

## Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting 62

Meeting Held on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> January 2018 at 19.30 hrs

Village Hall, Norley Road, Cuddington

**Present:** David Jackson, Tim Vincent, Mike Jeal, Alan Latham, Colin Coles, Andy Benson, John Kerrigan

**Apologies:** Juliette McDonald, Val Godfrey, Hilary Knowles and Eileen Kerrigan

### 315 Minutes of Previous Meetings & Actions arising

These were reviewed.

### 316 Review of Draft NP

The meeting focussed on reviewing the latest Submission Draft of the NP version 6.

There were a number of minor points raised which will be addressed in the final editing however a number of key points were discussed:

Emma had been contacted for some guidance regarding the need to change any Local Plan Part 1 references to the appropriate reference in Part 2, now out for consultation. She had advised that we leave the references to Local Plan part 1 as they are:

“As you are planning to submit shortly, the adopted plans are the Local Plan (Part One) and the retained Vale Royal policies, therefore the link should remain to these. We would expect this to change when the Local Plan (Part Two) is adopted (i.e. around Feb 2019). If you did reference any draft part two policies from the preferred approach, these will need to be updated to reflect the new policy and made clear that it is the Local Plan (Part Two) Publication Draft.”

### 316 Local Plan Part 2

The meeting reviewed the potential impact of the Local Plan Part 2 on our NP.

All the documents discussed in the meeting are listed below:

Local Plan Publication Draft

[Local Plan \(Part Two\) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies](#)

Local Landscape Policy Review Part 1 and Part 2

[Local Landscape Policy Review Part 1 \(January 2016\)](#)[Local Landscape Policy Review Part 2 - Key Settlement Gaps \(February 2016\)](#)

SG team notes on the Part 2 Draft publication.

An input for the planned meeting with the Parish Council was reviewed and discussed and it was agreed that this would be sent to members of the Parish Council ahead of the meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> January. The briefing Note is attached to these minutes

### Review of actions Agreed

The actions agreed in the meeting were reviewed.

**The meeting closed at 9.00 pm**

Meeting with Cuddington Parish Council  
Meeting Held on Monday 15<sup>th</sup> January 2018 at 19.30 hrs

Village Hall, Norley Road, Cuddington

At the meeting with the PC, the proposed response to the CWaC Local Plan Part 2 was discussed and it was agreed that this would be input to the consultation process via the Parish Clerk's office.

The Agreed Input is below:

### **Cuddington Parish Council- Response to the Local Plan Part 2 Consultation**

Cuddington Parish Council (CPC) is pleased to note the information presented in the Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies document providing further detailed policies in support of the strategic objectives and policies set out in the Local Plan (Part One), and demonstrating the Council's commitment to produce a comprehensive planning framework for sustainable development in the borough.

#### **Local Plan Part 2: Section 6 Rural Area**

##### **R1 Development in the Rural Area**

*"In line with Local Plan (Part One) policy STRAT 8, development proposals in the rural area will be supported in key service centres and local service centres (identified settlements) where they meet the relevant policy criteria.*

*Neighbourhood plans or Neighbourhood Development Orders can promote more development than that set out in the Local Plan (Part One) to meet local housing, economic and social needs where appropriate. Policies dealing with design of development will be a key consideration in determining the acceptability of proposals.*

##### **Key Service Centres**

*Within a key service centre settlement boundary, as identified on the policies map, development proposals that are in line with the development plan for the settlement, and are consistent with Local Plan (Part One) policy STRAT 8 will be supported."*

Cuddington Parish includes the key Service Centre of Cuddington and Sandiway and CPC recognises and welcomes the approach **R1 Development in the Rural Area** which is reflected in our Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

The Cuddington Neighbourhood Plan is consistent with the Local Plan statement at 6.6

in that:

*"an appropriate level of new development will be brought forward to support new homes, economic and social development"*

#### **Local Plan Part 2: Section 7 Green Belt and Countryside.**

CPC welcomes the approach to managing development in **Section 7.**

Approximately 70% of Cuddington Parish is washed over by Green Belt with the rest being Open Countryside. The parish has been an area of significant development over the past 15 years growing by

almost 20% in that time. Whilst some of the development has been on previously developed land (Eden Grange and the Grange estate), substantial development has occurred on agricultural land in open countryside (Forest Edge development).

CPC welcomes the fact that **Local Plan Part 2 Section 7** refers to Policy **STRAT 9** of the Local Plan (Part One) and acknowledges that:

*“the rural area of the borough and the high quality of its landscape is a key asset and is highly valued by residents. The diversity of landscapes, including a range of hard and soft landscape characteristics such as open fields and pastures, woodland or farmed land as well as built form and features, contribute to the intrinsic character and distinctiveness of the borough’s countryside. The policies in this section provide criteria for development proposals relating to existing commercial sites located within the Green Belt and the approach to be taken in protecting the landscape and key settlement gaps.”*

Section 7 goes on to deal with protection of the landscape.

**GBC 2 Protection of Landscape** refers to 8 Areas of Special County Value (ASCV), which are designated for their special landscape character and scenic value.

**GBC 3 Key Settlement Gaps** identifies 5 specific areas in the borough, which are designated as key settlement gaps, which are outside the Green Belt, and are afforded protection from inappropriate development.

*“Areas between the following settlements, as identified on the policies map, are designated as key settlement gaps:*

*A. Lostock Gralam and Northwich*

*B. Leftwich and Rudheath (Dane Valley)*

*C. Davenham and Leftwich*

*D. Davenham Village and Leftwich Grange (Kingsmead)*

*E. Davenham and Moulton*

*Within a key settlement gap, development will only be supported where it does not harm the settlement separation and identity functions of the gap and meets the requirements of Local Plan (Part One) policies STRAT 5 and ENV 2. Development within key settlement gaps will be supported where:*

- 1. it would not lead to coalescence of the settlements;*
- 2. it would not result in a significant increase in intervisibility between settlement edges, either by the extension of development or the loss of screening features such as woodland;*
- 3. it would not harm the undeveloped character or perception of openness of the key settlement gap, including through individual or cumulative impacts of isolated small developments; and*
- 4. it would not serve to materially alter historic form of the settlements such as its relationship to topographical features, open spaces, roads or important buildings.”*

**In paragraph 7.30**, among others, the Plan goes on to explain some of the reasons for designating areas as key settlement gaps:

*“Key settlement gaps are important for maintaining the distinct and/or remaining separation between settlements, and in doing so, help to define settlement identity, character, sense of place or historic settlement form. The network of key settlement gaps contributes towards protecting landscape*

*character and distinctiveness. The policy seeks to ensure that development within key settlement gaps is only appropriate where the settlement separation and identity functions of the gap are fully considered and conserved. Assessment of harm to the separation and identity functions of a key settlement gap should be informed by the details and justification for each designation set out in the Local Landscape Designation Review” – Advisory Position Paper.” (LLD Review)*

In the Vale Royal Borough Council Supplementary Planning Guidance - VRBC SPG5 (1998) around 20 areas were identified as Areas of Significant Local Environmental Value (ASLEV's), 13 of which protected important open land between settlements. This developed into policy VRBC NE12, (2006) which has never been replaced and therefore ASLEVs remain part of the existing development plan. It was recognised back in 1998 that:

*“ certain areas (in the countryside) are under particular pressure from urban development especially between existing settlements, and their value to the local population may be lost.*

*To maintain the identity and integrity of the settlements in the Borough it is important that the “green gaps” are maintained between them” - VRBC SPG5 (1998)*

The Local Plan Part 2 is proposing to no longer recognise ASLEVs. The LLD Review has recommended that 6 ASLEVs, which are in the Green Belt, should rely on the fact that they will be adequately protected by their Green Belt designation, and therefore will not be included in the list of Candidate Key Settlement Gaps (CKSGs). Three of these are in the Cuddington Parish Neighbourhood Area. In addition none of the newly designated CKSGs apply to our Neighbourhood Area.

Given the continuing pressure to develop land between the settlements of:

Hartford and Cuddington,

Weaverham and Cuddington

Cuddington and Whitegate & Marton

Cuddington and Oakmere

CPC is concerned that the proposals in the Local Plan Part 2 will significantly weaken the protection we have enjoyed in the existing development plan, in that:

- we will lose the protection hitherto provided by ASLEVs.
- there will be no new protection by way of the CKSGs that are being proposed in the publication draft Plan.

Additionally, we believe that an opportunity has been missed to possibly add to the original list of areas covered in VRBC NE12. In particular part of that area of Cuddington Parish south of the A556, which is not in the Green Belt, should be afforded the protection of being designated as a Key Settlement Gap. We believe that this area meets sufficient of the Primary and Secondary KSG Functionality criteria to be considered.

## **Section 8: Transport and Accessibility**

CPC welcomes the inclusion of Cuddington Railway station in **T3 Railway Stations**.

CPC is fully supportive of the proposals in **T5 Parking and Access** and would additionally like to see specific comments in the policy on the management of traffic around schools at pupil arrival and departure times.

## **Section 9: Minerals Supply and Safeguarding**

**In Paragraph 9.20:** CPC notes the proposal to extend Forest Hill quarry and would seek some reassurance that the access for traffic to the quarry is fully assessed for the potential impact on the local road network. Safety on the local roads has been a significant issue among comments in recent Parish surveys.

Additionally, given the scale of these operations, CPC feels that community engagement should be sought on the plans for the after use of these sites at the planning consent stage.

## **Section 10: Development Management**

CPC welcomes the general approach to Development and our Draft Neighbourhood Plan aligns strongly with this approach.

**Paragraph 10.10:** This is a welcome explanation specifying standards for improving space allocation in new development but we would prefer to see that the better standard is not diluted by “...other considerations including separation distances in the immediate surroundings.....,”

### **DM4- Sustainable Construction**

“Non-domestic buildings will be expected to achieve a BREEAM rating of 'Excellent', unless it can be demonstrated that this is not technically or financially viable.”

CPC feels that this statement may provide developers with a very low threshold in terms of achieving standards – what will be considered the minimum requirement?

**Paragraph 10.24:** CPC has had recent experience of significant nuisance and some damage as a result of vibration during construction work. We feel that the reduction of the adverse impacts of vibration should be specifically referred to in this explanatory section.

## **Section 11 Economic Growth Enterprise and Town Centres**

CPC welcomes the general approach to Economic Growth Enterprise and our Draft Neighbourhood Plan aligns strongly with this approach.

## **Section 12 Housing**

CPC welcomes the general approach to Housing and our Draft Neighbourhood Plan aligns strongly with this approach.

With regard to the explanatory note 12.20, CPC has some concerns:

**Paragraph 12.20** *“The Council will work with developers to agree on the most appropriate mix and type and it may not always be possible to provide a range of dwellings across all sites. The most up to date evidence of need at borough and local level should be fully taken into account. The Council recognizes that the most appropriate housing mix and the application of higher optional design standard may not always be achievable and account will be taken of any negative impacts on the viability of a scheme and local design considerations when determining the most suitable mix and type. The application of the higher optional standard may also contribute towards meeting the requirements of an ageing population in relation to major developments. Whole plan viability testing has identified that in some areas of the borough, particularly on brownfield sites, development requirements including affordable housing delivery, may be harder to secure. The Council will work with developers to ensure that viable schemes can come forward and deliver housing that best suits the need of the local area.”*

We are concerned that this paragraph could be used to circumvent a number of the policies in the Local Plan on the grounds that schemes are declared by developers as not economically viable when they actually are just a bit more costly than the developer would like them to be.

CPC feels that guidance on making these judgments should be in the public domain and the judgment process should include consultation with those existing residents who will be affected by the development.

### DM 26 Specialist accommodation

**Paragraph 12.54** “...*To ensure that the appropriate level of support is available and accessible to the elderly and vulnerable groups in the community, developments must have regard to the proximity of existing communities and facilities to ensure they are accessible by foot as well as public transport where appropriate.*”

CPC feels that specific reference could also be made to the mobility aids that people who require specialist accommodation are likely to need. Space should also be allocated to allow pick up and put down from taxis, local buses, etc.

### Section 14 Open Space, Sport and Recreation

CPC welcomes the general approach to Open Space, Sport and Recreation and our Draft Neighbourhood Plan aligns strongly with this approach.

Our Green Space nominations, and Travel and Movement policies are in line with **DM35- Open space and new development** and **DM37- Recreational Routeways**

CPC also welcomes the inclusion of Whitegate Way in **DM37- Recreational Routeways, para 14.28** as a “*strategic recreational routeway*”.

### 317 NEXT SG MEETING:

**Monday 22nd January 2018 at 7.30 pm.**

### Summary of Actions

Action	By whom	Due Date
Ensure that Glossary has definitions for Development and first reference to a defined term in the draft NP is asterisked.	John & Eileen	For Reg 15 submission
Check policies for consistency eg Policy 7 and Policy 13 v STRAT9	All	Complete
Consider whether an aspiration could be drafted on specific traffic issues (Comments made in the PC meeting)	David	Ongoing
Contact landowners regarding Green Space nominations	John & Eileen	asap
Produce a revised Views and Vistas Map and appendix	David	Ongoing
Prepare a project completion report	Juliette	End December
Forward Local Plan Part 2 details to the team	Eileen	Complete
Inform PC that the NP team will be providing an input on the Local Plan part 2 consultation for discussion at the PC meeting 15 <sup>th</sup> January	Eileen/Tim	Complete