many comments approve limiting the scale of development in the neighbourhood area, restricting to brownfield land. The neighbourhood plan is not in a position to assert limits on housing development scale without providing evidence of how that affects the need for housing.

*R1, Protecting and Enhancing Parks and Recreational Areas:*

One response called for extending tree cover. This is covered in the Design Codes accompanying the Plan. Other comments referred to matters that cannot be covered in a Neighbourhood Plan.

*R2, Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding:*

Comments tend to indicate a support for walking, cycling and horse riding – although not all comments supported provision for horse riding at the expense of other modes. Support for horse riding is explained in the supporting text of the Plan. General criticism was aimed at a lack of provision for active travel along the A6 and connecting the A555, Middlewood Way and the village centre.

Comments focus on transport/highways issues, including verge maintenance which are outside the planning policy remit, or are otherwise specific in nature. The proposed policy is conditional on actions being 'appropriate' which will be assessed on application for development.

*NH1, Protecting Local Landscape Character in the High Lane Area:*

There were few comments, and all were neutral or favourable

*NH2, Protecting Important Views and Vistas:*

There were few comments, and all were neutral or favourable. One comment suggested there were more views. The policy does not seek to identify all views, but highlights particular views that earlier research has found to be significant.

*NH3, Protecting and Enhancing Local Wildlife:*

Comments were favourable.

*HD1, Protecting Built Heritage Assets and their Settings:*

There were few comments, and all were neutral or favourable. One comment suggested that where conservation of the conflicted with leisure amenity, the latter should prevail. Should such a conflict arise the judgement of the decision-maker, informed by heritage officers, would take into account specific circumstances in accordance with NPPF and the local development plan as a whole.

*DH2, High Quality Design and Design Codes:*

All scaled responses, where expressed, were favourable. There were few comments, and the design codes address the issues raised. One comment refers to matters that fall under Building Regulations.

## **Conclusion & Subsequent Actions**

All comments have been noted and may be viewed in the accompanying spreadsheet. Some responses have been abridged from the public version, depending on whether individuals expressed a wish for their response to be made public or not.

The overall feedback is positive, and several respondents expressed appreciation of the hard work put into the preparation of the Plan.

Some comments made recommendations for specific aspects. Not all of these can be accommodated in Planning Policy (notably highways/transport schemes which are dealt with through parallel strategic transport strategy at the borough level and in conjunction with sub-regional transport planning). There is consequently a limit on what neighbourhood planning policy can make happen or prevent from happening. Similarly, although views may be honestly held and expressed, in Planning terms, there may need to be more significant evidence to balance evidence for the need, for example, of housing supply. With some exceptions, it is therefore not appropriate to make significant changes as a result.

Having also gone through independent examination, several changes have been made to the plan. In some case, these changes accommodate recommendations made through consultation, or otherwise amend the policy originally commented upon.