

**High Lane Village Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Regulation 14 Public Consultation**

**Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> September 2019 until Friday 1<sup>st</sup> November 2019**

**Table 3 Residents' and MP's Responses v2 after SMBC mtg 101219**

<b>Consultee Name Address Ref. No.</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para. No.</b>	<b>Vision/ Objective / Policy No.</b>	<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Comments received</b>	<b>HLVNF Consideration</b>	<b>Amendments to NP</b>
1.	All			Support	<p>We would like to thank all the members of the HLVND committee who have obviously worked extremely hard to produce a first class professional document.</p> <p>We agree with all the sentiments and proposals contained in the document and wish the committee success with all their proposals.</p>	Noted	No change.
2.	23		T2	Support / Comment	Although I agree that access to the station should be improved I am dubious about improving car access as this is likely to cause more traffic congestion at the junction of the A6 and Middlewood Road.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Steering Group has given further consideration to this, and a Table has been added to the NDP showing a SWOT analysis of proposals for a new</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b>Insert a new Table after 4.30 provided by Steering Group - SWOT Analysis of new station and improvements to existing station.</b></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
						<p>station and improvements to the existing station.</p> <p>The preferred approach will be to improve access for pedestrians and cyclists to support a move towards more sustainable transport alternatives. However some provision for car access and parking may also be required.</p>	<p><b>In 4.30 omit sentence 3 beginning ‘However there is a clear preference ...’ and replace it with this: <u>“Responses confirm there is a clear need for access to a railway station and opinion is mixed locally for the existing Middlewood Station to be part of any enhanced public transport plan or for a new railway station to be provided.”</u></b></p> <p><b>Paragraph continues with existing sentence “Subject to further detailed studies....New sentence at end of paragraph: <u>“The NF would actively seek to engage with SMBC on all public transport options as part of the multi phased plan”</u>. and final sentence of 4.30 is <u>“The Swot Analysis below includes pros and cons from draft plan consultations.”</u>(Swot to go in the body of the text not as an appendix)</b></p>
3.	All			Support / Comment	<p>I support the High Lane Village Neighbourhood Development Plan as at September 2019.</p> <p>My particular concerns for my local area are air pollution,</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>These matters are all addressed in the NDP.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>traffic congestion, efficient and accessible public transport and preservation of Greenbelt land.</p> <p>I support the NDP's stance on all of the above and also the requirement for affordable housing and accessible housing for the elderly in our community.</p> <p>Brownfield sites within the borough must be developed before greenbelt land is converted for development and action must be taken to address the traffic congestion and associated air pollution.</p>		
4.	28/ 29		Design Code LC1	Support / Comment	Each para: A-F makes total sense. Ensuring the preservation of the character and context of the existing residential areas is of paramount importance to maintain the character and	Noted.	No change to NDP or Design Codes.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>context of High Lane Village as a whole.</p> <p>The suggestion that there should be several small developments instead of one large one would reduce the impact of the traffic congestion and air pollution on the A6 corridor. Therefore, would seem an extremely sensible option.</p>		
5.			All T2	Support / Comment	<p>First of all I must say I am very impressed with the Development Plan and the work that the committee are putting into the Plan.</p> <p>The proposed development of the 500 houses either side of the A6 in such close proximity to the A6 is certainly going to cause added congestion ie minimum of say 1000 extra cars. It will add to the already high pollution already existing.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposal for 500 new houses has come forward through the GMSF.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>The idea of the 192 extending its route to High Lane is an excellent idea as the reliability of the 199 is already stretched as is its frequency.</p> <p>Instead of the new railway station at Brookside, would it not be better to make the access to Middlewood station easier by creating more car parking space.</p> <p>We must protect our greenbelt area – otherwise the ‘village’ name of High Lane would not seem appropriate.</p>		
6.			Vision  T1	Comment  (Objection relates to GMSF site allocation)	<p>I object to more houses adding traffic onto the A6. It's already a standing car park in rush hour. We have too many traffic lights in High Lane causing congestion.</p> <p>New houses should be built on brownfield sites first.</p>	<p>Noted .</p> <p>The Vision prioritises brownfield development.</p> <p>Policy T1 addresses air quality.</p> <p><u>The numbers of traffic lights and links to pollution (stop/start effect) will be</u></p>	<p><u>No change to Policies.</u></p> <p><u>However wording could be added to the supporting text:</u></p> <p><u>Amend NDP 4.26 page 19 of Plan :</u> <u>Start the opening sentence like this:</u></p> <p><b><u>"Policy H1 prioritises brown field development and Policy T1 resists new</u></b></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>The side roads are now a cut through to avoid the A6.</p> <p>I also object to the air pollution on the A6. Bad for health of the local people that walk and shop on A6.</p>	<p>raised with SMBC. (This cannot be addressed through the NDP's planning policies).</p>	<p>development which would have an adverse effect.....</p>
7.			Design Code MC1	Support / Comment	<p>With regard to traditional frontages I propose that not only should they be protected but businesses given a reasonable deadline to conform to an agreed design model which could be decided by an appropriate local body.</p> <p>Shop frontages should also meet an agreed traditional standard and not be 'fussy'.</p> <p>All the above should be sympathetic to the heritage of High Lane as a village.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Design Code MC1 does not require reinstatement of original designs but sets out "Opportunities to reinstate original designs should be taken whenever alterations are proposed. New or replacement shop fronts should be of high quality, sympathetic to the building and local architectural traditions and not detract from the character or appearance of the area as a whole." This provides sufficient flexibility and</p>	<p>No change to NDP.</p> <p>No change to Design Code.</p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
						encourages sympathetic designs.	
8.1	All			Support	<p>Clearly a great deal of work has been done on this and it seems comprehensive, detailed and justified. All contributors should be congratulated.</p> <p>The NPD is very comprehensive, balanced and justified; a commendable job.</p> <p>Some specific queries:</p>	Noted.	No change.
8.2	P15			Comment	<p>P.15: It is not clear what the SEMMMs A6 mitigation measures are/will be but limiting HGV is highlighted.</p> <p>Could this be linked to the air pollution issue (next section) ie. enforcement based on NOx and particulates? This could be the basis of a Clean Air Zone, as apparently favoured by Government.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2. Proposals and mitigation measures related to High Lane are highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>The NDP cannot identify a Clean Air Zone but the Forum will refer this to SMBC for consideration. It is understood that SMBC and</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					Not sure if this is appropriate for the NPD specifically.	GMCA are looking at a Clean Air Zone across the whole of Greater Manchester.	
8.3	P17			Comment	P.17: How was the air pollution monitoring data 'adjusted', resulting in levels below Air Quality Objectives? Was the monitoring in line with that in other areas ie. recognised as valid?	Noted.  Please refer to the full report (Air Quality Monitoring Results - High Lane, Stockport, Redmore Environmental, May 2019) for further technical information about how the data was adjusted.	No change.
8.4	P33			Comment	P.33: Figure 6 is confusing: what are the 'total' column values? They increase with decreasing ranking, so where does the ranking come from?	Accepted.  The Table has been revised by the Steering Group and a new, clearer Table will be inserted into the NDP.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <b>Insert new Table for Figure 6.</b>
8.5	P36			Comment	P. 36: The policy statement says HLNF could support 'major' development ('if met requirements of NPD') but this is this not contradictory with 'not in green belt' or 'within build up area' ( 5.23, P. 33)?	Noted.  The NDP recognises that at the current time High Lane village is inset within the Green Belt and there are likely to be few opportunities for significant new housing development.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <b>Amend para 5.23, after 4th sentence to:</b>  <b>"Therefore following consideration of the existing settlement boundary around the Village and constraints of Green Belt the HLVNF Management</b>



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
						<p>However proposals have come forward through the GMSF for major development; such development will require changes to the Green belt boundary and this will be considered through the GMSF process. Policy H1 has been prepared to be flexible so that the criteria could be applied to larger schemes in the future if they come forward. This should be made clearer in the supporting text.</p>	<p><b>Committee has taken the view that the NDP should not include site allocations in the Green Belt. In addition, the HLVNF proposes that the NDP should not allocate sites within the existing built up area due to the limited opportunities within the settlement boundary. <u>However there is a need for the NDP to demonstrate that the reasoning and evidence supporting the new emerging GMSF has been taken into consideration in the NDP (see paragraph 1.4), and the NDP should not conflict with the emerging policies and proposals. Therefore the NDP Policies (including H1) have been prepared to incorporate flexibility so that they may be applied to larger schemes if they come forward in the future.</u></b></p> <p><b>Insert the GMSF Response summary to Allocation 38 in Appendix 4.</b></p>
8.6	P55				P.55: If needed, several more viewing points could be identified on the map – such	Accepted.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					from the canal (W+E) south of Middlewood (as referred to on P. 60).		<p><b>Insert new View 4 text and photograph before 6.41.</b></p> <p><b><u>"View 4 Railles Field(opposite the Royal Oak) looking west towards Marsden House and the woods of Middlewood.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>This peaceful view alongside Middlewood Road is visible to pedestrians, cyclists, and walkers from the A6 and sets the scene for High Lane's rural character. Residents and visitors can quickly and easily access the view and escape the noise and pollution of the A6 thereby enhancing their physical and mental well being. Many local people choose to regularly walk, jog or cycle alongside it to enjoy its serenity. "</u></b></p> <p><b>Insert new view 4 to Map 6.</b></p>
8.7	P66			Comment	P.66: Could there be a comment on avoiding typical modern developer estates where houses are clones with	Noted.  Policy HD2 requires proposals to respond to local character	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					minimal space between? The point here is restricting profit maximisation being the overriding criterion of design (as opposed to the desire for more character, as expressed elsewhere).	and encourages imaginative modern designs.  Further detail is provided in the Design Codes, and together these should help to ensure that new development is distinctive and high quality.	
9.	All			Support	I support the Plan	Noted	No change.
10.	All			Support	I support the plan as it represents a positive framework for village life in High Lane.	Noted	No change.
11.	All			Support	I totally support the Draft Plan	Noted	No change.
12.	All			Support	I support the forum. Keep up the good work. Thank you!	Noted	No change.
13.	All			Support	Firstly, I am in overall support of the draft NDP and its vision and I commend the hard work and energy of the HLVNF team in producing this. Thank you very much for this.	Noted	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					I have a number of comments/observations that I would ask the HLVNF team to consider, further to the initial comments I submitted in response to the informal consultation in March 2019.		
14.		4.19 4.20		Comment	Para 4.19/4.20 – if the findings of the Redmore Environmental report are to be stated within the NDP then I consider it important, for balance, that the NDP also acknowledges the comments made in the review prepared by Darrell Williams on behalf of HLRA dated 15 September 2019 which highlights the limitations of the Redmore report and why its findings should be treated with caution.	Noted.  The report from the RA was provided to Redmore for comment and there professional response addressed the points raised in relation to the competency and scope of the report.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  Report from Redmore to go as an appendix to the Plan.  (Feedback from DW and Redmores response to go on web site.)  Insert after 4.20: " <u><a href="#">The Forum was provided with a technical review of the Redmore Air Quality Monitoring report by a member of the community which challenged some of the approaches to the data sampling, adjustments and data sets used. This information was shared with Redmore for comment, and their response on 12th December 2019 answered these points in relation</a></u>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
							<a href="#"><u>to the scope and funding provided and the standard of methods used. The Redmore report is seen as a significant indication of pollution levels in the community along the A6 are close to legal limits in several locations,. Additional traffic and or points of congestion on the A6 without adequate mitigation would risk a breach of these limits. (Note: the community review of the Red,report and the Redmore response are available on the HLVNF website.)."</u></a>
15.1		4.21	T3	Comment	Para 4.21 – I think, in addition to what is said here, it is also important to mention that the local shops, pubs/cafes, medical centre and church are all situated directly on the A6 and this coincidentally represents probably the highest localised concentration of people being exposed directly to the effects of traffic congestion within the	Noted.  Amend NDP as suggested.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <b>Insert new paragraph after 4.21:</b>  <b>" <a href="#"><u>It is important to note that many local facilities including shops, pubs, cafes, the medical centre and church are all located along the A6 corridor. Residents and visitors accessing these local facilities may be exposed to localised air pollution walking to and from the facilities.</u></a>"</b>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>NDP Area when walking to and from those facilities. The Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040/Draft Delivery Plan 2020-2025 includes a commendable strategy on “Streets for All”, dealing with <i>“the role of streets in creating sustainable, healthy and resilient places ... balancing the movement of people and goods alongside the creation of more people-friendly and less polluted streets and places”</i>. This surely builds the case for addressing traffic issues on the A6 in High Lane in the round, particularly in the context of other policies to promote a Liveable Neighbourhood with use of local facilities and encouraging walking/cycling over car use (e.g. Draft Policy T3 later in the Plan).</p>		<p>Insert new paragraph after 4.41:</p> <p><u><a href="https://tfgm.com/2040/delivery-plan-2020-2025">"The Transport for Greater Manchester Draft Delivery Plan 2020-2025 (ref https://tfgm.com/2040/delivery-plan-2020-2025 ) sets out an overall aim for 50% of all journeys in Greater Manchester to be made by walking, cycling and public transport by 2040. This includes implementing the programme "Streets for All". Paragraph 15 explains: " Streets for All is Greater Manchester’s new way of thinking about the role of our street network, with a focus on the needs of people and places, rather than considering the movement of vehicles alone. It will enable Greater Manchester to work in an integrated way to create sustainable, healthy and resilient places; tackling issues such as congestion, air pollution, bus service reliability; improving interchange between modes; creating walking and cycling improvements; and delivering</a></u></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
							<a href="#">local centre enhancements. We are already working on a number of major corridor studies using a Streets for All approach, and the recommendations from these studies will be incorporated into future versions of this Delivery Plan." The proposed measures include a Long-term Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (paragraph 174).</a>
15.2		5.10 - 5.34		Comment	<p>In my view, the section of the NDP at paras 5.10 – 5.34 would benefit from a conclusion which draws together the work done in analysing the data from Stockport HNA/HLVNF’s own questionnaires etc. into how this arrives at the policy and position taken in Draft Policy H1.</p> <p>A partial conclusion is included in paragraph 5.23 but this appears to be put before the analysis of the housing need/demand.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Insert new concluding paragraph after 5.34.</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP:</b></p> <p><b><a href="#">Insert additional wording after 5.34 (insert new concluding paragraph):</a></b></p> <p><b><a href="#">"Policy H1 has been prepared therefore to provide a positive planning framework to guide new housing development in High Lane over the plan period. The Policy has been prepared to be in general conformity with adopted strategic policies which identify High lane as a settlement inset within the Green Belt and the emerging new policies and proposals in the GMSF which is at an early stage of preparation but which</a></b></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
							<p><u>proposes a strategic site allocation in the existing Green Belt adjoining the settlement to the west. The Policy also sets out proposals for house types and sizes taking into account existing housing provision in the area, population changes and changing housing needs based on technical assessments and responses to local public consultations undertaken as part of the NDP process."</u></p> <p>Also typo - amend "Grenbelt" to "Green Belt" in 5.23</p>
15.3			H1	Comment	<p>I would ask the team to consider whether the current drafting of Draft Policy H1 goes far enough. In particular, how would the NDP respond, when considered objectively, to certain types of development application over the full lifetime of the NDP, as the examples below: Referring to Para 1 this states: <i>"Proposals for new housing</i></p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Policy H1 aims to provide a supportive planning framework for new development within the existing built up area in the first instance but also refers to larger scale development proposals which may come forward through the GMSF.</p>	No change.



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<i>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)"</i>		
15.4			H1	Comment	<p>Please consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the NDP's support be expressed as being conditional upon the proposals also meeting the requirements set out in the other policies in the HLVNDP?</li> <li>If this paragraph excludes 'major development', how would the NDP apply to a proposal for major development of say 20 units from a private developer (i.e. not GMSF)? Should the policy expressly state that proposals for major development will be resisted?</li> <li>Ought the policy also to say, for the avoidance of</li> </ul>	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The Policy already sets out that development proposals that come forward through the GMSF will be supported provided they meet the requirements of other NDP policies. This could be amended so that the first paragraph also refers to other policies.</p> <p>The second paragraph could also be changed to refer to the Stockport Local Plan as well as the GMSF. Proposals for major development are likely to require changes to the</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP</b></p> <p><b>Amend Policy H1 paragraph 1: Insert</b>  <i>"<a href="#">Subject to other policies in the HLVNDP, ...</a>"</i></p> <p><b>Amend Policy H1 Paragraph 2 to:</b></p> <p><i>"If proposals for major development in the HLVNDP Area come forward in the future through the GMSF or Stockport <a href="#">Local Plan</a>, they will be supported provided they meet the requirements set out in the policies in the HLVNDP."</i></p> <p><b>Note on need to need to retain GMSF ref, but update to Allocation 38 and</b></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>doubt, that any proposals for new development within the existing Green Belt boundary will be resisted?</p> <p>Referring to Para 2, this states: "If proposals for major development in the HLVNDP Area come forward in the future through the GMSF, they will be supported provided they meet the requirements set out in the policies in the HLVNDP"</p> <p>Please consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over the life of the NDP, major development may come forward from other strategic plans such as the Stockport Local Plan or some alternative incarnation of GMSF in the future. Should the wording here not be widened to cover any strategic plan?</li> <li>Whilst there is a proviso that support would be</li> </ul>	<p>Green Belt boundary and therefore they should come forward through the local plan as proposed site allocations.</p> <p>The NDP has to be in general conformity with the strategic planning policies in Stockport's most up to date adopted development plans in order to meet the basic conditions. It also has to consider the reasoning and evidence supporting emerging plans such as the GMSF.</p> <p>The NDP cannot be used as a tool to oppose proposals in the GMSF (or proposed new Stockport Local Plan) but should include planning policies which are positive to guide development proposals that may come forward in the future. Objections to the proposals and policies and policies in the GMSF should be</p>	<p><a href="#">include responses in Appendix - see 8.5 above.</a></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>conditional on the proposals meeting the requirements of other HLVNDP policies, none of those policies cover wider infrastructure requirements such as increases in healthcare and education provision and other services that would need to accompany major development as a pre-requisite. Should the requirement for providing supporting infrastructure also be expressly stated here as a condition of support?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I note that various extracts from the January 2019 Draft GMSF and in particular GM Allocation 38 are included and/or referred to in the draft NDP (including Appendix 4 but also for example para 4.50). I am not sure it is appropriate to include, and therefore potentially give credence to this, when that version of</li> </ul>	<p>undertaken in response to consultation processes for this development plan and not through the NDP.</p> <p>Existing national and Stockport planning policies provide a robust framework to protect existing Green Belt areas from inappropriate development. Changes to the Green Belt boundary can be undertaken through a review of the local plan.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements will be addressed through the GMSF, Local Plan and associated infrastructure delivery plan. Proposals which will lead to direct need to increases in infrastructure such as education, health etc may be required to contribute towards the required investment but this is not a matter for the NDP. SMBC</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					GMSF is itself “draft” and there are many reasons why development of the scale/density proposed in GM Allocation 38 would not be appropriate or sustainable in this location.	and GM authorities will be leading on work linked to infrastructure requirements and delivery.  It is appropriate to refer to the GMSF and the latest and most up to date versions of draft policies and proposals. The NDP will be updated at key stages in the process to ensure it refers to the most up to date versions of plans and policies.	
16.			Green Spaces	Comment	Finally I wish to reiterate comments first made in my response to the Informal Consultation in March 2019 concerning the lack of direct reference in any draft policy to a positive support for the preservation and support of rural life, including farming.  Section 6 of the Draft NDP focusses very much on the role of green spaces in a	Noted.  The preservation of rural life is not really a planning policy matter. The NDP aims to protect landscape character and will be amended and updated to take account of more recent information and studies on local biodiversity undertaken by the Cheshire Wildlife Trust. Hopefully, together protection and	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>recreational context but, apart from an indirect reference in paragraph 7.15, there is little that acknowledges the role of farming within the NDP Area and the fact that it is a vital contributor to the character of the setting within which the built-up area sits, notwithstanding its contribution to other factors such as environment. It may be that the team considers this to be covered sufficiently by other policies/objectives but I am concerned if there is no <i>positive</i> reference in any policy within the NDP towards supporting and preserving rural life in that form then I fear that is a missed opportunity because, without it, the purpose and sustainability of that land within the Green Belt (and making up a very large proportion of the NDP Area)</p>	<p>enhancement of landscape character and biodiversity will support rural life and farming in the NDP area.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					could become more vulnerable.		
17.			p.25 map 2	Comment	Sustrans proposal This proposed road to the south of the A6 runs straight through the Greenbelt. Why is this even being considered?	Noted. The Map has been updated to refer to the most recent proposal in the GMSF.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <b>Insert new updated Map 2 from Sustrans.</b>
18.			91 map 12	Comment	Map 12 Protected species of birds. How can this be updated? Provide information to residents.	Noted. The Forum is working with the Wildlife Trust to provide the most up to date information. All information provided in relation to the NDP as background supporting evidence will be made public on the NDP pages of the website.	No change.
19.			P56 6.44	Comment	In the Greenbelt to the south of A6 known as Cooper's Meadow[opposite the Royal Oak] there are badgers who visit the gardens most evenings. There are also resident bats seen every night at dusk. How can these be logged accordingly?	Noted.  SG to provide wildlife info to CWT for report. Send info to GMEU to update maps.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
20.			p.85	Comment	Page 85 refers to a previous survey of where houses could be built in the future. I believe that greenbelts suggested should be annotated here and therefore noted that they will not be considered e.g. Behind and to the side of the Royal Oak Opposite the Royal Oak, on the other side of the A6.	Accepted.  Create a table in appendix showing which of those sites are in the Green Belt.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <b>Show sites on p84-85 in a table indicating which are in the Green Belt (all except site rear of shops on A6 which is currently being built on).</b>
21.			P 82	Comment	Page 82 questions which of the sites identified in Allocation 38 is preferred.  Both are on Greenbelt so neither is preferred. Previous comments in the plan refer to this. No building on the Greenbelt. Propose a survey. Not done that I know of and shouldn't be done as GMSF are reviewing all sites again.	Noted.  The paragraph on p82 should be deleted as it was carried over from a previous version of the NDP and is no longer relevant.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <b>Delete paragraph on p82 (Appendix 4).</b>
22.			P 89	Comment	Map 10 on page 89 refers to bats. There are 100% bats in Cooper's meadow so	Noted.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					information should be provided as to how this information should be updated. Where can people report known bat habitats so all can be captured in the Plan.	Refer information to CWT report info &/or Engage GM Ecology Unit.	<a href="#">Refer to advice from CWT in relation to Policy NH3 and refer to report in supporting text after 6.46.</a>
23.	P 38		H1	Comment	<p>Page 36 states proposals for major developments in the HLVDP area will be supported if they meet the requirements set out in the plan.</p> <p>There is NO capacity for this in the HLVDP except for the GREENBELT which the village do not want to build on so I believe that this is a contradiction in terms?</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Refer to 15.4 above.</p>	No change.
24.				S/C	A great document with all areas of the plan well researched and well put together. The very considerable work and effort put into producing the document thus far is self-evident and is a credit to all those actively involved.	Noted	Support



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					We have absolutely no reservations in fully supporting all aspects of this draft NDP.		
25.				Support	<p>See supporting letter I wish to formally offer my <b>Support</b> to the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) as a whole, and I make additional comments on specific sections and related issues below.</p> <p>I wish to offer my thanks to all the members of the High Lane Village Neighbourhood Forum, and especially its NDP Steering Group and other Working Groups, for their time and effort in preparing the Plan to its current stage. I offer my best wishes for its future progress in the process to adoption.</p>	Noted.  Refer to Table	No change.
26.	p16	4.8	T1	Object / Comment	An A6 – M60 link road from the end of the A555 to the	Noted.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					M60 at Bredbury would be catastrophic for High Lane and all areas eastwards along the A6 as far as Whaley Bridge in terms of increased traffic volume, HGV's and congestion. The A555 has already brought a large increase in traffic volume in particular HGV's.	There is a need to balance negative impacts of A6 M60 link road. Additional traffic pulled into HL from East Link to original MARR survey?	<b>NDP Amendment. Add to 4.8 on page 16 of Draft Plan</b>  "There is a need to balance the negative impacts of an A6 M60 link road against possible benefits it could bring. However data from the residents' traffic survey October 2019(Appendix ..) highlights significant increases in HGVs through High Lane since the opening of the A555 and serious concerns have been expressed by residents in the Reg 14 consultation about the impact of an M60 link road drawing in more traffic to High Lane and all areas east along the A6. Should there be a plan for an M60 link road from the A555 the NF would want to engage in discussions re. mitigation measures ."
27.	P17	4.16	T2	Comment	The air quality monitoring carried out by Redmore Environmental was only undertaken for a 3 month period which is insufficient time for an accurate	Noted.  3 months monitoring meets the DEFRA requirement and was limited by community funding available.	No further change. See 14.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					assessment to be made as they should be taken over a 12 month period. The readings have been extrapolated to give the 12 month value and may have been affected by the unseasonably warm weather during the test period. In any event the readings from diffusion tubes are only generally accurate to + or – 20% and do not highlight any daily or weekly fluctuations. <a href="https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/environment/environmental_health/local_air_quality/what_is_pollution_like_near_me/diffusion_tube_monitoring/diffusion_tube_monitoring.aspx">https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/environment/environmental_health/local_air_quality/what_is_pollution_like_near_me/diffusion_tube_monitoring/diffusion_tube_monitoring.aspx</a>	A review of the report has been sent to Redmore for their comments and these documents will be placed on the NDP website.	
28.	P24	4.39	T3	Comment	It is disappointing to learn that the provision of cycle lanes on the A6 from the A6/Norbury Hollow Road junction to Middlewood Way and then through High Lane to Lyme	Noted.  It is understood that SMBC did not progress cycle lanes on the A6 due to the narrowness of the A6 carriageway.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <b>Add action for HLVNF to engage GM cycling Tsar (C Boardman) about on and off road plans after 4.54.</b>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Park entrance to tie in with the existing cycle lanes provided by Cheshire CC have been abandoned by Stockport MBC. This was one of the proposed mitigating measures of the A555. This section of the A6 is heavily used by commuters during the week and by serious leisure cyclists heading to the Peak District at weekends. Whilst the route suggested by Sustrans is welcomed and will be well used by families and leisure cyclists this is unlikely to be as quick as on the A6 due to the terrain of the suggested route and hence will be largely unattractive to commuters and longer distance cyclists and will therefore have little impact on reducing traffic volumes and congestion.</p>	<p>Discuss at SMBC meeting. <a href="#">Safe link from A6 to A555?</a> SMBC are looking at this and should provide relevant information. This may be a future option but it is not something the NDP can address. It will be reviewed when the Stockport Local Plan is prepared and the community can engage in the process at that time.</p>	<p><b>Add further sentence to 4.54:</b></p> <p><u><a href="#">"The HLVNF supports the principle of cycle lanes. However off road cycling is preferred as it is likely to be healthier and safer due to lower air pollution levels and fewer hazards from vehicles."</a></u></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
29.	P27	5.3	H1	Objection / Comment	<p>The proposed GMSF allocation 38 for 500 homes on each side of the A6 if implemented would likely require additional road junctions and traffic lights on the section of the A6 immediately to the east of the bridge over Middlewood Way.</p> <p>This section of road already suffers from serious congestion especially at peak times due to the proximity of the traffic light junction at Windlehurst Road and the two new traffic light junctions with Norbury Hollow Road and the A555. The A555 has already brought an increase in traffic flows to this stretch of the A6 (in particular HGV's) and any further intermediate junctions and additional flows will only exacerbate the current situation. Priority should be given to brownfield sites and small sites within the existing</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Objections to the GMSF should be referred to GMCA.</p> <p>The new traffic lights and impacts on air pollution and traffic flow could be added to the NDP.</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b>Add to end of 4.21:</b>  <u>"There were also opinions expressed during the Regulation 14 public consultation about ( a )the need to optimise traffic lights to maximise vehicle flow and ( b ) the potentially negative air quality and traffic impacts if a new junction or 4 way traffic lights were added on the A6 due to implementation of the proposed GMSF Allocation 38 "</u></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					built up area. If it is shown that there is a requirement for development on greenbelt land then alternative sites should be considered to the south west of the designated neighbourhood area in the vicinity of the old A6 to the rear of Cranleigh Drive adjacent to the A555 and the area of land opposite to the former Robin Hood PH bounded by the old A6 and the railway. Both these sites will have less traffic impact on High Lane and the A6 generally and are already bounded by existing infrastructure.		
30.				Support	Yes A well balanced plan that most importantly to me protects green belt.	Noted	No change.
31.				Support	I think the High Lane Village Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) has	Noted	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					been very well put together and I would support it in its current form. Well done to all concerned.		
32.			R1	Comment	<p>Would have liked to have seen within policy R1 inclusion of developer contributions to support improvements or extensions to existing sports facilities such as the Tennis and Cricket clubs.</p> <p>These facilities are assets to our community and could provide so much more for all age groups within High Lane ie a gym, squash indoor 5 a side etc. They have the capacity to expand but need investment. Makes sense as space is limited in High Lane to build new facilities for developers to support these facilities. Can this not be more specifically included within a policy proposal?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy R1 already refers to developer contributions in the final paragraph.</p> <p><u>Developer contributions cannot be used to support private clubs - only municipal provision.</u></p>	<p>No change.</p> <p><b>Amend NDP</b></p> <p><b>Add to supporting text to Policy R1 - insert at end of 6.18:</b></p> <p><b><u>“SMBC will only support public facilities not private clubs through the use of developer contributions. However the NF would seek to gain an appropriate portion of funding for the High Lane community”</u></b></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
33.				Support	I have no comment other than to confirm I support the HLVNDP.	Noted.	No change.
34.			Transport	Support / Comment	<p>Point 4.3 around Congestion is correct we live on the A6 and have noticed an increase in traffic on an already busy road. There is a noticeable increase in HGV's and there is a good percentage of these in the early hours of the morning 4am onwards that also don't seem to be doing the 30mph limit.</p> <p>Point 4.7 refers to mitigation measures including noise reducing tarmac which I support.</p> <p>Point 4.8 I support looking at the possibility of Disley/High Lane bypass</p> <p>Point 4.10 I support that air quality is poor in the area.</p>	Noted.	<p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b>Add the traffic survey speed data summary – comment &amp; appendix.</b></p> <p><b>Replace original text on 4.05 with this:</b></p> <p><b><u><a href="#">“The community of High Lane paid for a traffic survey between Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> Jan and Monday 4<sup>th</sup> February 2019 at the lamppost opposite Station Farm on the A6. There was heavy snow on the Tuesday and Wednesday resulting in a 7 day average of 20,093 and for the 5 days without snow of 21,465. The most comparable data is the 2012 actual from ID 56154 east of Windlehurst Road of 21192.</a></u></b></p> <p><b><u><a href="#">On 15<sup>th</sup> October 2019 the residents did a manual account at Dept of Transport count point 90082 which showed a projected 24 hour total of 29827 with 2368HGV's. This is comparable with</a></u></b></p>



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Point 4.21 I support that those people trying to use buses or walk are the ones most affected by the air quality as they have to be exposed to this on the walking routes and at bus stops</p> <p>Point 4.29 I support to alleviate road traffic the number of trains would need to increase enabling people to use this as an alternative.</p> <p>Point 4.43 I think the average person would find it difficult to cycle due to the gradient up the a6 even if cycle routes were available unless they were using an electric bike.</p>		<p><a href="#"><u>the equivalent count in 2018 (pre A555 opening) which showed 23,389 vehicles total and 1570 HGV. This represents an increase of 27.5% on total vehicles and 50.8% for HGV's. (See appendix x Table "High Lane Manual Traffic Count 15/10/19/"). This demonstrates the increase in traffic volumes; the resultant congestion and associated air pollution risks will all have risen significantly for the A6 through High Lane."</u></a></p>
35.		5.1 5.4 5.23	Housing	Comment	<p>Point 5.1</p> <p>I don't believe we can cope with 500 homes this is still around a 20% increase on the current volume of homes</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP promotes prioritising brownfield development in the vision but has been prepared to be flexible to</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>which is still too high and the only way this can happen is green belt land.</p> <p>Point 5.4 I support that exceptional circumstances are the only reason greenbelt should be changed. But I do not believe we are in that position currently and therefore zero greenbelt should be built on.</p> <p>Point 5.23 I support that there should be Zero homes on green belt.</p>	<p>guide any proposals for new strategic sites which may come forward and which require changes to the green Belt boundary.</p>	
36.		6.34 6.11 6.4 6.43	Green Spaces	Support / Comment	<p>Point 6.34 I support this as there is a noticeable feeling of leaving an urban area as you drive into high lane due to the surrounding farmland.</p> <p>Point 6.11 I support that more drainage is needed for the parks to be enjoyed.</p>	Noted	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Point 6.4 I support the views should be protected particularly the view from Brookside park.</p> <p>Point 6.43 I support there are ancient woodlands are trees of significant age- there is a large ash tree in the field proposed for houses.</p>		
37.	All		(T2)	Support	<p>With the exception of policy T2 (the reservations for which I have explained separately), I support the Draft NDP, notwithstanding the numerous minor errors contained therein.</p> <p>Overall, well done to all those who have worked hard to produce this document for our community.</p>	Noted	No change.
38.	p.23	4.37	T2	Object	I do not feel that any alternative location for a High Lane railway station has been adequately explored by	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The HLVNF does not have the resources to undertake a</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>HLVNF. Paragraph 4.30 correctly acknowledges that the A6 Corridor Study Report identified a “new rail station at High Lane”. But then the paragraph continues</p> <p><i>“However there is a clear preference locally for the existing Middlewood Station to be part of any enhanced public transport plan. In the responses to the HLVNF GMSF survey, an overwhelming 98% of the residents who responded and expressed a preference wanted Middlewood Station to be used for better public transport.”</i></p> <p><b>Where is the evidence for this preference?</b> The Issues and Options consultation simply posed the question</p>	<p>feasibility / viability study to test proposals for a new rail station, and is not aware of any such detailed study being undertaken by other organisations to date. Therefore the NDP does not have the technical evidence to support a proposal for a new station at this stage.</p> <p>At the current time it is considered appropriate for the NDP to support limited improvements to the existing station to improve use and promote more sustainable transport alternatives. The policy and proposals have been consulted upon both formally (at Reg 14) and informally (with users) and should be retained in the NDP.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p><i>“Should the NDP have a policy that supports improvements to Middlewood Station, including improving accessibility for users both day and night times? Yes / No”</i></p> <p>Phrased like this, of course the likely outcome would be majority support! The I&amp;O consultation did not give any hint that a new railway station, closer to more residents in High Lane, had been proposed by local government. This was therefore a leading question, producing a biased result.</p> <p>Also, the further informal consultation mentioned in paragraph 4.28 was “with rail users and people in the immediate area around Middlewood Station”. Again, by limiting the scope of that consultation to such a group,</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>the likelihood of producing a biased result in favour of support for Middlewood Station was increased.</p> <p>Although there is merit in the argument for improving access to the existing Middlewood Station, on balance, I think the huge scale* of the necessary improvements, coupled with the station's isolated and distant location relative to the village centre (cited in paragraph 4.27, as "about 1 mile (20 minutes' walk)") means that Middlewood Station is not necessarily a clear "winner" over a new, alternative location within High Lane that is closer to more residents and is less isolated.</p> <p>I contend that such an option has not been properly</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>explored in the consultations so far.</p> <p>*Lighting, paving and drainage improvements along a very long route to the station would be required. Also, there is currently no vehicular access to the station. These issues would be less of a problem (and presumably, therefore, less expensive) for alternative sites, such as near the existing railway track in the area close to Brookside School, and this would also seem to be a safer, less remote location, and closer (and so more convenient and walkable) for a greater proportion of residents.</p>		
39.1			All	Object / Comment	We have spent some time reviewing the Sep19 vs the Mar19 draft NDPs. It appears to have had some cosmetic editing but the substance has changed very little.	Noted.  The earlier comments submitted during the First Draft Plan consultation were considered by the Forum but	See 39.2 below - no further change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Therefore, virtually all our comments made on the earlier Plan seem to have been ignored or deemed not to represent the majority view. Although this is not supported by conversations we have had with other residents, we accept the outcome needs to reflect the democratic majority.</p> <p>It therefore seems pointless to reiterate detailed comments we have made previously and thus regretfully, we advise you we do not support the draft NDP.</p>	<p>unfortunately the proposed changes were not made prior to Reg 14 due to an administrative error. The HLVNF apologises for this and has considered the responses again - see 39.2 to 39.7 below.</p>	



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					Previous comments	Previous Responses (red) Further Responses (Green)	Proposed Changes to Submission NDP
39.2					<p><b><u>Question 1 Draft Policy T1 Mitigating Local Traffic Impacts of Development and Improving air quality</u></b>  <i>“Development proposals are required to provide evidence that they would not lead to further deterioration of air quality in those areas of High Lane which already exceed legal limits for Nitrogen Oxide and other pollutants”</i></p> <p>Do you agree with this policy? Is there anything we need to add?</p> <p>21) No I don't agree. Where air pollution exceeds the legal limit I would not allow further development. Developers will always find evidence that their proposals will not lead to further deterioration but I cannot imagine any</p>	<p>AQ levels do not currently exceed limits but mitigation is required (see letter to Defra from Theresa Coffrey Under Secretary on “Greater Manchester Local NO2 Plan” to Cllr Western 9July 2018)</p> <p>Work is ongoing at a SMBC and GMCA level to tackle air quality across Greater Manchester. The NDP cannot place a moratorium on new development as the NDP has to plan positively and be in general conformity with strategic planning policies. The GMSF although at an early stage of preparation includes the identification of a strategic site at High Lane and the NDP cannot be used to object to this proposal.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					development in the foreseeable future that will not, in one way or another, adds to deterioration. Additionally the policy goes on to talk about”... <i>where air quality is poor they will be required to provide suitable mitigation measures.</i> ” What is the definition of poor air quality? Unless it is specified, it is open to interpretation and likely to lead to none of these mitigation measures being implemented.	The letter from Theresa Coffrey Under Secretary to Defra on “Greater Manchester Local NO2 Plan” to Cllr. Andrew Western was 9-July-2018	
39.3					<b><u>Question 2 Draft Policy Transport T2 Middlewood Station</u></b> <i>“Proposals to improve passenger facilities at Middlewood Station will be supported subject to Green Belt policies”.</i> How important are improvements to public transport before any development begins to	Car parking options have benefits for some users but are dependent on council approval.  Please refer to SWOT analysis The NDP includes a number of policies which support increased levels of walking and cycling. Policy T2 supports improved vehicular access and car parking but	See 2. Above.  Policy T2 should be deleted and moved to the supporting text as an aspiration.  Policy T3 should be amended:  New title: " <b><u>Policy T2 Liveable Neighbourhoods and Sustainable Travel</u></b> "  Insert additional text at the end:

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p><b>mitigate car usage?</b></p> <p>21) While I agree with making improvements to the actual station itself and to pedestrian and cycle access, I absolutely disagree with providing car access and parking. My reasons for this objection: How would providing car access “reduce reliance on the car”[Para4.28} or “reduce the need to travel by car” [Para 4.29}</p> <p>How would this proposal align with “encourages other means of transport such as walking and cycling to reduce local reliance on cars” [Para 4.21]</p> <p>If car access is provided it will not only encourage High Lane residents to drive to the station it will encourage residents from elsewhere to drive there due to the lack of parking at other stations. It will also add to congestion on the A6 by virtue of cards</p>	<p>there is also an emphasis on providing better passenger facilities and improved facilities to encourage access by walking or cycling. Green Belt policies would apply and the NPPF (see NDP para 4.35) sets out that local transport infrastructure which requires a Green Belt location is "not inappropriate" (NPPF para 46c).</p> <p>Policy T2 will be reviewed. The Policy would be better incorporated into the supporting text as an "aspiration" rather than a planning policy.</p> <p>Policy T3 should be amended to refer to "Liveable Neighbourhoods and Sustainable Travel" and widened to refer to support for improvements to rail facilities in the area as well as</p>	<p><u>"Improvements to existing rail facilities at Middlewood Station, or the provision of a new station in High Lane, will be supported where they improve passenger facilities and accessibility for all users.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals for major new housing development should be located where there is good access to local bus routes and rail facilities."</u></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>accessing and egressing the route to the station [almost certainly another set of traffic lights].</p> <p>Additionally Para 4.25 states “<i>The station has viable options for ...parking..</i>” No it doesn’t. The only option for parking is to destroy more green belt land; how would that support Green belt policies?</p> <p>Regarding the suggestion of a new station. Of Middlewood Station Para 4.25 mentions “<i>The location and distance from local residential communities is also recognised...</i>”Where would a new station be located that didn’t have the same issues? I don’t see a suitable location within the environs of High Lane that doesn’t involve decimating another great swathe of green belt land. And if road access is allowed, it has the same problems as</p>	<p>support for new facilities and supporting development which has good access to local bus routes.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>the Middlewood Station above plus the potential additional issue of people driving through a residential area to access it.</p> <p>If we are to encourage people to walk and cycle and use public transport what better way to do this than by upgrading the route to Middlewood Station but not include cars?</p>		
39.4					<p><b><u>Question 3 Draft Policy H1 Housing Scale and Mix</u></b></p> <p><b><i>How important is it that the scale and distribution of developments are small scale and proportionate and dispersed where practical?</i></b></p> <p>21)I support the proposal for “small to medium scale housing developments of up to 9 units” but not “major schemes of 10 to around 20 units”. Additionally as Para 5.9 states “development in High Lane would be restricted to</p>	<p>No response required. Subjective</p> <p>The NDP has been prepared taking into account the reasoning and evidence of emerging development plans and in particular the GMSF which identifies a site in the Green Belt as a proposed strategic site. Therefore in order for the NDP to be flexible it has been prepared in the context of the existing planning framework whereby the built up area is surrounded</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p><i>infill sites within the existing built up area</i>". I find it difficult to envisage where you would find such sites to accommodate a major scheme.</p> <p>Also Para 5.16 states "...the type of homes that the current residents feel should be built: not 4 bedroom executive homes but affordable homes – so local children can afford to live here – or smaller retirement homes that will allow older residents to downsize without moving from the area they love to live in."</p> <p>Although the feedback was from current residents, your age structure shows that the majority of these are in the older age group who already live here and maybe have children who they would like to have living nearby. Has anyone asked the people who would actually be the</p>	<p>by Green Belt, and the emerging new planning context which identifies major development.</p> <p>The consultation process has focussed on existing residents and stakeholders but anyone can comment on the NDP during consultation processes.</p> <p>The responses to various consultations have demonstrated overall support for the housing policy which promotes smaller homes for older residents and young families and it is underpinned by technical evidence including a housing needs assessment undertaken by SMBC in 2015.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>occupiers of affordable housing whether they want to live here? It's likely that such people , if they have a job, may work some distance from High Lane and would prefer to have affordable accommodation nearer to where they work and reduce the need for commuting which in turn would be a benefit to all of us.</p> <p>Secondly, <i>"will allow older residents to downsize"</i>. My experience is that the majority of people in larger houses do not down size either when their families move away or one of the partners dies , preferring to stay in the house where they have probably spent a good deal of their lives.</p>		
39.5					<p><b><u>QUESTION 7 Any other comments or suggestions for improvement?</u></b></p> <p>21) Draft Policy T3 Supporting</p>	<p>The Sustrans Map (Map 2) was out of date and will be replaced by an updated</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP with new map.</b></p> <p><b>Sustrans map has been replaced in the submission plan..</b></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Cycling, Walking and Liveable Neighbourhoods I support parts of this policy but in particular I do not support “schemes to reduce through traffic on residential streets to make High Lane a more liveable neighbourhood as shown on Map 3” Map 3 is labelled as a Sustrans proposal, is clearly out of date as it includes housing proposals from the first GMSF consultation and shows a possible road scheme by passing High Lane using a route through Lyme Park and Bollinghurst Brook valley. This was a route suggested and rejected some 30 years ago and it is still unacceptable for a plethora of reasons. I find it hard to believe the HLVNDP supports this proposal particularly as Para 6.1 states: <i>The Forum has a commitment and passion to enhance and</i></p>	<p>version in the Submission Plan. <i>Amend or delete sustrans map</i></p> <p><b>This comment appears to be in relation to the Disley bypass which has been previously rejected. Map 3 refers to possible road schemes not schemes which have been passed. Lyme Park is not referenced by Sustrans as a route for cyclists on this map nor is it referenced in the policy.</b></p>	



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<i>protect the neighbourhood of High Lane including its village status, green open spaces and recreational facilities.</i>		
39.6					If a bypass of High Lane is to be achieved has anyone considered using the railway line and Disley tunnel as part of the route? I am not a railway engineer and I'm sure many reasons can be found to demonstrate this to be impracticable, unworkable or uneconomic, but if we can find £ billions to fund HS2 I'm sure we could find £millions to fund this. The said railway is only a relatively short section linking the Manchester/Marple/Hope Valley line to the east of New Mills and the Manchester/Buxton line at Hazel Grove. This link could be provided around Furness Vale freeing up a lot of the route to	<p>Measures would be agreed as part of transport review of development (speed limits, ramps signage etc)</p> <p>The NDP cannot propose major transport infrastructure such as a bypass.</p> <p>The NDP includes policies and proposals to support both on road and recreational cycling and Sustrans have supported the HLVNF with supporting text and policy wording. The NDP recognises that the 2 issues require different responses and this is reflected in the relevant policies and approaches in the Transport section and the Recreation section.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>connect the Chapel bypass at Bridgmont to the A555 at Hazel Grove. It may be that the Disley tunnel would need to be bored out and I appreciate it has been mentioned as local heritage but it would still be there and a small price to pay for burying the road.</p> <p><i>Para 4.34 states: The Forum is concentrating on off road cycling as part of the Recreational Activities..” This seems to contradict Para 4.37 which states:” The Forum is working with Sustrans to consider possible schemes for improving the local road network to enhance provision for walking and cycling.”</i></p> <p><i>The two things, off road recreational cycling and on road ‘utility’ cycling are fundamentally different. I frequently cycle off road in the</i></p>	<p>Accepted- wording to be clarified</p>	<p>Amend NDP</p> <p>Replace former 4.37/new 4.39 to this:</p> <p><u><a href="#">"The area is well used by cyclists. However the proposals for the cycle lanes on the A6 have been withdrawn by Stockport Council. The Forum is working with Sustrans to consider possible schemes for improving the local road network to enhance provision for walking and cycling.</a></u></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p><i>area around High Lane for recreational purposes and I consider it to be reasonably well catered for. It can always be improved and if you want suggestions I'd be happy to make some.</i></p> <p><i>However if you want to encourage people out of their cars and onto cycles it is utility cycling whereby people want to get somewhere for a purpose. In this case you need to know where they want to go and recognise they will very often ignore provided facilities if it doesn't suit them. For example where the A6 has been diverted to provide a junction with the A555 the old route has been designated as a cycle and bus route. However, commuting cyclists regularly ignore this and travel on the new section of the A6 because its shorter and faster.</i></p>		<p><u><a href="#">Whilst the Forum Transport sub group are concentrating on the establishment and development of safe cycle networks and routes for road cyclists, the Recreational and Natural Heritage sub groups will be concentrating on off road cycling networks and routes."</a></u></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p><i>Point 3. "Safe and secure parking provision at suitable locations..." Does this refer to car parking or cycles? It's not clear.</i></p> <p><i>Point 4. "Measures to deter rat running by vehicles through residential neighbourhoods"</i>  <i>It sounds good but has anyone seriously considered what these measures should be?</i>  <i>The current daily congestion on the west bound A6 has provoked a regular 'rat running' through Park Road, Hartington Road, Alderdale Drive. This route is clearly marked as illegal for thro through traffic at this time of the morning, there is a chicane at the end of Park Road and all the roads have a 20 mph speed limit. Neither the speed limit nor the 'no access' are enforced and thus are totally</i></p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<i>ignored with some vehicles travelling at excessive speeds to 'beat the traffic'. Elsewhere speed bumps have been installed. But here people just brake to go over the bump then accelerate between them creating additional pollution. Maybe if the proposed fitment of speed limiters on all new cars is implemented in 30 years time when most of the current cars are replaced, we may have solved the problem, but in the meantime what are the proposed measures?</i>		
39.7					However Para 6.29 " <i>The Lady brook Valley Trail offers off road access for cyclists and horse riders to pursue a route which extends from Coppice Lane in Disley passing through Middlewood and on towards Bramhall and Cheadle.</i> Has the person who wrote this ever achieved this on a cycle	Amend access to lady brook valley trail to "allows access to walkers and potentially cyclists and horse riders, for some or part of the trail"	Amend NDP.  Amend former 6.29 / new 6.30 to: " <u>The Ladybrook Valley Trail is an off road route for walkers which extends from Coppice Lane in Disley passing through Middlewood and on towards the A6 Marr cycle network and Happy Valley in Bramhall before going on to Cheadle, Stockport. At its junction with</u>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					or a horse? You would have to shoulder a bike over several stiles and steps and I would guess it to be impossible for even the most agile of horses.		<a href="#"><u>the Middlewood Way the route is sign posted for both cyclists and horse riders. The terrain on this route however requires considerable attention and investment in order to make it safe for users. With council planning and investment this cycle route could provide an alternative to on road cyclists travelling towards Cheadle.</u></a>
40.			T1 T2 T3 H1 R1 NH1 NH2 NH3 HD1 HD2	Support / Comment	Draft Policy T1 – Yes, I support these statements.  Draft Policy T2 – Yes, I generally support this but it may increase traffic locally which is accessing Middlewood Station.  Draft Policy T3 – Yes, I support these statements, especially item 4 to deter rat-runs	Noted	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Draft Policy H1 – Yes, I generally support these statement except for paragraph 2; I don't support any future major housing development in the HLVNDP area.</p> <p>Draft Policy R1 – Yes, I support these statements.</p> <p>Draft Policy R2 – Yes, I support these statements. Draft Policy NH1 – Yes, I support these statement</p> <p>Draft Policy NH2 – Yes, I support these statements</p> <p>Draft Policy NH3 – Yes, I support these statements.</p> <p>Draft Policy HD1 – Yes, I generally support this but I do not agree with any development (unless canal</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					related) within the Macclesfield Canal Conservation Area.  Draft Policy HD2 – Yes, I support these statements.		
41.	P14	4.1			Page 14, 4.1, - No development should take place without infrastructure enhancements being implemented prior to permission for such developments being granted. The minimum requirement for development over 10 houses should be that the effect should be mitigated prior to such development commencing. The reason for this comment being that the A6 Trunk Rd is already oversubscribed.	Noted.  Infrastructure requirements will be managed through the infrastructure delivery plan.	No change.
42.	15	4.6 4.7		Support	It is clear that traffic levels have increased since the opening of the A555 and that mitigation measures already implemented have had little	Noted	No change.



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					effect, evidenced by an increase in traffic in excess of expectations. Real measures have to be adopted prior to development as stated above as proof already exists that previous measures have been little more than a "Fob" to our village..		
43.	21	4.27		Support	<p>4.27 - It should be noted that Middlewood Station was not built to serve High Lane, it was purely a "Change over Station" due to two lines crossing. High Lane was served by "High Lane Station" (below the A6, west of High Lane adjacent to "Cooper Cottage) that was closed in January 1970, some 50 years ago!</p> <p>Since that date nothing has been implemented to make Middlewood Station readily usable and accessible to the residents of High Lane. One could go as far as to state that</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Refer to 2. Above.</p>	No further change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					High Lane doesn't have a Railway Station!  Either a new Station needs to be built or a Road access should be provided to Middlewood Station, adequately lit to provide safe access.		
44.	25, 46	4.45 4.47		Support	4.45, 4.46, & 4.47 - There is reference to "12km" within 4.45, followed by reference to 1.2km in 4.46 & 4.47, is this an error? 12km doesn't appear to relate to the argument?	Accepted.  (4.46 and 4.47 refer to 1-2km not 1.2km.)	<b>Amend NDP. 4.45 - Correct to 1.2km</b>
45.			Mpa 2	Comment	1) Page 25, Map 2 doesn't relate to the current GM Allocation 38? (Yellow hatching - Possible Housing Development, I believe relates to the 4000 proposal)  2) Page 31, 5.12, Figure 4 – The numbers don't add up, all households equates to 2207.	Accept.  Map 2 has been amended.  Figure 4 was drawn from - 2011 Census statistics. Households are different from the number of houses (properties) as sometimes more than 1 household share a house.	<b>Insert New Fig 6.</b>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					3) Page 33, 5.20, Figure 6 – I don't understand the figures, are they correct?	Figure 6 has been re-calculated.	
46.			T1 T2 T3 H1 R1 R2 NH1 NH2 NH3 HD1 HD2	Support / Comment	<p>Draft Policy T1 – Yes, I support these statements.</p> <p>Draft Policy T2 – Yes, I generally support this but it may increase traffic locally which is accessing Middlewood Station.</p> <p>Draft Policy T3 – Yes, I support these statements, especially item 4 to deter rat-runs.</p> <p>Draft Policy H1 – Yes, I generally support these statement except for paragraph 2; I don't support any future major housing development in the HLVNDP area.</p>	Noted	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Draft Policy R1 – Yes, I support these statements.</p> <p>Draft Policy R2 – Yes, I support these statements</p> <p>Draft Policy NH1 – Yes, I support these statements.</p> <p>Draft Policy NH2 – Yes, I support these statements.</p> <p>Draft Policy NH3 – Yes, I support these statements.</p> <p>Draft Policy HD1 – Yes, I generally support this but I do not agree with any development (unless canal related) within the Macclesfield Canal Conservation Area.</p> <p>Draft Policy HD2 – Yes, I support these statements. I do consent to my contact details being provided to</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					Stockport MBC so that they can keep me informed about the next stages to the NDP process.		
47.	All			Support	I approve of the Plan	Noted.	No change.
48.	All			Support	I fully support the High Lane NDP as a policy which takes into account the views of local people. A vision of how we envisage our village developing in the future, with regard to the main areas in the policy which aim to maintain and enhance our local heritage, and green open spaces, consider sympathetic housing and an improved transport system	Noted	No change.
49.	All			Support	I support the Plan and recognise the enormous amount of work that has gone into it.	Noted	No change.
50.	17	4.19 and 4.2		Comment	Are these results suspect? Surely with 30,000 vehicles a day , often crawling through	Noted  See new traffic survey data in Appendix.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					the village, you would expect limits to be exceeded		
51.	89		Maps	Comment	Land proposed for development south of the A6 (Coopers Meadow) has bats and is a highway for badgers, foxes and hedgehogs	Noted	Amend NDP.  Add further sentence to 6.44:  <u>" The land proposed for development south of the A6 (Coopers Meadow) is thought to have evidence of bats and is a highway for badgers, foxes and hedgehogs."</u>
52.	56		NH3	Support	I am very happy to support. The wildlife landscaping schemes should include wildlife	Noted	No change.
53.				Support	I support- well thought out Plan	Noted.	No change.
(No number 54)							
55.	19		T1	Support / Comment	The problem will get worse with all the building going on in East Cheshire	Accepted.  Add points on additional Each Cheshire development impacts	Add to 4.21: <u>"There may also be cumulative traffic impacts from nearby developments outside the neighbourhood area in Cheshire East at Disley, Wybersley and Carr Brow"</u>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
56.	23			Support / Comment	Draft Policy T2 Middlewood Station  support needed for better access lighting signage car parking. Hope a local bus could run round the village at peak times and 192 to come up to the station. Also cheaper than new one to put a station at Brookside with on road parking would cause more air pollution round Brookside School (just like station in Heaton Moor at roads clogged with cars) This would take years and a lot of money	Noted.  Refer to 2.	No further change.
57.	36 54 56 64 65		H1 NH2 NH3 HD1 HD2	Support / Comment	Page 36 Draft Policy H1 <b>Support</b> - if any larger build we need the transport and air quality addressing first!  Page 54 Draft Policy NH2 Support  Page 56 Draft Policy NH3 Support It is very important to	Noted	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>protect wildlife also woodlands and waterways</p> <p>Page 64 HD1 Support</p> <p>Page 65 HD2 Support</p>		
58.	51	6.39	NH1	Support / Comment	<p>If we have to have some new housing a small development of homes, similar to the Goldsmith Street development in Norwich awarded the Stirling Prize 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ultra low energy</li> <li>• roofs designed so sun hit houses opposite even in winter</li> <li>• Open Plan light bright eco houses with gardens backing onto enclosed soft play area for children</li> </ul> <p>Maybe a few low rise apartments on the same design and bungalows for older people or something on</p>	Noted.	<p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b>Add reference to this scheme in supporting text to Policy HD2.</b></p> <p><a href="https://www.architecture.com/awards-and-competitions-landing-page/awards/riba-regional-awards/riba-east-award-winners/2019/goldsmith-street">https://www.architecture.com/awards-and-competitions-landing-page/awards/riba-regional-awards/riba-east-award-winners/2019/goldsmith-street</a></p>



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					the lines of Chapelwood in Wilmslow for older people.		
59.	24	4.37, 4.38	T2	Support / Comment	<p>I support additional transport particularly to Marple from High Lane. Currently a bus runs from Marple to Hawk Green. Could this be extended ie up Windlehurst to A6 then return via Andrew Lane. Should the station get 'going' a shuttle bus would be great as would safe and well lit pathways</p> <p>NB Also the Hawk Green / High Lane route would also give High Lane residents access to other buses and rail links within Marple</p>	Noted	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Add further text to 4.38:</p> <p><u>"There would be considerable benefits to the local area if a bus service was provided linking High Lane to Hawks Green and Marple aligned to the proposed High Lane station improvements"</u>.</p>
60.	32	5.2	T3	Support / Comment	Support the need for suitable retirement accommodation for the more senior people – who love living in High Lane. Therefore ultimately releasing larger properties for families and younger generation	Noted	No change.
61.	All			Support	Seems like a job well done Support all	Noted	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
62.				Support / Object / Comment	<p>Overall I agree with the village plan. However I firmly believe in your <u>Brownfield Sites First Policy</u> throughout Greater Manchester must be adhered to, before any green belt is built on. I agree its much better to have small developments(up to 9) rather than a mass sprawl of 250 on either side of the A6. These new houses are still being built on Green Belt Land. How do residents feel about having their cul de sac, road or adjoining field extended?</p> <p><u>Air Pollution/Traffic Chaos</u></p> <p>For every new house built it is said add 1.9 additional cars. That is nearly 1000 more cars joining the often stationary A6 going one way or another</p>	Noted.	<p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p>Add further sentence to new conclusion after 5.34:</p> <p><b><u>"Overall the HLVNF would prefer to see the priority being for a brownfield first approach to development ahead of strategic development proposals which would require changes to the Green Belt boundary"</u></b></p>
63.			H1	Support / Comment	<p>Overall I agree with the village plan. However I firmly believe in your Brownfield Sites First Policy throughout Greater</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to 62.</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p>Add further sentence to 5.23:</p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Manchester must be adhered to before any green belt is built on. I agree it is much better to have small developments (up to 9) rather than a mass sprawl of 250 on either side of the A6. However these new houses are still being built on Green Belt Land. How do local residents feel about having their cul de sac, road or adjoining field extended?</p> <p><u>Air Pollution/ Traffic Chaos</u></p> <p>For every new house built it is said add 1.9 additional cars. That is nearly 1000 more cars joining the often stationary A6 going one way or another.</p>	Add additional sentence to 5.23.	<a href="#"><u>"The HLVNF will promote an approach that supports the local need for small scale developments and for schemes to be designed in close consultation with those residents most affected."</u></a>
64.	17	4.19 4.20		Comment	Is there any point including these paragraphs because the results and interpretation of them are open to question?	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The analysis was compliant with DEFRA standards. The issues raised on making it more valid are additional</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
						information and will be included in final plan.	
65.	23 24	4.36 4.38	T2	Object	<p>I object to this policy for the following reasons:</p> <p>1 ) As the planned housing developments along the A6 corridor in both East Cheshire and Derbyshire are completed, commuter traffic through High Lane will increase</p> <p>2) Train fares to Manchester from both East Cheshire and Derbyshire are more expensive than fares from Stockport. Therefore as a result, commuters drive through High Lane to Hazel Grove Station to avail themselves of cheaper fares.</p> <p>3) In developing Middlewood Station, it will become a target for these commuters. Improving Middlewood Station will do little to discourage traffic through the</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Improvements to Middlewood Station would help to increase local transport choices for residents and reduce reliance on the private car. Increased use of trains would support measures to tackle air pollution and reduce carbon emissions which contribute to climate change.</p> <p>The Policy aims to provide public transport infrastructure option before any housing development begins.</p> <p>Delete the text relating to the proposed turning circle. The Policy does not refer to this.</p> <p>Areas of ancient woodland and wildlife sites and the Middlewood Way would be</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP:</b></p> <p><b>Delete in para 4.38:</b>  <del>" If the road to Middlewood Station is improved, a turning circle could be created close to the junction with the A6 and Middlewood Road allowing the 192 to be extended from Hazel Grove."</del></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>village( and may well increase it further)</p> <p>4 ) Creating a bus turning circle at Middlewood Road will impede traffic flow up to the A6 as buses attempt a right turn.</p> <p>5 ) The above are all reasons why I believe it would be wiser to build a new station at the Disley end of the village as mentioned in the A6 Corridor Report</p> <p>6) Furthermore, Middlewood and Norbury Brook are sites of Scientific Interest (see Map 7). As a result shouldn't this area be protected from development?</p> <p>7)Map 9 clearly shows this is also an area of Ancient Woodland which adds further weight to the argument that it should be protected by the HLVNF.</p>	<p>protected in other planning policies and legislation.</p> <p>Proposals for a new station would have to be underpinned by a detailed viability / feasibility study.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
66.1	25	4.46	Policy T3	Objection / comment	<b>Page 25 Par 4.46</b> The sentence beginning “ <i>For example, having junctions..... up to Manchester Airport Eastern Link Road</i> ” is now out of date. Should it still be included?	Not accepted.  This is still relevant to the future Link Road project.	No change.
66.2			Map 2	Objection	<b>Page 24 Map 2</b>  I disagree with the inclusion of <u>Map 2 Sustrans Proposal for High Lane</u> . It is now out of date and features development proposals that no longer exist	Noted.  The map has been updated.	No further change.
67.	36 42	6.17	Policy H1 par 2  Policy R1	Objection / comment	HLVNF Neighbourhood Plan does not appear to facilitate any mass development. Since the village is largely against mass development; it is possible that any mention of accommodating the concept of mass development in the Neighbourhood Plan seems self- contradictory.	Noted.  As set out in the Housing Section (5) the NDP cannot be used to reject GMSF proposal. The Plan promotes smaller scale developments within the built up area but recognises that larger scale (major development) proposals may come forward through the GMSF or Stockport Local Plan.	No further change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					Wouldn't it be wise to omit any reference to mass development from the Plan, since its inclusion leaves the Plan open to ambiguity and misinterpretation?		
68.	56	6.45	NH3	Comment	<i>"Policy no. NH2 seeks to protect wildlife..."</i> Should this read policy NH3? Apologies if I have got it wrong.	Noted Change needed	<b>Amend NDP</b>  <b>6.45 change NH2 to NH3.</b>
69.	68			Comment	Bullet Point 2  Bullet Point 2 does not seem to make sense. If it is a direct quotation my apologies and please ignore this comment.	Noted	<b>Change " thought" to "throughout"</b>
70.	81 82			Comment	Are these maps and the accompanying comment relevant now?	Noted. Yes they are	No change.
71.	89			Comment	<b>Page 89 Map 10 Bats, Map 11 Protected Species</b>  Map 10 is inaccurate. There are bats in evidence over Coopers Meadow. They need	Noted.  Maps are from GM Ecology Unit. The information has been referred to the GMEU.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>to be logged and /or mention of this location included.</p> <p>Re Map 11 Page 90 – Do Badgers still count? Coopers Meadow is a Badger highway.</p> <p>See <b>Page 56 para 6.44</b></p>	<p>We will contact GMEU with emails from residents and ask for update timelines. May not be done until next GMSF update 2020.</p> <p>The CWT report will balance this.</p>	
72.				Comment / Support	<p>My main concerns are:</p> <p>The infrastructure needs to be in place</p> <p>The pollution levels on the A6 need to be thoroughly addresses</p> <p>Construction limited to two floors</p> <p>I would also like to thank you and the rest of the team for all your efforts and I am happy with most of the Development Plan</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements associated with new development will be dealt with through the infrastructure delivery plan - see <a href="https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/what-we-do/housing/greater-manchester-spatial-framework/gmsf-documents/">https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/what-we-do/housing/greater-manchester-spatial-framework/gmsf-documents/</a> (Supporting Infrastructure).</p> <p>The NDP seeks to address air quality and this will also be addressed at a Greater</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b>Add a new paragraph after 5.35:</b></p> <p><b><u>"Infrastructure</u></b></p> <p><b><u>"During the Regulation 14 public consultation a number of consultees expressed concern about the pressures on infrastructure associated with associated with new development proposals. Infrastructure provision at a strategic scale is being considered as part of the GMSF process - see <a href="https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/what-we-do/housing/greater-manchester-spatial-framework/gmsf-documents/">https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/what-we-do/housing/greater-manchester-spatial-framework/gmsf-documents/</a></u></b></p>



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
						<p>Manchester and Stockport level.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate to limit buildings to 2 storeys but the design codes and NDP planning policies require development to respond to local character and context.</p> <p>The Design Codes are being reviewed following consideration of the consultation responses.</p>	<p><a href="#">(Supporting Infrastructure). The website also includes Topic Papers looking at Physical Infrastructure and Social Infrastructure."</a></p>
73.			Design Codes  Housing Pollution	Object / Comment	<p>Whilst I appreciate the need for additional housing, I feel; that the building of so many on the planned sites would spoil the charm of High Lane village and its surrounding green fields.</p> <p>I do however feel that some of the shop fronts in High Lane village could be neater and enhance this charm.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP addresses local character and the Design Codes include advice for shop fronts. The NDP also seeks to address air quality through support for more sustainable transport alternatives.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					The traffic in and out of High Lane is the worst it has ever been, to add more homes on the scale proposed could be disastrous. Not only the gridlock and frustration of being stuck in constant traffic jams on my commute to and from work to Stockport but living so close to the A6 I am aware that the traffic fumes cannot be good for anyone.		
74.	24	4.38		Object / Comment	<i>"a turning circle could be created close to the junction with the A6 and Middle wood Road..."</i> Is there room to do this safely? What would be the impact on traffic flow, congestion and pedestrian safety? The majority of High Lane residents live higher up so would still face an uphill walk of some distance to their homes from this point so how well used would it be? A turning point higher up the village maybe down Alderdale	Noted.  The reference to the proposed turning circle has been deleted from the supporting text.  Refer to 65.	No further change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					Road would be more useful for more people.		
75.	45	56.2 8		Object / Comment	<p><i>"Access to the Middle wood Way for the disabled and wheelchair users is via Middle wood Road."</i> Even if the surface of this route is improved, I do not feel it is a practical proposition for the disabled or wheelchair users. It is quite a long distance and parts of it are uphill and winding. Maybe improving the path off Windlehurst Road to the M Way would be a better idea ?</p>	Noted.	<p>Amend NDP</p> <p>Post line 4, Para 6.28 following the sentence which ends 'support group', delete last 3 lines and insert ....</p> <p><u><b>"Access to the Middlewood Way however remains restrictive for those with disabilities. At present High Lane has no signage for the disabled advising of accessibility for this group to any of its off road walking routes including the Middlewood Way. While there are two potential routes which lead to the Middlewood Way both have unsuitable terrains. The 1<sup>st</sup> is the route which lies off Middlewood Road . This is an off road path which, whilst it is wide enough to accommodate wheel chair users , is long and uneven and in wet conditions muddy and impassable. 2<sup>nd</sup> potential route a recognised walkway which lies off Windlehurst Rd on Mag Lane is narrow, uneven and impassable when wet. The NDP</b></u></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
							<a href="#">supports upgrades to both these routes and the establishment of a multi user route off Windlehurst Rd."</a>
76.	87		Facebook Survey	Comment	I think you should indicate the number of people who participated in this survey.	Noted.  The numbers taking part in the Facebook Survey will be added to page 87 Appendix 7 and also to par 6.22	Amend NDP.  <a href="#">Par 6.22 Start with: "Of the 42 responses received ,results indicated....."</a>  <a href="#">And in Appendix 7 the title will become:</a>  <a href="#">'Adult Survey using the Survey Monkey Tool '</a>  <a href="#">and the first sentence will be: "A Sample of Issues raised in our survey by the 47 respondents included:"</a>  <a href="#">Bullet Point 1 : "Inconsiderate use of the Middlewood Way by cyclists..."</a>
77.	15 16 18	4.7 4.8		Support / Comment	I support mitigation measures such as the laying of a quiet	Noted  Amend link road wording	Amend NDP  <a href="#">Add further text to 4.7:</a>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
	37 70	4.24 BP3 6.4			<p>road surface to mitigate noise pollution</p> <p>Extending the M60 from Hazel Grove to Bredbury may cause substantial additional traffic to come through High Lane</p> <p>Mitigation measures re air quality include “<i>means of ventilation</i>”. What is meant by this and who would be responsible for the “<i>means of ventilation</i>”?</p> <p>What is “<i>a Green chain</i>”? Looking at the map I am not clear what the Green chains actually represent or what routes they are following? Are they accessible for pedestrians or cyclists?</p>	<p>Ventilation can be mechanical or natural and allows air to circulate in a building.</p> <p>Green Chains are identified in the Stockport UDP. Policy NE 3 Green Chains sets out that <i>'The council will protect and enhance a network of green chains throughout the borough, linking areas of open space and ecologically valuable routes with each other, the open countryside</i></p>	<p><b><u>"There is likely to be additional traffic impacts on High Lane following the opening of the M60 to A555 link road."</u></b></p> <p>Insert a footnote to explain “means of ventilation”: <b><u>" Ventilation can be mechanical or natural and allows air to circulate in a building"</u></b></p> <p>Insert a footnote to "green chains": <b><u>" Green Chains are identified in the Stockport UDP. Policy NE 3 Green Chains sets out that The council will protect and enhance a network of green chains throughout the borough, linking areas of open space and ecologically valuable routes with each other, the open countryside and similar features in adjoining districts."</u></b></p> <p>Insert footnote:</p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					I think a brief explanation at the top of the page as to why the A6 Corridor Study is in the Appendix and the reason for the highlighting would be helpful.	<i>and similar features in adjoining districts.'</i>	<p><u>"The A6 Corridor Study was undertaken to consider the potential impact of predicted traffic growth and demands on public transport within the A6 Corridor (Buxton to Stockport / Manchester) over the next twenty years.</u></p> <p><u>The two-fold objectives of the study are summarised as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>To identify the key transportation issues affecting the A6 corridor now and in the next 20 years and their underlying causes; and</u></li> <li>- <u>To develop a corridor strategy to address these issues and a short, medium and long term action plan to implement the strategy."</u></li> </ul>
78.	27	5.1		Object / Comment	<i>"The Open Day in 2017 showed the vast majority who answered the questionnaire (87% or 108 responses) believed that 500 or fewer houses would be a more</i>	Accepted.  Amend into 2 statistics	<p><b>Amend NDP</b></p> <p><u>Amend 5.1 : The third sentence becomes: "The NDP Open Day showed the strength of feeling in the area. Of those who answered the questionnaire</u></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p><i>suitable growth figure for the village</i></p> <p>This is probably one of the most important statistics in the draft and it is distorted and misleading. If it were true that 87% of people believed that 500 or fewer homes would be suitable, there would not be the large local protest against the current development for 500 houses. I think the actual figures gathered from the Open Day event were that 52% suggested between 0 and 200 homes and only 35% suggested building up to 500 homes. You have added the 2 figures together but they are each separate figures. It is important to change that</p>		<p><u>"52% preferred 0-200 houses and a further 35% preferred less than 500 (or 500 to 200)"</u></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					because any reader, including GMCA or a developer ,would believe that you endorse the building of 500 new homes. I did make this point during the earlier informal consultation in March 2019.		
79.	12 13 All			Support / Comment	<p>Overall I support the Plan and its aims and am grateful for the work which has gone into producing it.</p> <p>I fully support the NDP Draft Objectives in particular</p> <p>1)Improving traffic issues within and to/from High Lane and improving air quality around the A6. Serious consideration to reducing traffic through High Lane is well overdue. The mitigation measures implemented when the A6 Marr was opened are insufficient.</p> <p>And</p>	Noted	No change.



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>2) Improvements to Middlewood Station to enable access by car and fully lit walking access by paved footpath</p> <p>3) Preserving the rural character of the village by avoiding any building on green belt land.</p>		

Also amendment to R2 page 47 of Plan requested by Ann Y

1 Please add a number 4 to the list of policy points to state: [Provision of new bridleways and the establishment of a multi user footpath from Windlehurst Road to the Middlewood Way](#)

2 Also on page 47 line 3 of the last paragraph which at the moment states "...and improved to support walking and cycling"

Now becomes

"and improved for walkers, cyclists, horses and their riders"