

Cheshire East Local Plan

Report of Consultation: Brooks Lane (Middlewich) Draft Development Framework (Masterplan)

November 2019

Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Consultation documents	2
3. Document availability.....	2
4. Publicity and engagement	3
Consultation notifications.....	3
Other publicity.....	3
Consultation 'drop-in' session.....	4
5. Submitting comments	4
6. Representations received	5
Appendix 1: Notification letter and email	6
Appendix 2: Screen shot from the council website	9
Appendix 3: Press releases.....	10
Appendix 4: Consultation response forms.....	12
Appendix 5: Summary of key issues and responses.....	15

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Brooks Lane site is identified as a strategic location in the Council's Local Plan Strategy (adopted July 2017) as site reference 'LPS 43'. The Local Plan Strategy ('LPS') requires that future re-development of the site will be supported by a masterplan led approach that will help determine the nature and quantum of development that is appropriate for the site.
- 1.2 Consultants Barton Willmore, on behalf of the Council, prepared a draft framework to support the future development of the site. The development framework was prepared as a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and intended to provide over-arching guidance for the future development of the site.
- 1.3 The Brooks Lane (Middlewich) draft Development Framework (masterplan) SPD was published for consultation between 14 January and 25 February 2019.
- 1.4 This report of consultation sets out the details of the consultation exercise on the draft development framework held in January / February 2019. This consultation was preceded by a number of engagement events held in April and August 2018 with landowners, business and residents on the site which helped inform the draft document. The outcomes of those consultation events have been documented already in the draft Development Framework which was consulted upon in January / February 2019.

2. Consultation documents

- 2.1 Comments were invited on the Brooks Lane (Middlewich) draft Development Framework (masterplan) SPD. A Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Assessment were also included as an appendix and comments could be made on both documents.

3. Document availability

- 3.1 Electronic copies of the consultation documents were available on the council's consultation portal which could be accessed via the council's website.
- 3.2 Printed copies of the consultation document were available for inspection at the council's principal offices at Westfields, Middlewich Road, Sandbach CW11 1HZ.
- 3.3 Printed copies of the consultation document were also available for inspection at:
 - Crewe Customer Service Centre, Delamere House, Delamere Street, Crewe CW1 2JZ;

- Macclesfield Customer Service Centre, Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA;
- Middlewich Library, Lewin Street, Middlewich, CW10 9AS

4. Publicity and engagement

Consultation notifications

- 4.1 Notification of the consultation was sent to all active stakeholders on the council's local plan consultation database. This consisted of 132 printed letters sent on 10 January and 2,413 emails sent on 10 January 2019. The stakeholders on the consultation database include residents of Cheshire East, landowners and developers, as well as planning consultants, businesses and organisations.
- 4.2 Copies of the notification email and letter are included in Appendix 1.
- 4.3 Separate email letters were also sent to Natural England, Historic England, the Environment Agency and Natural Resources Wales as statutory consultees.
- 4.4 In addition, 160 letters were sent to landowners, businesses, organisations and residents within the Brooks Lane site.
- 4.5 Town and parish councils adjoining Cheshire East in neighbouring authorities are included in the local plan consultation database and received the notification letter / email as detailed in paragraph 4.2.

Other publicity

- 4.6 A number of pages on the Cheshire East Council website provided information and links to the consultation. These pages included:
- The homepage (in the 'have your say' section): www.cheshireeast.gov.uk
 - The Cheshire East Local Plan page: www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan
 - The Local Plan consultations page: www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/planning/spatial_planning/cheshire_east_local_plan/local_plan_consultations
- 4.7 A press release was issued; informing people of the consultation (Consultation on Middlewich Marina Scheme). A copy of the press release is included in Appendix 2.
- 4.8 A number of articles related to the consultation were published, including:
- Middlewich Brooks Lane Masterplan Unveiled & Council Asks Middlewich Residents for thoughts on Masterplan (Winsford Guardian, 16 December 2018 & 8 January 2019)
 - Marina, Homes and Train Station form part of Middlewich Masterplan (Cheshire Live, 17 December 2018)

- Cheshire East to consult on Middlewich Masterplan (Place North West, 13 December 2018)

Consultation ‘drop-in’ session

- 4.9 Two consultation ‘drop-in’ sessions were held at the Middlewich Community Church on Brooks Lane in Middlewich on Wednesday 23 January 2019 and Monday 28 January 2019 from 5pm-8pm. These ‘drop in events’ were publicised on the council’s website, as well as details being included on the notification letter / emails and the press release. Representatives from Cheshire East Council were available to discuss the draft SPD proposals.
- 4.10 Approximately 40 people attended the sessions, with a variety of comments made, including:
- Concerns over the relationship between employment and future housing proposals included in the draft SPD
 - Concerns over access constraints into and out of the site
 - Concerns the impact of any future proposals on infrastructure in Middlewich
 - Concerns over the deliverability of the scheme
- 4.11 These issues have been considered alongside the issues raised through the formal consultation responses in the summary of key issues raised (Appendix 5).

5. Submitting comments

- 5.1 Comments could be submitted in a number of ways:
- Using the online consultation portal, linked from the council’s website;
 - By email to locaplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk; or
 - By post to Strategic Planning (Westfields), C/O Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe CW1 2BJ.
- 5.2 Printed copies of consultation response forms were available for people to take away from the council’s offices at Westfields, Sandbach and the locations listed in paragraph 3.3. The response form is shown in Appendix 4.
- 5.3 Information on how to submit comments was included on the consultation portal; in the foreword of the printed and PDF versions of the draft SPD; and on the printed comments form.

6. Representations received

- 6.1 In total, 28 comments were received from 25 parties. These comments can be viewed on the consultation portal at <https://cheshireeast-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/planning/spd/brookslane?tab=list>
- 6.2 The comments received covered a wide range of topics and issues. However the key matters brought out during the consultation can be summarised as follows:
- Provision of infrastructure on the site and phasing
 - Improvements to highways, access into and parking arrangements on the site
 - Support for the provision of a train station
 - Concern over relationship of new housing with existing retained employment uses on the site
 - Responses from statutory bodies and infrastructure providers
 - Relationship and status of the development framework and its links to the adopted Local Plan Strategy.
- 6.3 A full summary of the key issues raised alongside the council's response and how the SPD has been amended as a result is set out in Appendix 5.

Appendix 1: Notification letter and email



Working for a *brighter future* together

address

Planning & Environment
Westfields
c/o Municipal Buildings, Earl Street,
Crewe, CW1 2BJ
01270 685893
localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk
www.cheshireeast.gov.uk

DATE: 10/01/2019 OUR REF: BLDF

Brooks Lane (Middlewich) Draft Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document Consultation

You have received this letter as you have previously responded to a Local Plan consultation or you have been asked to be kept informed of future Local Plan consultations.

Following the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, the Council has been preparing a number of additional planning policy documents to provide further guidance. The Brooks Lane (Middlewich) draft Development Framework (Masterplan) Supplementary Planning Document ("SPD") has been prepared to provide further guidance about a site allocated for redevelopment in the Local Plan Strategy - Brooks Lane (Middlewich) strategic location (LPS 43). The draft development framework has been prepared by consultants, Barton Willmore, on behalf of the council. The council is now seeking views on the document prior to it being finalised and adopted as a SPD. As a SPD, its guidance would need to be taken into account in deciding relevant planning applications affecting the site.

Consultation on the draft Brooks Lane (Middlewich) Development Framework is taking place between the 14 January and 5pm on the 25 February 2019. The document will be available to view on line at www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan, at Middlewich Library and at the following Council Offices during their normal opening hours:

- Delamere House, Delamere Street, Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 2JZ;
- Macclesfield Town Hall, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK10 1EA; and
- Westfields, Middlewich Road, Sandbach, CW11 1HZ

Comments forms are available at the above locations. We would encourage you to respond using the consultation portal on our website. Alternatively you can e-mail your views to localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk or send them by post to Spatial Planning (Westfields) C/O Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe, CW12BJ.

OFFICIAL

All other enquiries 0300 123 5500

www.cheshireeast.gov.uk

Two public consultation drop-in events are also being held at Middlewich Community Church, Brooks Lane, on:

**Wednesday 23 January (5pm – 8pm); and
Monday 28 January (5pm – 8pm)**

Council staff will be on hand at each event to explain the proposals and answer any questions.

Please note that the deadline for the receipt of comments is 5pm on the 25 February 2019.

Your personal data will be processed in line with our privacy notice and your name and comments will be published and made available to view on the consultation portal. Further information can be obtained from the Council's website or by contacting the Spatial Planning team using the details at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J Owens', is written over a light grey rectangular background.

**Jeremy Owens
Development Planning Manager**

OFFICIAL

From: LOCAL PLAN
To: LOCAL PLAN
Cc:
Subject: [OFFICIAL] CEC Consultation on Brooks Lane Draft Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document - 14 Jan - 25 Feb 2019

Sent: Thu 10/01/2019 14:07

You have received this e mail as you have previously responded to a Local Plan consultation or you have been asked to be kept informed of future Local Plan consultations.

Following the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, the Council has been preparing a number of additional planning policy documents to provide further guidance. The Brooks Lane (Middlewich) draft Development Framework (Masterplan) Supplementary Planning Document ("SPD") has been prepared to provide further guidance about a site allocated for redevelopment in the Local Plan Strategy - Brooks Lane (Middlewich) strategic location (LPS 43). The draft development framework has been prepared by consultants, Barton Willmore, on behalf of the council. The council is now seeking views on the document prior to it being finalised and adopted as a SPD. As a SPD, its guidance would need to be taken into account in deciding relevant planning applications affecting the site.

Consultation on the draft Brooks Lane (Middlewich) Development Framework is taking place between the 14 January and 5pm on the 25 February 2019. The document will be available to view on line at www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan, at Middlewich Library and at the following Council Offices during their normal opening hours:

- Delamere House, Delamere Street, Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 2JZ;
- Macclesfield Town Hall, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK10 1EA; and
- Westfields, Middlewich Road, Sandbach, CW11 1HZ

Comments forms are available at the above locations. We would encourage you to respond using the consultation portal on our website. Alternatively, you can e-mail your views to localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk or send them by post to Spatial Planning (Westfields) C/O Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe, CW1 2BJ.

Two public consultation drop-in events are also being held at Middlewich Community Church, Brooks Lane, CW10 0JQ on:

- Wednesday 23 January (5pm – 8pm); and
- Monday 28 January (5pm – 8pm)


Council staff will be on hand at each event to explain the proposals and answer any questions.

Please note that the deadline for the receipt of comments is 5pm on the 25 February 2019.

Your personal data will be processed in line with our privacy notice and your name and comments will be published and made available to view on the consultation portal. Further information can be obtained from the Council's website or by contacting the Spatial Planning team on 01270 685893 or by e mailing localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk

Jeremy Owens,
Development Plans Manager
Spatial Planning Team
Westfields, Middlewich Road, Sandbach, CW11 1HZ

Appendix 2: Screen shot from the council website


A to Z site index

🔍 Search

[Home](#) / [Planning](#) / [Spatial Planning](#) / Cheshire East Local Plan

Cheshire East Local Plan

The Local Plan sets planning policies and allocates sites for development. It is part of the statutory development plan for Cheshire East and is the basis for deciding planning applications. The Local Plan covers a range of matters including the number and location of new homes; the amount and location of employment land; protection and improvement of important open areas; provision of new infrastructure; and improvement of town centres and community facilities in the borough.

Our [Spatial Planning Update](#) provides a regular bulletin on planning policy matters affecting Cheshire East.


Consultations

- Consultation on the [Crewe Station Hub Area Action Plan](#) Development Strategy is underway until 26 March 2019.
- Consultation on the draft Brooks Lane Masterplan (Middlewich) Supplementary Planning Document will start on Monday 14 January and run until 5pm on 25 February 2019. [Further details and the consultation documents](#) can be viewed on our consultation portal.

Key Local Plan documents

The Local Plan consists of a number of key documents which form part of the statutory development plan:

Document	Status	Description
Local Plan Strategy	Adopted 27 July 2017	The LPS is the centrepiece of the Local Plan, setting out strategic priorities for the development of the area along with planning policies and proposals. It is accompanied by an interactive policies map, which shows sites, policies and environmental / heritage designations.



In this section

- [Local Plan Strategy Development Plan Document](#) >
- [Area Action Plan for Crewe](#) >
- [Authority Monitoring Report](#) >
- [Cheshire East Local Plan](#)
- [Local Development Scheme](#) >
- [Local Plan Consultation Portal](#) >
- [Local Plan Consultations](#) >
- [Site Allocations and Development Policies Document](#) >
- [Statement of Community Involvement](#) >
- [Supplementary Planning Documents](#) >

Contact us

Local Plan matters only

[Email Local Plan Team](#)

01270 685893

Appendix 3: Press releases

[Home](#) / [Council and Democracy](#) / [Council Information](#) / [Media Hub](#) / [Media releases](#) / 8/1/2019 - Consultation on Middlewich marina scheme



Council unveils exciting proposals for new rail link, homes and marina

8 January 2019

Cheshire East Council is set to unveil proposals for an exciting redevelopment incorporating new homes, a marina and railway station – and it wants the public's views on the plans.

Residents, businesses and stakeholders in Middlewich are to be asked to comment on the proposed Brooks Lane development framework – a 23-hectare site where 200 new homes could be built, together with a marina on the Trent and Mersey Canal, which runs through the town.

The draft framework also includes an impression of how a new railway station for Middlewich could enhance the whole scheme. This envisages the re-opening of the Sandbach-Middlewich-Northwich line for passenger services, something many local people have called for to coincide with the arrival of HS2 at Crewe.

And a plan to set the old brine works within an accessible public space is also included within the framework. The Murgatroyd's Brine Works is a scheduled ancient monument containing a late 19th Century 'wild' brine pumping plant with an original brine shaft, pump house, gantry, power house and other rare features.

The council first opened business, landowners and residents on the site – together with the town of Middlewich – to a public consultation.

The council first engaged businesses, landowners and residents on the site – together with the informal views of town council members – and those views have helped planners to shape the draft Brooks Lane development framework.

The Brooks Lane site is allocated as a 'strategic location' in the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy and is one of a number of sites earmarked for new homes and employment, alongside a proposed Middlewich Eastern Bypass, currently subject to planning approval.

A six-week public consultation will be launched from Monday (14 January), closing at 5pm on 25 February. The draft development framework will be available for public viewing and two drop-in events will be held at Middlewich Community Church, Brooks Lane, on:

Wednesday 23 January (5pm–8pm);

and Monday 28 January (5pm–8pm).

Council staff will be on hand at each event to explain the proposals and answer any questions.

Councillor Ainsley Arnold, Cheshire East Council cabinet member for housing, planning and regeneration, said: "I would encourage everyone to engage with this consultation to help shape the final planning guidance for this important site.

"The Trent and Mersey Canal is an important, historic and environmental asset in the town and we would like to see it enhanced through new investment. Canals and waterways have been the catalyst for positive change in so many towns and we would like Middlewich to similarly benefit in this way.

"As part of the local enterprise partnership, Cheshire East Council is also developing an outline business case for the transport minister to bring back rail passenger services to the town. The draft development framework supports that ambition by showing how a station could potentially be provided."



Green open spaces, pedestrian and cycle ways also feature in the proposed scheme and a key element of the plan is the offer of waterside living, which has become so popular in many towns and cities across the country.

Following the consultation and consideration of the feedback, the council intends to adopt the development framework as 'supplementary planning guidance' and, as such, it would be obliged to consider the guidance in making decisions on relevant planning applications affecting the site.

The draft development framework will be available to view at the council's Sandbach head office and at Middlewich Library. [It can also be viewed via the council's website from Monday.](#)

Further information can also be obtained by contacting the council's spatial planning team on 01270 685893.

Appendix 4: Consultation response forms



Cheshire East Local Plan Brooks Lane Draft Development Framework (Masterplan) Supplementary Planning Document - Comments Form

Following the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, a draft development framework (masterplan) Supplementary Planning Document ('SPD') has been prepared to support the delivery of strategic location (LPS 43) at Brooks Lane, Middlewich. Consultation on the draft development framework (masterplan) SPD will take place between Monday 14 January and 5pm on Monday 25 February 2019. The consultation documents can be viewed online at www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan and at:

- Westfields, Middlewich Road, Sandbach CW11 1HZ;
- Crewe Customer Service Centre, Delamere House, Delamere Street, Crewe CW1 2JZ;
- Macclesfield Customer Service Centre, Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA; and
- Middlewich Library, Lewin Street, Middlewich, CW10 9AS

The draft SPD is linked to the Local Plan Strategy, which identified that the precise quantum and nature of new development at Brooks Lane will be determined through a masterplan led approach. A draft development framework has been prepared by consultants Barton Willmore, on behalf of the Council, to inform the preparation of development proposals for the site, setting out key matters that proposals should address in order to achieve high quality new development that will significantly enhance the area and benefit the town as a whole.

A screening exercise has been carried out to determine whether the draft document gives rise to the need for further Sustainability Appraisal or Appropriate Assessment (under the Habitats Regulations), or whether those matters have been adequately addressed through the Local Plan process. This screening concludes that further such assessment is not necessary and is also available for consultation, alongside the draft development framework.

A number of consultation 'drop in' events are being held at the Middlewich Community Church, Brooks Lane, Middlewich on the following day / times:

- Wednesday 23 January 2019 – 5pm – 8pm
- Monday 28 January 2019 – 5pm – 8pm

Submit your views

The council's online consultation portal is our preferred method of submitting responses, but you can also respond by email or in writing using this comments form. You can also contact us:--

Online: Via the consultation portal at www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan

By e-mail: To localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk

By post: Spatial Planning (Westfields), C/O Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe CW1 2BJ

Please make sure that your comments reach us by **Monday 25 February 2019**. We are not able to accept anonymous comments and you must provide us with your name and contact details. Your personal data will be processed in line with our Spatial Planning Privacy Notice, which is available on the council's website. Your name and comments will be published and made available to view on the consultation portal.

Cheshire East Local Plan

Brooks Lane Draft Development Framework(masterplan)

Supplementary Planning Document - Comments Form



Please return to: Spatial Planning (Westfields)
C/O Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe CW1 2BJ or by email to
localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk

Please return by: Monday 25 February 2019

This comment form has two parts:

- Part A – Personal details.
- Part B – Your representation(s).

Comments Form Part A: Personal Details

	Personal Details*	Agent's Details (if applicable)
	<i>* If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation in column 1 but complete the full contact details of the agent in column 2.</i>	
Title	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
First Name	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Last Name	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Job Title <small>(where relevant)</small>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Organisation <small>(where relevant)</small>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Address Line 1	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Address Line 2	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Address Line 3	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Address Line 4	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Postcode	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Telephone Number	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Email Address <small>(where relevant)</small>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Your Reference No. <small>(if known)</small>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>

Please complete a separate Part B form for each comment that you would like to make. This response form provides enough space for four comments but please copy and attach further part B forms if required.

For further assistance in making comments please contact the Spatial Planning Team at localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk or by telephone on 01270 685893.

Comment Form Part B: Brooks Lane Draft SPD Comment Form

Name and
Organisation:

Office Use Only:

PID:

RID:

Q1. Which section of the document are you commenting on?

Page / Chapter / Paragraph / Figure

(please delete as appropriate and state which): _____

Q2. What is your overall view on this section? (please tick one box)

Support

Object

Comment only

Q3. Please set out your comments or views on this section:

Appendix 5: Summary of key issues and responses

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
BLMP2 – Geoffrey Williams	<p>1) The comment expressed concerns regarding the traffic impacts of the masterplan proposals including highways and access arrangements into the site.</p> <p>2) More homes in Middlewich is putting local infrastructure (doctor's / school places) under pressure.</p>	<p>1) The development framework identifies the potential for highway improvements to the Brooks Lane Canal Bridge & at the junction of Brooks Lane and Kinderton Street. Point E of the site specific principles of development for the strategic location (LPS 43) makes reference to contributions towards highways improvements.</p> <p>2) The Local Plan Strategy (“LPS”) in establishing the Brooks Lane site as a strategic location (LPS 43) considered infrastructure provision through the preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which supports the LPS. Policy wording contained in the site principles for LPS 43, (which the Brooks Lane Development Framework seeks to supplement), includes requests for contributions towards, education, health and highways infrastructure. The need for contributions from developments will be considered on a case by case basis when planning application(s) are submitted on the site.</p>	No change proposed
BLMP3 – The Coal Authority	<p>1) No specific comments on the masterplan.</p>	<p>1) Noted.</p>	No change proposed

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
BLMP 4 - South Cheshire Clinical Commissioning Group ("CCG")	1) Request for contributions to Oaklands Medical Practice and Water's Edge Medical Centre. Additional information submitted regarding the ability of the CCG to continue to provide the expected level of Primary Care services in Middlesbrough. This includes the view that Oaklands Medical Practice and Water's Edge Medical Centre are working at capacity currently for additional patients and steps are being considered in response to ensure a continued level of service at both practices. Estimated level of contributions that would be requested for a proposal for 200 homes and proposal for 450 homes provided.	1) Noted. LPS 43 (Brooks Lane, Middlesbrough) includes reference to contributions towards health infrastructure (point F of the site specific principles of development). The type and level of contributions sought will be considered in response to planning applications as and when they come forward on the site.	No change proposed
BLMP 5 - Worsley Plant Limited	1) Worsley Plant Limited have just recently constructed a new unit on their site and have no intention of moving.	1) Noted – the location of Worsley Plant Limited is within the area expected in the development framework to be retained for employment related uses.	No change proposed
BLMP 6 - Rainbow Day Nursery	1) Please amend to show the day nursery (Rainbow Day Nursery) area as retained on the illustrative masterplan	1) Noted and change proposed	Rainbow Day nursery - shown as retained on the revised version of the masterplan framework (figure 18)
BLMP 8 - David Roberts	1) Support for the re-use of a brownfield site 2) Development needs to modernistic,	1) Noted 2) Noted, the development framework includes clear recommendations on matters including	No change proposed

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>address diverse residential requirements and house types, use building designs/structures which are energy efficient, fulfil leisure and recreational requirements, appealing/pleasant to the eye, environmentally friendly and future proof (in terms of house/building design) and provide appropriate landscaping and parking.</p> <p>3) Key requirement of the masterplan is the integration with the current town centre (pedestrianised walkway)</p> <p>4) Landscaped areas should be provided with appropriate planting</p> <p>5) Support for train station</p> <p>6) Adequate car parking should be provided for. Bowling green could be enhanced to include modern facilities</p> <p>7) Review traffic volumes before development starts</p> <p>8) Concerns regarding the infrastructure</p>	<p>layout and appearance. The draft development framework tested a number of options for delivery across the site. The development framework includes a number of character areas, with example layouts shown.</p> <p>3) The access plan in figure 20 of the revised development framework shows the potential for enhanced connections into Middlewich Town Centre from the site.</p> <p>4) Noted. The masterplan includes references to the importance of a landscape framework and includes a green infrastructure framework for the site (figure 21).</p> <p>5) Noted</p> <p>6) The revised masterplan framework included in the document (figure 18) identifies that the Community Church is retained for commercial / community use.</p> <p>7) The SPD should be read alongside existing provisions contained within the LPS. Policy CO 4 (Travel Plans and Transport Assessments) of the LPS requires all major</p>	

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	requirements generated from future development on the site.	<p>developments likely to generate significant additional journeys to be accompanied by a transport assessment, and where appropriate a Travel Plan.</p> <p>8) The Local Plan Strategy (LPS) when it established the Brooks Lane site as a strategic location (LPS 43) considered matters in relation to infrastructure through the preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Policy wording contained in the site principles for LPS 43 (which the Brooks Lane Development Framework seeks to supplement), includes requests for contributions towards, education, health and highways infrastructure. This will be considered on a case by case basis for planning application(s) submitted on the site</p>	
BLMP 9 - National Grid	1) An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's intermediate and High-Pressure apparatus. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the area.	1) Noted	No change proposed
BLMP 17 - Canal and	1) Introduction – Vision in para 1.3 should be expanded to reflect potential for new	<p>1) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>2) Noted</p>	1) Reference to Marina added to the overall

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
Rivers Trust	<p>canal marina</p> <p>2) Para 2.1.2 – welcome reference to importance of Canal</p> <p>3) Para 2.2.3 – welcome reference to sustainable transport modes</p> <p>4) Para 2.2.4 – role that the canal plays in acting as a wildlife corridor should be referenced here. Any enhancements to canal habitats would improve the functionality of the wildlife corridor</p> <p>5) Para 2.4.1 – reference should be made to existing boating businesses – Kings Lock Chandlery and others add to character of the canal</p> <p>6) Page 23 – document includes a photograph of the Middlewich Wharf outside of the masterplan area</p> <p>7) Para 2.4.2 – welcome inclusion of canal towpath in figure 16. Supporting text should be included to make reference to the canal towpath as a sustainable transport route</p> <p>8) Para 2.4.3 – the proposed green infrastructure should seek to connect to the canal, where possible, to enhance functionality of the corridor</p> <p>9) Para 2.4.4 – welcome acknowledgment of the listed heritage assets of the canal. May be worth adding reference to the canal as a designated conservation area (although noted that depicted in figure 20).</p>	<p>3) Noted</p> <p>4) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>5) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>6) Noted, the photographs are illustrations of Brooks Lane and its immediate surrounds.</p> <p>7) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>8) This section is a contextual analysis of the existing site and so no change proposed to this section of the document.</p> <p>9) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>10) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>11) Noted and change(s) proposed</p> <p>12) Para 6.11 (5.11 in the revised SPD) relates to specific recommendations that are identified on the Plan. Section 6.1.4 (5.1.4 in the revised SPD) supports green& blue infrastructure across the site</p> <p>13) Figure 29 (figure 18 in the revised SPD) relates to the core elements set out in para 6.11 (section 5.11 in the revised SPD). It does not include every element of the site.</p> <p>14) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>15) The imposition of weight restrictions on the Brooks Lane Canal Bridge is outside of the remit of this SPD. Support for references to the potential signalisation of Brooks Lane Canal Bridge is noted. Change proposed in respect of locks 72 and 73.</p> <p>16) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>17) Reference to Canal side park identifies that separation will be required. Additional text added to the drainage section regarding</p>	<p>vision included in the revised SPD (section 1.3)</p> <p>2) No change proposed</p> <p>3) No change proposed</p> <p>4) Reference to the role that the Canal has as a wildlife corridor has been included in section 2.2.4 in the revised SPD.</p> <p>5) Reference to Kings Lock Chandlery added to the example businesses listed in the SPD (section 2.4.1 of the revised SPD)</p> <p>6) No change proposed</p> <p>7) Reference to Canal towpath added to section 2.4.2 of the revised SPD.</p> <p>8) No change proposed</p> <p>9) Reference to the canal as a designated Conservation Area added to section 2.4.4 of the revised SPD.</p> <p>10) Reference to structural integrity of Canal added to para 4.1.1 of the revised</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>10) Para 5.11 – should be expanded to include ‘protection of the structural integrity of the canal both during and post construction’. Any development adjacent or on landholdings of the canal and rivers trust should be in accordance with third party works code of practice.</p> <p>11) Para 5.12 – pedestrian routes should connect to existing bridge crossings. Reference to canal boat marina should note separate consent process from the Trust to make connection to waterway. Should also include reference to – ‘enhancing of green / blue infrastructure across the site’.</p> <p>12) Para 6.11 - should also include reference to – ‘enhancing of green / blue infrastructure across the site’.</p> <p>13) Page 39 – figure 29 should include existing dry dock between locks 72 and 73. This should be shown as being retained</p> <p>14) Para 6.12 – reference to marina should state about separate permission from trust to connect to waterway. Community church location could include a canal car park</p> <p>15) Para 6.13 – reference to improvements to Brooks Lane Canal Bridge – bridge has suffered from parapet strikes and long vehicles being</p>	<p>engagement with Canal and Rivers Trust.</p> <p>18) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>19) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>20) It is considered that the existing description of the character area is sufficient for its purpose.</p> <p>21) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>22) Section 6.2.2 (section 5.3.2 in the revised SPD) refers to urban design principles and canal frontages</p> <p>23) Comments are noted. Existing wording is considered appropriate.</p> <p>24) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>25) Noted and change proposed</p>	<p>SPD</p> <p>11) Reference added to enhancing Green/Blue infrastructure and the role of the Canal and Rivers Trust acknowledged in the document in section 4.1.2 of the revised SPD.</p> <p>12) No change proposed</p> <p>13) No change proposed</p> <p>14) Reference to consent procedure for a Canal Boat Marina added to the masterplan framework (section 5.1.2 of the revised SPD).</p> <p>15) Reference to pedestrian access (section 5.1.3 of the revised SPD) across the two locks on the canal has been amended to refer to appropriate enhancements to ensure user safety in</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>grounded on the bridge. A weight restriction should be applied to potential enhancement works to the junction. Support for introduction of light – controlled junction. Consideration also needs to be given to pedestrian and cycle access to the site. The Kings Lock bridge is Grade II listed – not support increased vehicle movements over the bridge and are not designed for cycle use but could be a pedestrian connection for development with access to the canal towpath and then to the town centre. Should not encourage pedestrian movements over canal lock 72 and 73.</p> <p>16) Para 6.1.4 – green infrastructure – should be titled ‘green / blue infrastructure. Reference should also be made to protection as well as enhancement</p> <p>17) Canal side park – concerns over reference to dry dock – it is a working boat yard and concerns over housing being located so close to industrial uses. Opportunity to celebrate the canal and salt works in this location. Canal may be able to receive surface water and this should be acknowledged. The trust is not a land drainage authority and subject to commercial agreement. Detailed design processes need to consider water</p>		<p>the development framework</p> <p>16) Reference added to blue infrastructure and protection of infrastructure in section 5.1.4 in the revised SPD.</p> <p>17) Additional text added to the drainage section regarding engagement with Canal and Rivers Trust (section 5.1.4 in the revised SPD).</p> <p>18) Reference to consent procedure added alongside reference to the importance of sign posting (section 5.3.2 in the revised SPD).</p> <p>19) Reference to cycling added to section 5.3.3 of the revised SPD.</p> <p>20) No change proposed</p> <p>21) Reference to enhancements to support user safety added to the</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>drainage.</p> <p>18) Para 6.2.2 - consideration needs to be given to the Trust separate consent process. Size and form of marina will need more consideration. Buffer between the marina and residential uses needs to be given consideration and signposting and directions needed at key locations</p> <p>19) Para 6.2.3 - street hierarchy should make reference to bicycles. Primary residential street and shared street examples have little tree planting shown.</p> <p>20) Para 6.2.5. – town centre gateway village – development adj to the Canal should have an active frontage</p> <p>21) Para 6.2.6 – train station village – do not support increased pedestrian and cycle use across of the lock crossings. Noise sensitive development adjacent to the dry dock would need to be considered and appropriate and landscaped buffer provided for.</p> <p>22) Para 6.2.7 – canal side village – active frontage by the canal (similar comments to 6.2.6)</p> <p>23) 6.2.8 – Marina village – welcome reference to boat access – need consent from the Trust. Any fencing would have to be appropriate and a publicly accessible launce site is recommended here with parking for canal uses –</p>		<p>development framework in respect of locks 72 & 73.</p> <p>22) No change proposed</p> <p>23) No change proposed</p> <p>24) Figure 44 deleted to remove inconsistency in the revised SPD.</p> <p>25) References amended to the Canals and Rivers Trust throughout the document</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>reference should also be made to improved boating facilities for other users (as required by the Middlewich NP).</p> <p>24) Para 6.3 and 7 – discrepancy between 6.3 which shows a phase 4 but does not appear on the map on pg 67.</p> <p>25) General – reference to trust should use their full title (Canal and River Trust).</p>		
BLMP 10 - Nikk Smith	1) Document should guarantee that the marina, access improvements, station and Brine pump are all developed either before or alongside residential development.	1) The Brooks Lane (Middlewich) Development Framework SPD provides further guidance on Strategic Location (LPS 43) in the LPS. There is no policy requirement in the LPS for development being brought forward simultaneously on the site. The LPS includes policy IN 1 (infrastructure) and IN2 (Developer contributions) to which any future planning application would be considered. Each application on the site would be considered on its own merits and against the requirements of the LPS, including strategic location policy LPS 43, supplemented by detail included in the Brooks Lane Development Framework SPD (once adopted), as appropriate.	No change proposed
BLMP 18 - Network Rail	1) Confirm that the route of the railway line is currently freight only – 4-5 trains per week. Needs to be an evidence based approach to amending the current	1) The Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership, Cheshire East and Cheshire West and Chester Council's have commissioned initial feasibility work, called	Additional text has been inserted to section 5.1.3 of the revised SPD regarding the need to consider the

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>network. Feasibility work will need to ensure that it feeds into the broader strategy for meeting future demands on the railway.</p> <p>2) There are 5 user worked level crossings and 2 public footpath level crossings in the area. The Council has purchased land in the SPD area from Network Rail and are currently engaging with them regarding the future of 3 level crossings on the back of the Middlewich Eastern Bypass proposal.</p> <p>3) Network Rail consider that the proposals within the SPD area could have an unacceptable risk on level crossings (individually or cumulative). Assessment of the impact on level crossings would need to consider any changes in volume and character of users. SPD should include specific wording that:- -detailed assessments should be carried out on the impact of level crossings prior to development coming forward and where necessary: the level crossings are stopped up (via s257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Closure of the level crossings and any diversionary route(s) must be completed prior to the undertaking of the development proposals or an appropriate level of development / occupation.</p>	<p>the Mid Cheshire and Middlewich Rail Feasibility Study to consider options for the re-opening the Sandbach – Middlewich – Northwich line to passenger services. This document has informed the revised version of the SPD:- http://www.871candwep.co.uk/latest-news/initial-findings-of-the-mid-cheshire-and-middlewich-rail-study-now-available/.</p> <p>2) Noted</p> <p>3) Additional text has been added to the SPD relating to an assessment of impacts on level crossings to support future planning applications on the site.</p>	<p>impact on railway level crossings prior to development coming forward in consultation with Network Rail. The positioning of the railway station in the revised SPD has taken into account the initial feasibility work undertaken and reflected within the Mid Cheshire and Middlewich Rail Feasibility Study.</p>
BLMP 19 -	1) Welcome proposals to regenerate the	1) Noted.	No change proposed.

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
Historic England	<p>site that would improve public access and interpretation of the industrial heritage of the area. There are significant opportunities for sympathetic redevelopment to enhance the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets – historic salt manufacture and its export via the canal and railway infrastructure.</p> <p>2) The Murgatroyd Brine Works is a designated scheduled monument and recently received funding from Historic England’s Heritage at Risk programme for the roof to be replaced and asbestos removal. The work is being overseen by the Middlewich Heritage Trust who has a long-term lease of the site from Cheshire East Council. A second phase of work is due to start in April 2019 to repair the external fabric and to stabilise the brine extraction shaft. There are plans for a third phase of work to improve landscaping around the site and to add interpretation. The Trust would be well placed to help incorporate this into the Development Framework proposals to create new and enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes through the area as part of Green Infrastructure public realm improvements and signage etc. Industrial heritage of the site could tell the story of salt manufacture and could</p>	<p>2) The update on the ongoing work of the Middlewich Heritage Trust relating to the Murgatroyd Brine Pump is noted and welcomed. Section 5.1.2 of the revised SPD makes reference to the Brine Works and notes how the pump should be restored with enhanced public access (including the potential provision of a visitor information centre) and public space, green infrastructure and new landscaping provided to improve the setting of the Monument.</p>	

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	be provided in a number of ways, including the proposal for a visitor information centre or interpretation panels at key locations across the site.		
BLMP 20 - Susan Jones on behalf of Middlewich Tank Wash (P Sheeran)	<p>1) There is a need for a detailed environmental assessment as part of the SPD - noise and odour impacts have not been considered sufficiently in developing the masterplan. Lack of consideration of those impacts has not provided sufficient assurance around deliverability of numbers and / or whether mitigation measures (such as buffer planting) are sufficient.</p> <p>2) Observations when visiting the site include long hours of operation and industrial operations. The masterplan fails to take account of material considerations – taking account of para 182 of the NPPF. SPD should be subject to in depth assessment of environmental constraints and then consulted upon again.</p> <p>3) The owners want to retain employment uses on the site without introduction of sensitive users in the locality.</p>	<p>1) The Brooks Lane (Middlewich) Development Framework SPD provides additional guidance on the strategic location included in the adopted LPS (as reference – LPS 43). The allocation of the site was supported by a detailed site selection process including the Middlewich Settlement Report. The development framework considers a number of broad parameters for the site whereas future planning application(s) will provide additional and detailed justification for individual proposals. These will be considered on their own merits against the policies contained within the Development Plan and any other relevant material considerations.</p> <p>2) See above.</p> <p>3) Noted. The development framework includes an area of retained employment land. This includes the Middlewich Tank Wash area.</p>	<p>1) New section added to the revised SPD (in section 5.2) - 'development parameters and delivery considerations' which details site specific considerations, where additional assessments and potential mitigation on the site would likely be required. Alongside the relationship of the SPD to existing policies contained in the Development Plan.</p> <p>2) As above</p> <p>3) No change proposed</p>
BLMP 21 - Centec	1) Support the comments by S Jones on behalf of P Sheeran (BLMP 20).	1) Noted	See response to comment reference BLMP 20
BLMP 22 - Martin's MOT centre			

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
BLMP 23 - Worsley Plant Hire			
BLMP 25 - BIP organics			
BLMP 24 - Environment Agency	<p>1) Re-development of the site provides opportunity to restore the ecological value of the River Croco and Sanderson's Brook. To restore these areas which are currently in culvert. The Agency would be supportive of a re-development proposal which seeks to remove the aforementioned culverted extents and restore these watercourses to their natural state. Re-naturalisation of these watercourses would offer both ecological benefits and a lowered fluvial flood risk. Engineered river channels are one of the most severe examples of the destruction of ecologically valuable habitat; we therefore seek to restore and enhance watercourses to a more natural channel wherever possible, as required and promoted under the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>2) Currently the Water Framework Directive waterbody, River Croco, (GB112068055460) ecological status is classified as poor but this development provides a pathway to improve this</p>	<p>1) Support for the restoration of the River Croco noted.</p> <p>2) Noted and change proposed</p> <p>3) Noted and change proposed</p>	<p>1) No change proposed</p> <p>2) Reference made to inclusion of a green infrastructure buffer alongside River Croco and Sanderson's Brook (8 metre buffer strip) – section 5.1.4</p> <p>3) See point 2 (above)</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>status. It is standard Environment Agency practice to seek, as part of any new development that lies close to a watercourse, the inclusion of a green undeveloped buffer strip alongside the watercourse. Where such a buffer strip does not currently exist, we normally seek that this is implemented; this is a key way in which we carry out our legal duty to further and promote the ecological and landscape value of rivers and land associated with them.</p> <p>3) A permit may be required from the EA for any proposed works or structures in 8 metres of the River Croco and Sanderson's brook. Standard practice to seek the inclusion of green infrastructure along the watercourse.</p>		
BLMP 11-Tata Chemicals	<p>Representation made on behalf of British Salt Limited. Reference made to Cledford Lagoons south of the site.</p> <p>1) The Lagoons offer little likelihood of providing a multi-functional open space unless investment is made available, which can only be released through development opportunities coming forward. The Cledford Lagoons site was not carried forward within the Local Plan Strategy (LPS) and was not allocated for residential-led mixed development, however the reasoned justification for the inclusion of Brooks Lane within the</p>	<p>1) The role of the Brooks Lane Development Framework is not to allocate additional land but provide supplementary detail on the existing policy context set out in the Local Plan Strategy (site LPS 43), utilising the existing boundary for the Brooks Lane Strategic Location as shown on the policies Map for the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>2) The draft development framework does not rely heavily on Cledford Lagoons as a recreation and landscape asset. Its presence is mentioned for contextual purposes.</p> <p>3) The reference to the Cledford Lagoons as a Local Wildlife Site is accurate and is correctly</p>	<p>1) No change proposed 2) No change proposed 3) No change proposed</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>LPS states that; "There is potential to expand the site into the salt lagoons in the future" (Para 15.501) . It goes on to state, at Para 15.503 that; "The British Salt Lagoons located directly to the south of the site offer an opportunity to explore the potential for enlarging the site in future and making best use of brownfield land here. The design of the development should respect and capitalise on its canal-side setting</p> <p>2) The Draft Masterplan relies heavily on the Cledford Lagoons as a 'recreation and landscape asset' (see section 2.2.4) despite the fact that currently public access to it is restricted solely to a single footpath on the eastern boundary, and it offers no notable landscape or recreational benefit. We believe this is therefore misleading and disingenuous.</p> <p>3) British Salt undertook a process of ecological assessment of the Cledford Lagoon in support of prospective local plan designation. The conclusions from this process were that Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) (such as the SBIs) form an important layer within the hierarchy of sites that are designated biodiversity and ecological value. However, the importance of such sites within the local context needs to be carefully considered when designating sites within the plan</p>	<p>referenced in the documentation.</p>	

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>making process. We note that Appendix 1 (Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report) refers to the Cledford Lagoons as being a Local Wildlife Site. It states (at Paragraph 13) that the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken for the LPS recognised that mitigation provided through the Plan would not have any significant effects. We assume this is a typographical error and, for the reasons set out above, reference to Local Wildlife Site should be replaced by Site of Biological Importance until such time as an assessment has been done to confirm that the site warrants LWS status. As set out above, we strongly believe that the site does not meet the LWS criteria and its designation as an SBI should be removed.</p>		
<p>BLMP 26 - Alison Roylance – Whyte</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Displacing local businesses for residential will not benefit to town. 2) Remove reference to Middlewich Folk and Boat Festival as no longer exists (pg 12) 3) Challenging to relocate limited housing near a new marina and safeguards to protect current employment sites and employers. To keep the two areas separate is essential to provide a marina but keep our employment sites. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Brooks Lane Development framework is seeking to provide additional guidance on the strategic location (LPS 43) included in the adopted development plan – the Local Plan Strategy. LPS 43 sets out that the site is likely to include the delivery of around 200 homes (point 1 of the policy). 2) Noted and change proposed 3) The purpose of the framework is to unlock the site’s regeneration benefits, whilst recognising that there are existing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No change proposed 2) Reference to Middlewich Folk and Boat Festival now removed from the revised development framework 3) No change proposed 4) No change

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>4) As one of the largest towns in the north west without a railway station, and a net outflow of residents to places of work, a railway station with passenger trains is a necessity for Middlewich</p> <p>5) In favour of a marina village, definitely in agreement of a train station (but fail to see why we cannot use the current platform areas and space left for car parks on earlier developments) and ensure our employment on Brooks Lane is supported but left in situ. I am not in favour of a gateway village, train station village nor losing a vital employment area and jobs.</p>	<p>businesses that may wish to remain operating on the Site. It provides guidance to inform the preparation of development proposals for the site, setting out key matters that proposals should address in order to achieve high quality new development that will significantly enhance the area and benefit the town as a whole.</p> <p>4) Support noted</p> <p>5) See response to point 3 (above)</p>	<p>proposed</p> <p>5) No change proposed</p>
BLMP 12 - Sean Boyle	<p>1) Traffic problems already exist on Brooks Lane. No development until Middlewich Eastern Bypass is completed and Wheelock Street is rejuvenated.</p>	<p>1) The development framework identifies the potential for highway improvements to the Brooks Lane Canal Bridge & at the junction of Brooks Lane and Kinderton Street.</p>	<p>No change proposed</p>
BLMP 27 - Walsingham Planning on behalf of Centec International	<p>1) Centec are a specialist chemical manufacturing and recovery business and has no intention of relocating its business</p> <p>2) Hazardous substances consent has now been sought (18/4186c). Subject to this being approved then a further submission of a Major Accident Prevention policy will be submitted to the HSE. Development should be located at a safe and considerable</p>	<p>1) Centec are shown in the development framework within the area proposed to be retained for employment purposes.</p> <p>2) The Brooks Lane Development Framework is a requirement of policy LPS 43 Brooks Lane Strategic Location which established the principle of residential uses on the site. An SPD is needed in order to provide additional guidance regarding the allocation.</p> <p>3) The SPD makes appropriate references to</p>	<p>1) No change proposed</p> <p>2) No change proposed</p> <p>3) A new section has been added to the revised document (section 5.2) on 'development parameters and delivery considerations' which details site specific considerations, where additional assessments</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>distance from the Centec site. It is not possible to confirm the exact distance that the HSE would consider to be appropriate for development until our client has further engaged with them. Our client has begun this process by applying for a Hazardous Substance Consent to Cheshire East Council. In this regard, to avoid a potential land use conflict, our preferred outcome is that the adoption of this SPD is put on hold until this is clarified or that it is not adopted at all and the required policy is adopted through the second part of the Cheshire East Local Plan;</p> <p>3) Welcome the retained employment area but are concerned over the proximity of the residential uses. Disappointed to see the framework does not facilitate the protection of existing businesses or that it contains separation distances.</p> <p>4) Policy DHI of the Middlewich NP refers to landscaped buffer zones to protect residential areas for existing nearby users and this is supported. Policy OS2 in the NDP refers to the BLMP setting separation distances and it does not do this.</p> <p>5) Our client will not have sufficient clarity on this issue until the Risk Contour Analysis has been undertaken by the</p>	<p>existing businesses and additional detailed assessments required to support development on the site.</p> <p>4) The local referendum for the Middlewich Neighbourhood Plan was held on the 14 March 2019 and returned a 'no vote'.</p> <p>5) The Brooks Lane Development Framework is a requirement of policy LPS 43 Brooks Lane Strategic Location which established the principle of residential uses on the site. An SPD is needed in order to provide additional guidance regarding the allocation.</p> <p>6) One of the purposes of the development framework is to determine the precise location and quantum of development across the strategic location. This is focused on an initial phase of proposed development to the south west of the site.</p> <p>7) The illustrative masterplan highlights Brooks Lane and various access roads into the site. The masterplan framework identifies the potential for highway improvements to the Brooks Lane Canal Bridge & at the junction of Brooks Lane and Kinderton Street. Policy LPS 43 in the LPS also identifies highways and public transport contributions.</p> <p>8) The SPD when read as a whole provides the necessary guidance on the site relative to its strategic nature. It recognises that the document provides a framework that seeks</p>	<p>and potential mitigation on the site would likely be required</p> <p>4) References to the Middlewich Neighbourhood Plan have been removed from the development framework.</p> <p>5) see response to point 3 above</p> <p>6) No change proposed</p> <p>7) No change proposed</p> <p>8) see response to point 3 above</p> <p>9) The location of the proposed railway station has been amended to reflect the initial appraisal work undertaken in the "Mid Cheshire and Middlewich Rail Feasibility Study" (2019).</p> <p>10) The illustrative masterplan has been amended to reflect the focus on a potential shorter term development opportunity adjacent to the Trent and Mersey Canal.</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>HSE. It is not acceptable that the future growth of this successful business is curtailed by the potential of residential development that is too close to allow the granting of a lower tier COMAH licence by the HSE. As such, this document, or indeed any related adopted policy, should not be further progressed until this is clear.</p> <p>6) The figure of around 200 dwellings in line with the strategic location wording should be adhered to.</p> <p>7) Concerned about the impacts of increased traffic within the industrial estate; at the junction of the A54 and Brooks lane and on the one-way Brooks Lane Bridge. The vehicular access to the Centec site should be clearly set out within the illustrative drawings. Centec receive circa 6 road tanker deliveries per day, most of which contain highly flammable liquids.</p> <p>8) The SPD does not contain any written policy protecting the interests of our client, other existing employment uses that wish to stay, or future residents. We believe strongly, for reasons set out within this letter, that policies covering the following spatial strategies should be clearly set out and the wording formally consulted upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separation Distances – The required 	<p>to supplement policies in the development plan. The development framework is clear that any future planning application(s) would need to be supported by further detailed appraisal.</p> <p>9) The station location reflects initial appraisal work undertaken by Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership, Cheshire East and Cheshire West and Chester Council's have commissioned initial feasibility work, called the Mid Cheshire and Middlewich Rail Feasibility Study to consider options for the re-opening the Sandbach – Middlewich – Northwich line to passenger services which has informed the final version of the SPD:- http://www.871candwep.co.uk/latest-news/initial-findings-of-the-mid-cheshire-and-middlewich-rail-study-now-available/</p> <p>10) The revised SPD refers to a 'longer term' opportunity subject to securing an acceptable relationship between employment and residential uses on the site.</p>	

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>separation distances between proposed residential development and existing industrial uses should be clearly set out;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Improvements – A policy should be adopted setting out the requirement for highways improvements before any residential development takes place, or at least that developer contributions are required; • Buffer Zones – The precise requirements for adopted buffer zones should be clearly set out in written policy. This should contain required sizes, materials and locations. <p>9) The Railway Station should be located at the more northerly of the two proposed locations;</p> <p>10) The aspirational further stages of the masterplan should be removed, all policy requirement for housing can be met through the 'shorter term phase';</p>		
BLMP 13 - Thomas Hardie Commercials	<p>1) The proposed use of the development area will be sensitive to the existing use of our client's site, noise and air pollution. The proposed residential development will be detrimentally impacted by the environmental effects arising from the retained employment land, including our client's site. THCL's business operates 24 hours per day, 365 days per year in order to meet customer</p>	<p>1) The Brooks Lane (Middlewich) Development Framework SPD provides additional guidance on the strategic location included in the adopted LPS (as reference – LPS 43). The allocation of the site was supported by a detailed site selection process including the Middlewich Settlement Report. The development framework considers a number of broad parameters for the site</p>	<p>1) New section added to the document (section 5.2) on 'development parameters and delivery considerations' which details site specific considerations,</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>demand and their industry means that without constant access, their business would not be viable at their site. Our client has concerns regarding future restrictions over their land. Despite the introduction of the agent of change principle in the revised NPPF 2018 (placing the burden of mitigating the impacts of our client's use of an adjacent site onto future developers of residential property), real concerns remain that our client could be subject to pressure to curtail or limit their obligations</p> <p>2) We have particular concerns with the proposed location of Extra Care Housing for the elderly. Retention of the employment land means that HGV traffic would pass extremely close to Extra Care Housing, down Brooks Lane immediately adjacent to the accommodation</p> <p>3) The proposed locations of a new train station also mean that residents of the 200 homes planned in stage 1, and further afield from housing to the west of the site, will travel along Brooks Lane, past the junction of Road Beta and directly adjacent to the employment area in order to access the train station. The resulting increased traffic, particularly pedestrians and cyclists, raises serious safety concerns when coupled with high intensity industrial and employment traffic on the already busy, single carriage, Brooks</p>	<p>whereas future planning application(s) will provide additional and detailed justification for proposals. These will be considered on their own merits against the policies contained within the Development Plan. An additional section has been added to the development framework which sets out the need for additional assessments in support of future planning applications on the site.</p> <p>2) The location of extra care housing in the draft masterplan has been removed in the revised version.</p> <p>3) The station location reflects initial appraisal work undertaken by Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership, Cheshire East and Cheshire West and Chester Council's have commissioned initial feasibility work, called the Mid Cheshire and Middlewich Rail Feasibility Study to consider options for the re-opening the Sandbach – Middlewich – Northwich line to passenger services:- http://www.871candwep.co.uk/latest-news/initial-findings-of-the-mid-cheshire-and-middlewich-rail-study-now-available/</p> <p>4) To Canal site village section refers to buffer planting and landforming to provide separation between new residential development and the retained / enhanced employment area.</p>	<p>where additional assessments and potential mitigation on the site would be required.</p> <p>2) References to extra care housing in the illustrative masterplan framework have been removed.</p> <p>3) The location of the proposed railway station has been amended to reflect the initial appraisal work undertaken in the Mid Cheshire and Middlewich Rail Feasibility Study.</p> <p>4) Canal side village section confirms that buffer planting and landforming may be required to provide separation between new residential</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>Lane.</p> <p>4) We note the proposed buffer planting and land-forming along the eastern edge of the Canal-Side Village. It is submitted that this limited area (shown to be the width of 3 trees on illustrative plans) will be insufficient to mitigate the effects of vehicular disturbance from Road Beta, even on the assumption that mature specimens are used from the outset. Impact will be increased at particularly sensitive times, such as at nights and weekends in light of the fact that the proposed development at Canal-Side Village includes homes for families and older people. There does not appear to be any mitigation measures contained in the Proposals relating to the northern part of the site.</p> <p>5) THCL are not opposed to carefully considered re-development which will be of advantage to Middlewich, local residents and business. THCL supports the redevelopment of the entire Brooks Lane strategic location in accordance with the allocation in the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy.</p>	<p>5) The Brooks Lane (Middlewich) Development Framework SPD provides additional guidance on the strategic location included in the adopted LPS (as reference – LPS 43). Following engagement and a review of the constraints on the site. It is proposed to retain an area on the site for employment uses.</p>	<p>development and retained / enhanced employment area (s).</p> <p>5) No change proposed</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
BLMP 14 / BLMP 15 - Green 4 Developments / Chave Planning	<p>1) The scale of marina proposed in planning application 17/6366C is based upon an identified market requirement for a marina and a proposal to integrate it with the adjacent Boatyard. Green 4 Developments do not agree to provide a 20 berth marina. In view of the above, we request that the sentence under 'Canal Boat Marina' is changed to 'An approximate location has been identified for the provision of a canal boat marina, subject to viability, physical constraints and integration with the surrounding development and waterways network'. We also request that references to a proposed '20-berth marina' should also be replaced elsewhere in the document with 'a marina'. The above amendments will provide adequate flexibility so that the size of the marina can be determined taking into account relevant factors at planning application stage.</p> <p>2) It is acknowledged that Figure 29 shows Phase 1 vehicular access equally from both Brooks Lane and Road Beta, so it would appear on the face of it that our previous comments have been taken into account in terms of the access from Road Beta having been indicated as for construction purposes only. However there is still a very worrying reference at paragraph 6.1.3 that, in the longer-term,</p>	<p>1) Reference to Canal Boat Marina in the development framework is set out in the terms of an approximate location – it is identified as providing for a 20 berth canal boat marina (subject to viability). These references are considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>2) In the longer term, the preference would be for the phase 1 area of development being accessed from Brooks Lane rather than Road Beta. This could be secured by planning condition.</p>	<p>1) No change proposed</p> <p>2) No change proposed</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>Road Beta should accommodate employment and emergency residential traffic only. It is stated that vehicle access should ultimately be provided from Brooks Lane as opposed to Road Beta, the aim being to change the Road Beta access to an emergency access when the opportunity arises. Quite apart from how this would be achieved in practice - i.e. how would a planning application be determined with full vehicular access, only for it to be taken away by some means at an indeterminate point in the future? - the effect of this policy is that it impacts on deliverability. Intertechnic currently has an access from Road Beta and there has been no objection from the local highway authority to the access proposals in planning application reference 17/6366C. There is no reasoning in the SPD as to why it is necessary to restrict access from Road Beta. Green 4 Developments request that the sentences under 'Road Beta' and 'Phase 1 Vehicle Access' are removed from paragraph 6.1.3</p>		
BLMP 16 - J Wilcock	<p>1) Brooks Lane bridge is a narrow bridge and dangerous for pedestrians. The bridge should be made two way, if possible, with a separate pedestrian footpath. Also a road from the development should link to the Middlewich Eastern Bypass.</p>	<p>1) The development framework identifies the potential need for highway improvements to the Brooks Lane Canal Bridge & at the junction of Brooks Lane and Kinderton Street. LPS 43 in the LPS also makes reference to contributions towards highways and public transport</p>	<p>1) No change proposed</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
		improvements.	
BLMP 28 - Pochin (Avison Young)	<p>1) The SPD could follow a better structure by providing clear design parameters and requirements within boxes supported by justification text. This approach would be similar to other SPDs recently adopted by CEC and would accord with CELPS Policy LPS 43 which states that the SPD will determine the precise nature and quantum of development appropriate for the Strategic Location.</p> <p>Initial Option 1 – Shorter-term Change</p> <p>2) With regard to ‘Initial Option 1 – Shorter-term Change’, Pochin supports the retention of canal-side businesses and agrees in principle with environmental enhancements and improved public access to the canal frontage. However, Pochin would not support any environmental enhancements or infrastructure requirements that would be overly burdensome or threaten the viability of development at the site. Greater flexibility should be provided within the Masterplan to allow for further employment uses to be accommodated within the Phase 1 residential area in the case that the residential development proposed does not come forward in its</p>	<p>1) The structure of the development framework is considered appropriate in detailing the design considerations and context for the site. Additional text has been added to note further assessments that may be required on the site.</p> <p>2) Initial option 1 is presented as an option that informed the development framework as a whole. This section has now been removed from the document to reflect its final status.</p> <p>3) Initial option 2 is presented as an option that informed the development framework as a whole. This section has now been removed from the document to reflect its final status.</p> <p>4) Noted</p> <p>5) Policy LPS 43 of the LPS already includes references to contributions and improvements required on the site. Contributions / improvements would be requested by development proposals as they came forward on the site in line with policies IN 1 and IN2 of the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>6) Development proposals would be considered on their own merits in line with the development plan. This would include the need for transport assessments, in line with policy CO4 of the Local Plan Strategy and contributions in line with the requirements of the development framework, policy LPS 43 and polices IN1 and IN2 of the Local Plan Strategy.</p>	<p>1) Additional section added in 5.2 of the revised SPD on ‘development parameters and delivery considerations’.</p> <p>2) Section on initial option 1 – shorter term phase – removed from the document</p> <p>3) Section on initial option 2 - longer term phase removed from the document</p> <p>4) No change proposed</p> <p>5) No change proposed</p> <p>6) No change proposed</p> <p>7) No change proposed</p> <p>8) No change proposed</p> <p>9) No change proposed</p> <p>10) No change proposed</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>entirety.</p> <p>Initial Option 2 – Longer-term Change</p> <p>3) Regarding ‘Initial Option 2 – Longer-term Change’, Pochin seeks further clarification as to who will be responsible for undertaking the extensive environmental enhancements and green infrastructure cited. Pochin would not support any requirement or enhancement that would render development at the site unviable.</p> <p>4) Pochin is supportive of the public engagement that has been undertaken by CEC and Barton Willmore. In particular, Pochin is pleased to see that a ‘key change’ included in the final Masterplan, as a result of the engagement undertaken, comprised the expansion of the area of retained employment land.</p> <p>5) Pochin supports in principle the opportunities identified at the Brooks Lane site. However, Pochin seeks further clarification as to who would be expected to undertake the identified potential works</p> <p>6) Regarding the constraints identified in the Draft SPD, it is stated that the Brooks Lane and Kinderton Street (A54) junction, which provides primary access to the site, will require improvements to support the site’s redevelopment.</p>	<p>7) The masterplan acknowledges that there are businesses on the site who wish to remain in situ. The document highlights this and emphasises the need to ensure that new residential uses are compatible with existing, retained employment uses. This is a matter that will have to be addressed in detail as part of relevant planning application proposals.</p> <p>8) See response to point 7</p> <p>9) Policy LPS 43 of the LPS already includes references to contributions and improvements required on the site. Contributions / improvements would be requested by development proposals as they came forward on the site in line with policies IN 1 and IN2 of the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>10) Noted</p> <p>11) The phasing section of the document has been revised noting that the redevelopment of the site needs to be considered alongside existing businesses that remain operational in the Brooks Lane site.</p> <p>12) Noted</p>	<p>11) Section 6 of the revised SPD, in respect of phasing has been revised in the SPD.</p> <p>12) Document has been proof read.</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>Furthermore, the Draft SPD states that improvements and potential signalisation of the Bridge junction need to be explored to support the site's redevelopment. The aforementioned highways enhancements and identified potential works are likely to be costly, yet the Draft SPD does not state who will be expected to pay for these works. Pochin suggests that further investigation should be undertaken into the feasibility of utilising the canal bridge for access into the site. This would enable access into the proposed Phase 1 residential area which does not pass through employment uses.</p> <p>7) Pochin also seeks further clarification with regard to how businesses that wish to remain operating at the site will be able to do so</p> <p>8) At present, the Draft SPD states that 7.7ha of land will be retained/enhanced for employment provision at the site. Pochin supports the retention and enhancement of this land for employment use, which is required to deliver new jobs on site. Pochin would like to reiterate that greater flexibility should be incorporated into the Masterplan to allow for the release of more land for employment use if the residential development does not come forward in its entirety and to allow businesses that wish to remain at Brooks</p>		

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>Lane to occupy suitable premises.</p> <p>9) Although Pochin broadly supports the proposed landscape planting and environmental and highways enhancements outlined in the Draft SPD, Pochin would not support any green infrastructure requirements, ecological enhancements or pedestrian/cycle connections that would make development at the site unviable. Pochin seeks further clarification as to who would be expected to provide the stated enhancements.</p> <p>Character Areas</p> <p>10) With regard to the identified 'Canal-side Village' Character Area, Pochin supports the retention of canal-side businesses and reference to retained employment uses to the east, and agrees with the statement that these should be "key structural elements underpinning the design of the Illustrative Masterplan".</p> <p>Phasing Strategy</p> <p>11) Regarding the proposed Phasing Strategy, Pochin has concerns as to how the rest of the site will remain in employment use, while part of the site is redeveloped for residential use. Pochin</p>		

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>asks that further consideration is given to the phasing of development at the site, setting out how employment uses at the site will be safeguarded during the proposed phases of development to ensure that businesses are able to remain in operation during this period.</p> <p>Further comments</p> <p>12) Pochin acknowledges that the Draft SPD is a working document and is not yet in its final form. However, the text currently contains a number of spelling mistakes and grammatical errors. It is thus recommended that a thorough review of the SPD is undertaken prior to its adoption.</p>		
BLMP 29 - Natural England	<p>1) Section 6.14 (Green Infrastructure) - In our view this chapter could be strengthened and provide more guidance for future developments coming forward at this site. The Green Infrastructure (GI) aspects listed in this chapter do not have much relation to each other and we would like to see a landscape scale approach that would achieve multi-functional benefits for GI.</p> <p>2) Cheshire East Local Plan Policy SE3 Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that all development should positively contribute to the conservation and enhancement of</p>	<p>1) The masterplan framework, alongside the green infrastructure plan seek to provide for the multiple benefits of Green Infrastructure across the site</p> <p>2) The content of the Brooks Lane Masterplan should be read alongside the policy provisions set out in the Local Plan Strategy.</p>	<p>1) No change proposed</p> <p>2) No change proposed</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>biodiversity and that enhancement measures will include increasing the total area of valuable habitat in the Borough, linking up existing areas of high value habitat to create 'ecological stepping stone sites' and 'wildlife corridors'. Brooks Lane SPD could go further by identifying the appropriate GI enhancements that would enhance ecological networks and provide stepping stones between the network of wetland sites in Cheshire and Greater Manchester.</p>		
BLMP 30 – United Utilities	<p>1) United Utilities wishes to highlight that we will seek to work closely with the Council during the development process to develop a coordinated approach for the delivery of the Brooks Lane allocation. 2) We wish to highlight our free pre-application service for developers 3) Development of allocations in multiple ownership (s) - the experience of United Utilities is that where sites are in multiple ownership, the achievement of sustainable development can be compromised by developers/applicants working independently. Specifically we recommend consideration of a land value equalisation mechanism amongst land owners which is in the best interest of ensuring an overall strategy for the delivery of development and the</p>	<p>1) Noted 2) Noted 3) Noted. Matters such as equalisation agreements are not matters for this SPD to consider. 4) Additional summary text added to section 5.1.4 of the revised SPD on drainage requirements.</p>	<p>1) No change proposed 2) No change proposed 3) No change proposed 4) Additional summary text on drainage matters added to section 5.1.4 of the revised SPD.</p>

Consultee Ref	Summary of key issues including where the comment relates	Response to issues raised	Changes required
	<p>implementation of infrastructure.</p> <p>4) Green Infrastructure Network and Surface Water Management - United Utilities appreciates the reference made to drainage provision that will be encouraged by the amount of green infrastructure network in the draft layout. United Utilities feel that there is opportunity as part of the SPD to further reference an expectation that future applications utilise the green infrastructure for surface water attenuation to ensure all new to development comes forward in the most sustainable way.</p>		