

Local Development Framework

Smallwood Village Design Statement

Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Statement

Equal Opportunities and Access

Cheshire East Council recognises that it can improve the quality of life of people in the area by seeking to ensure that every member of the public has equal access to its services, facilities, resources, activities and employment.

We want these to be accessible to everyone in the community regardless of gender, age, ethnicity, disability, marital status or sexual orientation. Furthermore, we are keen to respond to the individual requirements of our customers to develop services that recognise their diversity and particular needs.

We use the Big Word as a translation service, and have hearing induction loops in our reception areas.

Information can be made available in large print, in Braille or on audiotape on request.

If you would like this information in another language or format, please contact us.

如欲索取以另一語文印製或另一格式製作的資料，請與我們聯絡。

如欲索取以另一語文印制或另一格式制作的资料，请与我们联系。

Jeżeli chcieliby Państwo uzyskać informacje w innym języku lub w innym formacie, prosimy dać nam znać.

ਜੇ ਇਹ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਜਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਰੂਪ ਵਿਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ, ਤਾਂ ਇਹ ਸਾਥੋਂ ਮੰਗ ਲਓ।

اگر آپ کو معلومات کسی دیگر زبان یا دیگر شکل میں درکار ہوں تو برائے مہربانی ہم سے پوچھئے۔

اگر این اطلاعات را به زبانی دیگر و یا در فرمتی دیگر میخواهید لطفاً از ما درخواست کنید

Se deseja obter informação noutro idioma ou formato, diga-nos.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Pre-production Consultation	1
3	Statutory Consultation	18

1. Introduction

1.1 Under Regulation 17 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, it is a requirement of Local Planning Authorities to carry out pre-consultation on all proposed Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), and to publish a statement setting out who has been consulted during the preparation of the draft SPD, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (including the Scoping Report), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Statement and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report. This includes a summary of the issues raised and how these issues have been addressed (see below).

2. Pre-production Consultation

1.2 The Specific Consultation bodies were contacted by email or by post, with the exception of the residents of Smallwood Parish, who were consulted via an open afternoon held on 27th April 2008. This was advertised in the monthly Village notes, which are distributed to all households in Smallwood Parish. The residents were given an opportunity to complete an anonymous questionnaire, which was advertised in the June 2008 'News' sheet. Along with the questionnaire informal views were also requested. The open afternoon included a photography display of village houses and scenes and the landscape of Smallwood. The local primary school also displayed local children's view of the village.

1.3 The consultation of Smallwood Parish residents on the draft SPD took place during the period 27th April 2008 to 13th June 2008. The SA Scoping Report, SEA Screening Statement and HRA were consulted upon between 3rd July and 3rd August 2009.

1.4 Pre-production Specific Consultation Bodies:

- Residents of Smallwood Parish
- Government Office for the North West
- Natural England
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- South East Cheshire Enterprise
- Central and Eastern Cheshire Primary Care Trust
- Learning and Skills Council
- Cheshire West and Chester Council
- High Peak District Council
- Manchester City Council
- Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council
- North Shropshire Borough Council
- Peak District National Park
- Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
- Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council

- Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council
- Warrington Borough Council

1.5 Congleton Borough Council (CBC) and Cheshire East (CE) internal departments and Cheshire County Council (CCC):

- Conservation (CBC)
- Local Planning and Economic Policy (CBC)
- Highways Development Control Engineer (CCC)
- Planning and Policy (CE)
- Regeneration (CE)
- Portfolio Holder for Performance and Capacity (CE)
- Portfolio Holder for Prosperity (CE)
- Urban Design (CE)

Pre-production Consultation Summary of Issues Raised and Responses

1.6 In total 60 questionnaires were returned, which represented the views of 99 residents of Smallwood Parish.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
Draft SPD	
Smallwood Residents (By questionnaire, between April and June 2008).	
Concern was raised regarding the retention of the rural character of the Parish in terms of its openness, serenity, sense of community and its distinctiveness as a series of small settlements.	The SPD's vision is that any future development should have a regard to the history and appearance of Smallwood Parish.
Enthusiasm for the Parish's traditional and distinctive buildings was expressed particularly for the church, school and other listed buildings within the Parish.	Chapter produced on buildings with reference to the Parish's architectural heritage along with design guidelines for new buildings.
The design of any development or building work within the Parish should pay attention to existing traditional aspects of building stock, (their vernacular details) and the scale of dwellings to plot size in the Parish as well as the layout of dwellings in plenty of space and with open views to front and rear.	Building design guidelines produced with reference to the local architectural vernacular.
The suggestion that there was some room for "some modern design in new buildings in Smallwood" drew no strong opinion from the majority.	Comment noted.
Strong views were expressed regarding the preservation of the nature of the landscape of Smallwood, as both a rural setting and as a habitat for wildlife.	Landscape guidelines have been produced that preserve the character, setting and views of the natural environment.
1.01 The character of Smallwood should be preserved - <i>majority strongly agreed</i> .	The SPD's vision is that any future development should have a regard to the history and appearance of Smallwood Parish.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response														
1.02 I would like to see some modern development in Smallwood - <i>majority disagreed.</i>	Comment noted.														
1.03 I would like the population of Smallwood to remain basically the size it is at present - <i>majority agreed.</i>	Comment noted.														
1.04 Smallwood should retain a mix of smaller houses as well as larger family homes - <i>majority agreed.</i>	Comment noted.														
1.05 Smallwood's series of small settlements, with open countryside between are important and should be retained - <i>majority strongly agreed.</i>	The SPD's vision is that any future development should have a regard to the history and appearance of Smallwood Parish.														
<p>1.06 "Which feature of Smallwood is most important to you"?</p> <p>The following were put forward by more than one person:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Church</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Open countryside</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Open aspect of the village</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The character of a hamlet</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The villages' rural aspect</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The serenity of the village</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The sense of community</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table>	Church	9	Open countryside	6	Open aspect of the village	4	The character of a hamlet	4	The villages' rural aspect	4	The serenity of the village	3	The sense of community	3	There are references to these qualities throughout the document.
Church	9														
Open countryside	6														
Open aspect of the village	4														
The character of a hamlet	4														
The villages' rural aspect	4														
The serenity of the village	3														
The sense of community	3														

Comments/Issues Raised	Response																				
<p>1.07 “Which feature of Smallwood are you most disappointed with?”</p> <p>The following were put forward by more than one person:</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Traffic</td><td>11</td></tr> <tr><td>The new housing estate</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>Roadsides and verges</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr><td>Lack of a centre</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>Fly tipping</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>Demise of the Salamanca</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>Lack of playground and sports equipment</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>Lack of a village shop</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>Litter</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>The lack of a bus service</td><td>2</td></tr> </table> <p>The main disappointments with the current state of the Parish were concerned with those things that threaten its character and rural quietness, for example: traffic (and the lack of traffic calming), damage to roadsides and verges, fly tipping, recent building developments (which have veered from the traditional layout of dwellings).</p>	Traffic	11	The new housing estate	8	Roadsides and verges	6	Lack of a centre	3	Fly tipping	2	Demise of the Salamanca	2	Lack of playground and sports equipment	2	Lack of a village shop	2	Litter	2	The lack of a bus service	2	<p>The SPD's vision is that any future development should have a regard to the history and appearance of Smallwood Parish.</p>
Traffic	11																				
The new housing estate	8																				
Roadsides and verges	6																				
Lack of a centre	3																				
Fly tipping	2																				
Demise of the Salamanca	2																				
Lack of playground and sports equipment	2																				
Lack of a village shop	2																				
Litter	2																				
The lack of a bus service	2																				
<p>2.01 Building design in Smallwood should take into consideration the features found within its existing traditional buildings ('traditional buildings' refers to buildings in the village at least 100 years old) - <i>majority agreed</i>.</p>	<p>Building design guidelines produced with reference to the local architectural vernacular.</p>																				
<p>2.02 I would like a design guide to provide examples of traditional building details for design reference for new buildings, conversions and building extensions - <i>majority agreed</i>.</p>	<p>Inclusion in VDS of typical and traditional housing within the Parish along with notes on local architecture and illustrations of local building</p>																				

Comments/Issues Raised	Response																		
	vernacular.																		
2.03 The layout of new dwellings should reflect the traditional layout of buildings in the village, with space and open views to front and rear - <i>majority agreed.</i>	The SPD's vision is that any future development should have a regard to the history and appearance of Smallwood Parish.																		
2.04 I am happy to see some modern design in new buildings in Smallwood - <i>majority had no strong opinion.</i>	Comment noted.																		
2.05 Extensions to existing buildings should be sympathetic in terms of scale to the original building and the size of the plot - <i>majority strongly agreed.</i>	Building design guidelines produced with reference to siting, scale, design and materials.																		
2.06 Infill housing, utilising land between houses, should be discouraged - <i>majority agreed.</i>	This would create a new Local Plan policy, which is not the role of an SPD.																		
<p>2.07 "Which buildings in Smallwood do you find visually / historically important?"</p> <p>More than one person put the following forward:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Church</td><td>26</td></tr> <tr> <td>School</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr> <td>The Chapel</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr> <td>The Blue Bell (pub)</td><td>11</td></tr> <tr> <td>Smallwood House</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr> <td>Old Farm</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr> <td>Tithe barn</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr> <td>Overton Hall Farm</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>Pinfold Farm</td><td>3</td></tr> </table>	Church	26	School	15	The Chapel	12	The Blue Bell (pub)	11	Smallwood House	9	Old Farm	6	Tithe barn	6	Overton Hall Farm	4	Pinfold Farm	3	These are Listed Buildings except for the Chapel, Blue Bell, Overton Hall Farm and the Mill.
Church	26																		
School	15																		
The Chapel	12																		
The Blue Bell (pub)	11																		
Smallwood House	9																		
Old Farm	6																		
Tithe barn	6																		
Overton Hall Farm	4																		
Pinfold Farm	3																		

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
The Mill 3	
3.01 The planting of traditional trees, shrubs and hedge species should be encouraged in new planting schemes in the village - <i>majority strongly agreed</i> .	Guidelines produced on the replacement of trees and examples of suitable hedge varieties.
3.02 Grass verges should be valued and respected as a natural habitat - <i>majority strongly agreed</i> .	Comment noted.
3.03 Gateways should be traditional in design and not over-elaborate - <i>majority agreed</i> .	Examples have been provided of traditional gateways.
4.01 The road network in Smallwood needs more traffic calming measures. (For example, speed limits) - <i>majority agreed</i> .	Letter written to the VDS Chairman/Coordinator referring to Highways contact details to discuss this issue.
4.02 Public footpaths and bridleways need to be kept open and maintained - <i>majority strongly agreed</i> .	Comment noted.
4.03 The village should remain free of street lighting - <i>majority agreed</i> .	Comment noted.
5.01 Light pollution from excessive garden illumination should be discouraged - <i>majority agreed</i> .	Guideline produced referring to exterior lights and the issue of light pollution.
5.02 Natural sewage treatment such as reed beds and willow planting should be encouraged - <i>majority agreed</i> .	The support given to unobtrusive renewable energy developments is referred to within the SPD.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
5.03 Domestic scale wind turbines should be encouraged - <i>majority had no strong opinion.</i>	The support given to unobtrusive renewable energy developments is referred to within the SPD.
5.04 Domestic scale solar panels should be encouraged - <i>majority agreed.</i>	The support given to unobtrusive renewable energy developments is referred to within the SPD.
6.01 Smallwood village has a strong sense of community - <i>majority agreed.</i>	Comment noted.
6.02 The existing community spirit would be damaged by substantial expansion of the village - <i>majority agreed.</i>	Comment noted.
Government Office for the North West (Paul Byrne, by email 11/05/09)	
Overall the only real concerns with the document relate to the guidelines and the need to be more specific and/or related to place.	Comment noted.
Whilst it is appreciated that East Cheshire has yet to compile its own SCI, it is assumed that that document will place emphasis upon the benefits to be derived from pre-application discussions in regard to planning applications. Therefore, it would be helpful if in either paragraph 1.21 or 1.22, the document highlighted the benefit of pre-application discussions.	Amendment made.
<i>Landscape Guidelines</i> – would suggest that rather than state, ‘any development’, it would be better to say, ‘where appropriate development should’, as clearly L4 is not likely to be appropriate to all development. But you need to be clear that the guidelines are not merely restating other Local	Amendment made.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
Plan policies regarding protection of, for example, rights of way, ponds, hedgerows etc. Are there specific locations which need protection and could be mentioned?	
<i>Settlement Guidelines</i> – query whether S2 is not covered by the green belt policy or a similar policy in the Local Plan? Is it appropriate that S3 would apply to ‘any development’? Or might it be better to say of a similar design, scale and massing to neighbouring properties?	Comment will feed through to the consultation on the draft SPD, where it will be considered.
<i>Buildings Guidelines</i> – B1 relates to ‘low density’ but doesn’t define what ‘low density’ is. Care will need to be taken to ensure that this guideline does not seek to make new policy and is consistent with Local Plan policies on density.	Comment will feed through to the consultation on the draft SPD, where it will be considered.
Paragraph 6.4 could refer to the existence of Tree Preservation Orders to protect threatened trees.	Comment will feed through to the consultation on the draft SPD, where it will be considered.
<i>Open spaces, Paths etc., Guidelines</i> – the first bullet point needs to be reviewed in light of Local Plan policies on new development. Will new houses be expected to provide public amenity space?? The third bullet point repeats guidance under landscape above.	Bullet points deleted.
<i>Highways and Traffic Guidelines</i> – there is no guidance shown but care will have to be taken to ensure that any guidance is consistent with Local Plan policies.	Comment noted.
<i>Monitoring</i> – the document needs to explain how the effectiveness of the document will be monitored within the authority’s Annual Monitoring Report and how that document will advise on any changes necessary in the future to the VDS arising from future LDF document production etc.	Amendment made.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
<i>Glossary</i> – it may be necessary to consider the need for a glossary of terms.	Amendment made.
<i>Contact Details</i> – you will need to review some of the contact details given following local government reorganisation; especially you will need to include details of the new Council's website.	Amendments made.
CBC Internal departments (Local Planning and Economic Policy and Conservation, hand written on the draft document, received on various dates during 2008)	
Suggestions of various amendments to be made.	Amendments were made.
CCC Development Control Engineer (Nigel Curtis, by email 19/11/08)	
Suggestions of various amendments to be made and for other sources of information and provided contact details for departments that may aid in the resolution of some of the issues raised.	Amendments made and letter written to the VDS Chairman/Coordinator providing contact details for the resolution of some of the issues raised.
Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report	
English Heritage (Judith Nelson, by email 08/07/09)	
No comment to make. Guidance on SA/SEA and the historic environment was attached.	No changes required.
Natural England (Lisa Taylor, by email 15/07/09)	
We acknowledge that you have broadly covered topics related to our interests of conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, geo-diversity, green infrastructure, landscape character and quality, sustainable use of resources and access to green spaces and countryside.	No changes required.
Environment Agency (Catherine Hunt, by email 05/08/09)	
<i>Baseline Information: Stage A2</i>	

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
<p><i>Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna</i></p> <p>We are pleased to see the inclusion of an indicator relating to the 'number and area of sites of local importance for nature conservation (Sites of Biological Importance) Smallwood Parish, by grade'.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>
<p><i>Issues: Stage A3 (Part 1)</i></p> <p>Issue 4: 'the need to promote high quality building standards (in terms of sustainability, character and build standards), for all new development and improve the quality of existing residences that fail to meet the decent homes standard' we would recommend that new developments, particularly major developments, meet a BREEAM Very Good level as a minimum standard.</p>	<p>The Council is trying to ensure that the same issues and objectives are used for all Local Development Documents. These can be changed through the Core Strategy process and the comments will therefore be taken on board for the future.</p>
<p>Issue 7: 'there is a need to conserve and enhance the biodiversity and geo diversity of the Borough. Particularly important wildlife and habitat sites and areas under threat'. We are pleased to see that this is considered to be of great significance within the document. However, this could perhaps be linked to Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (PPS9) which states that development should:</p> <p><i>"...promote sustainable development by ensuring that biological and geological diversity are <u>conserved and enhanced</u> as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development, so that policies and decisions about the development and use of land integrate biodiversity and geological diversity with other considerations."</i></p> <p><i>"...conserve, enhance and restore the diversity of England's wildlife and geology by sustaining, and where possible <u>improving</u>, the quality and extent</i></p>	<p>The Council is trying to ensure that the same issues and objectives are used for all Local Development Documents. These can be changed through the Core Strategy process and the comments will therefore be taken on board for the future.</p>

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
<p><i>of natural habitat...and the populations of naturally occurring species which they support.”</i></p> <p><i>“...<u>enhance biodiversity</u> in green spaces and among developments so that they are used by wildlife and valued by people, recognising that healthy functional ecosystems can contribute to a better quality of life and to people’s sense of well-being; and ensuring that developments take account of the role and value of biodiversity in supporting economic diversification and contributing to a high quality environment.”</i></p>	
<p>Issue 8: ‘the need to conserve, enhance and where necessary provide additional Green Infrastructure in the Borough, including open spaces, countryside, woodlands, lakes, private gardens, the countryside and the setting of the Peak District National Park’. We recognise the importance of Green Infrastructure (GI) and support the development of GI networks. GI can provide many benefits, including flood storage, biodiversity and recreation. Particular areas of flood risk may be addressed through the protection or provision of GI. Additionally, GI can also have wider community benefits. PPS9 refers to GI as ‘networks of natural habitats’ which should be maintained by avoiding or repairing fragmentation and isolation of natural habitats. Such networks should be protected from development, and where possible, strengthened by or integrated within it. See http://www.greeninfrastructure.eu/ for more information.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Issue 9: ‘threats to the quality and quantity of water within the Borough, particularly rivers and canals. In line with the Water Framework Directive (WFD), good chemical and ecological status in inland and coastal waters should be reached by 2015. The WFD is a wide-ranging and ambitious piece</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
<p>of European environmental legislation. Its overall objective is to bring about the effective co-ordination of water environment policy and regulation across Europe in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent deterioration and enhance status of aquatic ecosystems, including groundwater, • Promote sustainable water use, • Reduce pollution and • Contribute to the mitigation of floods and droughts. 	
<p>The WFD will have implications for spatial planning and development decisions. Development can contribute to an improved water environment, but can also have an adverse impact. Spatial planning bodies can help deliver the WFD objectives by adopting policies that contribute to or support measures that need to be put in place to achieve 'good status'. For example, new developments (such as new housing) when proposed, could be assessed against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • available water resources; • existing capacity for sewage treatment; • the potential environmental impacts discharges of treated effluent might have on receiving water bodies. 	
<p>Within the current document there is little mention of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs). SUDS provide an opportunity to protect rivers and groundwater from the effects of pollutants and reduce flood risk in urban areas by changes in the design of drainage systems and/or the provision of treatment facilities prior to discharge. We are now promoting, with help of unitary authorities and councils, a range of structures with a flexible series of options for reducing the damage of our freshwater resources of this country.</p>	<p>SPD4: Sustainable Development includes information on SUDs and will be taken into consideration when determining planning applications.</p>

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
Therefore any new development should assess the feasibility of incorporating SUDs. (http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/sectors/36998.aspx)	
Issue 10: 'the need to reduce waste generation and reliance on landfill disposal; primarily through recycling and composting'. We are pleased to see this included and support recycling.	No changes required.
Issue 12: 'managing and mitigating flood risk in the Borough' we are pleased to see this included as a key sustainability issue within the Borough.	No changes required.
<i>Objectives: Stage A3 (Part 2)</i> 1. 'To protect and enhance biodiversity, habitats and important geological features; with particular care to sites designated internationally, nationally, regionally and locally'. We are satisfied with this sustainability objective.	No changes required.
2. 'To prevent inappropriate development on flood plains and guard against increased risk of flooding'. We are satisfied with this sustainability objective however, the wording could possibly be changed to link in with PPS25: Development and Flood Risk. We are satisfied with this sustainability objective.	The Council is trying to ensure that the same issues and objectives are used for all Local Development Documents. These can be changed through the Core Strategy process and the comments will therefore be taken on board for the future.
3. 'To minimise the need to travel by car and facilitate integrated forms of sustainable transport'. We are pleased to see the inclusion of this objective and support the use of sustainable transport.	No changes required.
4. 'Encouraging sustainable waste management by reducing the production of waste and increasing opportunities for recycling and composting'. We are satisfied with this sustainability objective.	No changes required.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
7. 'To reduce the consumption of natural resources, protect green infrastructure and optimize the re-use of previously developed land and buildings'. We are pleased to see this as a sustainability objective.	No changes required.
8. 'To minimize the requirement for energy use, promote energy efficiency, and increase the use of energy from renewable sources'. We welcome this target and promote the use of energy from renewable sources.	No changes required.
9. 'To promote high quality building standards, particularly in relation to sustainable design, the incorporation of renewable energy generation, building character and good/considerate construction techniques'. We would recommend that new developments, particularly major developments, meet a BREEAM Very Good level as a minimum standard. With regard to 'good/considerate construction techniques' we are unsure what exactly this means and suggest that it could perhaps be reworded to make it clearer.	The Council is trying to ensure that the same issues and objectives are used for all Local Development Documents. These can be changed through the Core Strategy process and the comments will therefore be taken on board for the future.
SEA Screening Statement	
Natural England (Lisa Taylor, by email 15/07/09)	
We acknowledge that you have broadly covered topics related to our interests of conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, geo-diversity, GI, landscape character and quality, sustainable use of resources and access to green spaces and countryside.	No changes required.
Environment Agency (Catherine Hunt, by email 05/08/09)	
We would agree with the Council's statement that the Village Design Statement is unlikely to have a significant environmental effect and accordingly will not require a SEA.	No changes required.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment Scoping Report	
Natural England (Lisa Taylor, by email 15/07/09)	
<p>Given the nature of the SPD, we are satisfied with the selection methodology and description of the European site, and welcome the interpretation of the site information to pick out the key points. We are satisfied that the methods of assessment and prediction are clearly explained and that the potential effects of the plan on the conservation objectives of the site are clearly demonstrated.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>
<p>We note that you have reported the conclusion of the assessment at paragraph 1.5 of the SPD Habitats Regulations Assessment report. We recommend that the reason for this conclusion should also be made as part of the summary.</p>	<p>Amendment made.</p>
<p>We recommend the inclusion of a map which illustrates the location of the relevant parish in relation to European sites in the area, in order to give the report geographical context.</p>	<p>Amendment made.</p>
<p>In paragraph 3.1 of the SPD Habitats Regulations Assessment report, reference is made to the SPD being used in conjunction with and support of the 'saved' policies in the Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review, 2005. Natural England recommends that this statement is followed with reference to the predicted length of time that these 'saved' policies are likely to remain relevant.</p>	<p>A footnote has been added to say that the most up to date information on the LDF can be found in the Council's Local Development Scheme, with a link to the web page.</p>

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
In a number of places through the report Bagmere is referenced as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). This is of course correct, but in the context of the HRA, the higher designation of Bagmere, as forming part of the Midlands Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar site should be the suffix, rather than the national SSSI designation.	Amendments made.
Overall, we are satisfied with the assessment and concur with the conclusion that the proposed SPD is not likely to have a significant effect on European sites, alone or in combination with other plans or projects.	No changes required.

3. Statutory Consultation

1.7 The consultation took place during the period 12th March to 23rd April 2010 with consultees being contacted either via email or by post. The consultation consisted of supplying consultees with either hard copies of the documents or web links to the draft SPD and background documents, following which the consultees were invited to make any comments in respect of the draft SPD, Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment, by email or post. The documents were also available to view at local Council Customer Service Points, Council Customer Service Centres, Congleton Tourist Information Centre and local libraries.

1.8 Two consultation events were also held within Smallwood Parish for interested parties on 25th March 2010 from 10am to 12pm and 5.30pm to 7.30pm. A Planning Officer and members of the Village Design Statement group were available to answer any questions. The SPD consultation and the consultation event were publicised in the local press and within the Smallwood Notes, a local newsletter that is delivered to all households within the Parish.

Statutory Consultation Summary of Issues Raised and Responses

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
Draft SPD	
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council (Dave Bryant, by email 09/03/10)	
The Council does not wish to comment.	No changes required.
Manchester Airport Group (Andrew Murray, by email 09/03/10)	
We do not have any comment to make.	No changes required.
Network Rail (Diane Clarke, by email 09/03/10)	
No comments at this moment in time.	No changes required.
Congleton Cycling Campaign (Peter Hall, by email 11/03/10)	
Paragraph 7.2 correctly identifies the lane known as Church Lane/Congleton Road as being a road which receives a lot of traffic at rush hour both morning and night. As you also correctly note this road is also designated as part of Route 70, the Cheshire Cycleway (please note that this is not part of the National Cycle Network but is described as being part of the regional cycle network). The speed of traffic and the space given to cyclists when overtaking on this lane is particularly menacing. This is not just at times when people are travelling to work or travelling to Smallwood school to drop off or collect their children. In keeping with government guidance on reducing speed in rural roads and lanes the Congleton Cycling Campaign and the Cheshire East Cycling Campaign would like the Cheshire East Council to consider reducing the speed limit on this lane to 40mph (it is currently 60mph). We feel that this would go a long way to making Smallwood a more attractive place to live and travel through than it currently is.	This is beyond the scope of the VDS however this comment has been forwarded to the Congleton Area Highways Team, with Mr Hall cc'd.
Mary Logan (Smallwood Resident, by email 25/03/10)	
I found the Design Statement very interesting and had a useful discussion at the consultation event this morning. I hope it might be helpful to point out a few typos. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> p16 3.1 "includes damsons" should be "included damsons" 	Amendments made.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
<p>3.2 should be "practised" not "practiced"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • p20 Signposts say Martins Moss, without an apostrophe s. • p22 4.10 "Pollution" does not need a capital p. • p23 Settlement Guidelines S4 Should be "affect", not "effect". • p24 Should be Four Lanes End not Four Lane Ends, I think. • p29 6.7 Should be farmers' not farmer's or just "gates." Should be "five barred" not "five bared" gates. 	
Smallwood Parish Council (Helen Baker, by email 25/03/10)	
<p>I am requesting the following amendment on behalf of Smallwood Parish Council.</p> <p><i>Hedgerow maintenance</i> "Except where site lines and pedestrian safety need to be maintained, along roadsides it is not necessary to cut hedges annually".</p>	Amendment made.
Highways Agency (Victoria Ridehaugh, by email 25/03/10)	
We have no comments to make.	No changes required.
CABE (Andrew Davies, by email 29/03/10)	
<p>Unfortunately, due to limited resources, we are unable to comment on this document. However we would like to make some general comments which you should consider.</p> <p>A good spatial plan is essential to achieving high quality places and good design. CABE believes that getting the local development framework (LDF) core strategy (CS) right is one of the most important tasks planners are undertaking. We have run workshops with over 65 local planning authorities to look at how design is being embedded in CS documents, which form part of the LDF. The workshops offer local authorities independent informal advice from an expert panel and allowed us to identify the strengths and weaknesses of current approaches to spatial planning and how design, functionality and space are dealt</p>	No changes required.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
<p>with in CS documents. Three key messages for local planning authorities preparing CSs have emerged from our workshops. These are now embedded within a CABA publication called <i>Planning for places: delivering good design through core strategies</i>, available to download from the CABA website: www.cabe.org.uk/publications/planning-for-places</p> <p>The three key messages are also applicable to other LDF documents and you should keep these in mind when preparing other Development Plan Documents and SPDs:</p> <p><i>Tell the story</i> A good CS needs to tell the story of the place, explain how it works and highlight its qualities and distinguishing features. Telling the story helps everyone understand how the qualities of the place have shaped the strategy and its priorities for future quality. For more information, refer to: www.cabe.org.uk/planning/core-strategies/tell-the-story</p> <p><i>Set the agenda</i> Use the CS to say what is wanted for the area, express aspirations and be proactive and positive about the future of the place and say how this will be achieved. Set out what is expected in terms of design quality and where necessary provide links to the relevant development plan documents or SPDs. For more information refer to: www.cabe.org.uk/planning/core-strategies/set-the-agenda</p> <p><i>Say it clearly</i> Make the CS relevant and understandable to a wide audience. Use diagrams to inform the text and communicate the strategy and show what quality of place means. For more information refer to: www.cabe.org.uk/planning/core-strategies/say-it-clearly</p> <p>It is also important that there is a clear priority for design quality and place-making objectives in the CS, setting out the key principles. This needs to be explicit so that it cannot be challenged when applications are being determined. We would also like to respond by drawing your attention the following CABA Guidance that you might find useful:</p>	

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Making design policy work: How to deliver good design through your local development framework</i> • <i>Protecting Design Quality in Planning</i> • <i>Creating Successful Masterplans – a guide for clients and Design Reviewed Masterplans</i> • <i>By Design: urban design in the planning system towards better practice</i> (published by DETR) <p>These, and other publications, are available from our website www.cabe.org.uk</p>	
English Heritage (Judith Nelson, by email 07/04/10)	
<p>I am afraid that I am unable to respond in detail to this consultation but suggest that you take a look at our recent publication on SA/SEA and the Historic Environment which you can download from www.helm.org.uk. The historic environment is more than an environmental and cultural asset; it is an important driver for economic development and delivering social objectives. The historic environment contributes positively to all aspects of sustainable development. English Heritage is one of the designated environmental consultation bodies for SEA and SA.</p>	No changes required.
The Coal Authority (Rachael Bust, by email 13/04/10)	
Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make at this stage.	No changes required.
Natural England (Kieran Preston, by email 13/04/10)	
<p>We strongly support the preparation of village design statements (VDS), and very much welcome this draft SPD, which should help to guide and shape development in a way that reflects and enhances local character and distinctiveness. We support the incorporation of the VDS as an SPD, which should ensure it is given appropriate weight in planning decisions.</p> <p>While we do not wish to comment on individual proposals, we welcome the general approaches in the draft VDS, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strong reliance on landscape character and village character assessments. • The recognition of the role that hedges and associated landscape features can have on providing habitats for wildlife. 	No changes required.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emphasis on local distinctiveness in any new development. • The attention given to building form, appearance, materials and spacing of new development, amongst other considerations. 	
<p>We have some general comments on the text of the SPD:</p> <p><i>The Landscape Setting</i></p> <p>Section 3.10 and 3.11 refers to the importance hedges have in respect to wildlife and also refers to the area as being “ecologically rich”. While we concur with these statements we would advise that further information could be included in this section to give a more informative description of the “ecologically rich” area. References to biodiversity and the parish’s contribution to this should be mentioned, for example habitats and species contained within the area would improve the description of the Parish.</p>	<p>Further information on habitats, flora and fauna can be found in the accompanying SA and HRA.</p>
<p><i>Settlement Guidelines</i></p> <p>In the section on Settlement Guidelines (page 17), there is a need to consider protected species in terms of alterations to existing buildings and construction of new buildings. There is the potential for protected species (Bats / Barn Owls / Breeding Birds) to be present on/in existing buildings as well as other protected species such as great crested newts, water vole and badgers in the wider area which could be affected by building. Reference should be made in this section to ensure protected species such as these are considered in the design and construction/alteration of any building in the parish.</p>	<p>Additional guideline (S6) created to incorporate this.</p>
<p>We note in this section the recommendation that exterior lights should not adversely affect the character of the settlements or their settings. As exterior lighting can affect bats emerging from roost entrances and also foraging at night, we would also advise that exterior lights are positioned away from any potential bat roost or foraging areas (trees hedgerows etc.) to avoid any potential impacts on bats.</p>	<p>Additional guideline (S5) created to incorporate this.</p>
<p><i>Building Guidelines</i></p> <p>Natural England believes in encouraging the adoption of the principles of sustainability in all plans and</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
<p>projects. We support the implementation of standards such as; The Code for Sustainable Homes (http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/theenvironment/codesustainable1) and BREAAAM (http://www.breeam.org/), both of which are concerned with a range of measures from building design to water and energy use.</p> <p>We are generally supportive of the policies for building guidelines and while we note that a policy to cover sustainable design including sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) is not included within the SPD, we do note that this important area is included within policy GR2 of the Local Plan, which this SPD supplements.</p>	
<p><i>Open Spaces, Paths, Trees, Boundaries and Gateways</i></p> <p>Natural England believes that the provision of high quality green infrastructure should be an integral part of the creation of sustainable communities. One function of green infrastructure is the provision of new opportunities for access. Natural England's Access to Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt) gives a useful minimum standard of the extent and quality of provision which could be expected. Information regarding ANGSt is again available through our website at: http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/enjoying/places/greenspace/greenspacestandards.aspx</p> <p>We note in this section that the parish of Smallwood is characterised by open spaces, occurring within the farmland setting, spaces between settlements and within the gardens surrounding houses. Most of this land however is private (although there are many footpaths and rights of way within the parish) and it is acknowledged in the report that there is very little public open space within the settlements of Smallwood itself. While a policy to support provision of open spaces in this document is not included we do note that such provision is included in policy GR1 of the local plan which should create more public open spaces when developments are built.</p>	No changes required.
Smallwood Storage Ltd (Stephen Goodwin, Goodwin Planning Services, by post 20/04/10)	
We welcome the production of a VDS for Smallwood and believe this will greatly assist in the preparation and determination of planning applications. The document provides useful information in relation to	No changes required.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
existing design features and landscape character. It also provides useful guidance in relation to architectural heritage including materials and detailing.	
<p>We believe the document has missed an opportunity to identify existing problem sites which would potentially benefit from redevelopment. We note that there is limited mention in the highways and traffic section (7) regarding the use of the local road network by HGV's. The road network is generally very narrow and unsuitable for such HGV movements.</p> <p>The document would benefit from the identification of potential redevelopment sites, one of which, we believe should be the Smallwood Storage site. This is a brownfield site with substantial existing commercial buildings which generates considerable HGV movements through the local road network and settlements. We believe the area covered by the VDS would benefit substantially from the redevelopment of the site for a mixed use scheme which would provide a limited level of additional employment together with a range of housing, including affordable housing (if required).</p>	It is not the role of a Supplementary Planning Document to allocate sites for development.
Cheshire Wildlife Trust (Chris Driver, by email 21/04/10)	
<i>L1</i> Landscape Character should be more precisely defined and evaluated in order to allow assessment of whether or not development 'detracts' from it. The VDS could include relevant extracts from the Cheshire Landscape Character Assessment (2009), as well as the documents cited here.	Reference made to Cheshire Landscape Character Assessment in guideline L5.
<i>L2</i> Similarly, settings and important views should be identified on a map, with viewpoints and main elements identified.	Although this is outside the scope of the existing document, this is something to be considered in future reviews.
<i>L3</i> It would be helpful to explain which elements formulate the 'distinctive character'.	This is already covered

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
	within the guideline.
L4 The CWT supports this proposed guideline, which is based on sound detailed principles.	No changes required.
S1 Is already covered by LP Policy.	It is assumed that this comment relates to either Policy GR2 or Policy H6. The VDS provides more detail on GR2 in the form of a locationally specific guideline. H6 refers to the scale of residential development within the open countryside and Green Belt, with respect to limited development within an Infill Boundary Line (IBL) ¹ . Smallwood doesn't have an IBL due to the predominantly open and loose-knit character of existing development. Therefore no changes necessary.

¹ Within this boundary development is still subject to open countryside or Green Belt policies, but in addition some controlled housing infill may be permitted.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
S2 It would be helpful to define 'unobtrusive' in this context.	Comment noted.
S3 and S4 The CWT supports these proposed guidelines.	No changes required.
B1 – B6 These are very prescriptive and do not accommodate high quality contemporary design. Reliance on traditional materials and methods may be relatively costly and lead to pale imitations of the original models. A low-density constraint would not allow affordable housing, which may be the most sustainable (and necessary) form of development in the rural context.	The guidelines are worded to allow some flexibility with the words 'normally' and 'where appropriate'. They also wouldn't prevent high quality, contemporary design being acceptable.
<i>Paragraph 6.3</i> Neither Sycamore nor Beech are native to the area, and their use should not be encouraged	'Native' deleted and replaced with 'common'.
OS2 It would be helpful to identify and place TPOs on important hedgerow trees. Species and sizes of preferred replacement trees should be given.	Information on Tree Preservation orders and tree planting are included in SPD 14: Trees and Development.
<i>Paragraph 8.2</i> Are there also opportunities in the river or brook for micro-power generation?	Information on small hydro schemes can be found in Planning for Renewable Energy: A Companion Guide to PPS22.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
Domestic-scale wind turbines are now considered to be inefficient in overall energy costs. (i.e. it costs more energy to make them than they save during their operating lifetime).	Research from the European Commission shows that this is not the case, therefore no changes required.
It is unclear how 'reed beds and willow (?)' would improve the <u>efficiency</u> of sewage disposal, although they could have advantages for biodiversity and pre-treatment water quality of domestic effluent to cess pits/septic tanks and highways run-off.	Text amended.
<i>Appendix 4</i> Other noteworthy sites of biological value which should be mentioned are: Brookhouse Swamp SBI Grade A, Wet woodland/marshy grassland, Smallwood SBI Grade B	These sites are mentioned in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.
National Trust (Alan Hubbard, by email 22/04/10)	
The National Trust welcomes the initiative that has been taken locally to pursue the production of a VDS. It is re-assuring that local people take a special interest in the history and character of the places where they live and accordingly this initiative is generally welcomed and supported. The use of the final document to inform both LDF work as well as the preparation and assessment of planning applications would be appropriate (para 1.18).	No changes required.
The Trust's specific interest in this matter relates to its ownership and management on behalf of the nation, in accordance with its statutory purposes, of Little Moreton Hall which is situated some 2.5 kms to the east of the Village. Little Moreton Hall is regarded as one of the finest, if not the finest, example of Domestic Tudor Architecture in England. The Hall is a Scheduled Monument as well as a Grade I Listed Building and its grounds are unusual for having two prospect mounds. The National Trust owns 7 acres	No changes required.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
and a further 23 acres of land around the property are under restrictive covenants to help protect part of the immediate setting. Additional information about the Hall, including the Trust's Statement of Significance, can be provided on request.	
It is agreed (para 3.1) that the open countryside between settlements in this part of Cheshire is a key and defining characteristic. In this particular case it is also considered that the countryside to the south and east of Smallwood, including a small portion of land within the area covered by the SPD, forms part of the essential wider setting of Little Moreton Hall. As part of its work on "Conservation Performance" at Little Moreton Hall the Trust has identified that its wider setting is a key feature of the property and the related objective seeks to ensure that the setting is protected from adverse impacts – 'performance' in this regard is re-assessed on an annual basis. A plan is enclosed with this response identifying the assessed setting based upon work undertaken on site by Trust staff. It is anticipated that this work will have increasing importance in the context of existing planning policy and guidance, in particular following the recent publication of PPS5 (especially relevant are Policies HE6, HE9 and HE10) and the related Planning Practice Guide (e.g. paras 113 – 124).	Comment noted.
It is considered that reference to the south eastern part of the VDS area also being part of the wider setting of Little Moreton Hall should be added to Section 3 of the document.	Reference added to paragraph 3.11.
The proposed Landscape Guidelines are supported, but it is considered that they should be supplemented to include a new Guideline after L2 as follows: " Should not detract from the wider setting of Little Moreton Hall, including views to and from the Hall ". In this context the Guidelines would also supplement 'saved' Congleton Local Plan Policy BH4 .	Additional guideline added.
The content of Section 4 of the VDS is generally agreed; the reference at para 4.10 to the adverse impacts of light pollution is noted and supported. Accordingly the Settlement Guidelines are supported.	No changes required.
The Trust has no specific observations to make on Section 5 of the consultation document.	No changes required.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
In respect of Section 6 it is agreed that the open spaces are a key component of the distinctive character of the VDS area, and in particular that roadside and hedgerow native trees and areas of woodland are identifying features that are important positive elements of the landscape. The Open Spaces, Paths, Trees, Boundaries and Gateways Guidelines are supported.	No changes required.
The Vision for the future is considered to be appropriate and to reflect the key local characteristics of Smallwood.	No changes required.
United Utilities (David Sherratt, by email 23/04/10)	
<p>As there is little information on the size, location or timescale for the proposed developments; United Utilities Water plc (UU) does have any specific comments to make at this stage.</p> <p>UU suggests that developments should take place at locations accessible to existing public sewers & water mains. Developments may require enhancement to existing UU wastewater treatment facilities and water supplies. Developments must be drained on a separate system and sustainable drainage techniques should be employed.</p>	Comments noted.
Environment Agency (Catherine Hunt, by email 23/04/10)	
2.4 We note that there are two rivers through the Parish – the Croco and The Brook. If these rivers are designated ‘main river’, the Environment Agency under the Water Resources Act 1991 has the powers to control any development, in, under, over or within 8 metres of any river designated ‘main river’.	Comment noted. Neither the Croco nor The Brook are designated ‘main rivers’.
If any new development is to take place within Flood Zones 2 (medium probability risk of flooding) and Flood Zone 3 (high probability risk of flooding) or a site in Flood Zone 1 over one hectare (low probability risk of flooding) a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would need to be submitted with any planning application which should meet the requirements outlined in PPS 25: Development and Flood Risk, Annex E. Housing developments should be steered to areas at the lowest risk of flooding by applying the	Comments to be addressed in Appendix 1 of the SA in the Water and Soil section.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
'Sequential Test' in line with PPS25.	
We would recommend the use of Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) where possible which can positively be incorporated into the design of any new development. Support for the SuDS approach to managing surface water run-off is set out in paragraph 22 of Planning Policy Statement 1: Sustainable Development (PPS1) and in more detail in PPS25 Annex F.	Information on SuDs can be found in SPD 4: Sustainable Development.
3.3 We note that Brookhouse Moss Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) lies within the Smallwood Parish and is now protected. We recognise that this site supports Alder Buckthorn and also nationally important communities of mosses, liverworts and uncommon flowering plants and supports the nationally rare Bog Rosemary.	Comment noted.
3.10 We welcome this paragraph which highlights the importance of hedgerows as being important to wildlife and they can positively enhance biodiversity.	No changes required.
4.8 We support the re-use of existing buildings and conversions of redundant barns to dwellings. We support the re-use of brownfield land and whilst brownfield land is generally relatively limited in rural areas, its re-use creates opportunities to positively contribute to the sustainability of rural areas within the borough.	No changes required.
6.1 We support this statement that open spaces have been recognised as 'essential ingredients' of Smallwood. Open space in Smallwood can positively contribute to Green Infrastructure (GI).	No changes required.
We recognise the importance of GI and support the development of GI networks. GI can provide many benefits, including flood storage, biodiversity and recreation. Particular areas of flood risk may be addressed through the protection or provision of GI. Additionally, GI can also have wider community benefits. Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (PPS9) refers to GI as 'networks of natural habitats' which should be maintained by avoiding or repairing fragmentation and	Comment noted.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
isolation of natural habitats. Such networks should be protected from development, and where possible, strengthened by or integrated within it. See http://www.greeninfrastructure.eu/ for more information.	
6.4 We welcome the inclusion of the statement relating to 'more tree planting of 'native' species should be encouraged where it fits in with the landscape'. We support this and we would recommend the use of native species where possible, not only in relation to tree planting, but also more broadly and we recommend the use of native species within any landscaping scheme. If there are distinct local varieties where the local gene pool should be maintained, then stocks of local provenance should be used. British forms tend to be more resistant to frost and damp than their European counterparts, and flower and fruit at times more appropriate to the British animals that depend on them.	Comment noted.
8.2 We welcome the inclusion of this paragraph and our vision outlined in our new Corporate Strategy, Creating a Better Place 2010 -2015, compliments this as we all need to act to reduce climate change and its consequences. We support the development and use of low-carbon technologies, including renewable energy such as domestic scale wind turbines and solar panels, while minimising other environmental impacts.	No changes required.
Government Office for the North West (Carolyn Burgess, by email 7/05/10)	
<i>General</i> There is good use of illustrations which help the flow of the document. It is a well organised and informative document with good use of cross references and appendices. Perhaps photographs could be used more to refer specifically in text to what they are trying to illustrate.	Text amended.
<i>Chapter 1: Introduction</i> The Policy Context should be separate from the Introduction, or at the end of it, for clarity.	Policy context moved to the end of the Introduction.
Page 1. The Map showing Smallwood Parish Boundary could be enlarged for greater impact.	Map enlarged.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
Page 2. The inclusion of Burdett's Historical Map of Smallwood 1777 is interesting and if the aim is to demonstrate the differences between the Parish Boundary now and then, and to put the Village Design Statement into context of "past and present", this could be described in the Introduction.	Comment noted. The map was inserted to provide a historical background.
Page 2. What is a Village Design Statement? This section could include information to say that the Statement is a Supplementary Planning Document as part of the Local Development Framework and go on to refer to existing policies that relate to this area.	Text amended to include reference to the LDF and that the VDS is an SPD. Relevant policies are mentioned in the SA Scoping Report and SA.
Page 3. Purpose of the document is already mentioned in Paras 1.2 - 1.4, which could include reference to the Local Plan policies GR1, GR2 and GR5 as in Para 1.9.	Paragraph 1.9 deleted and text amended in para 1.2 to include reference to the supplemented policies.
Page 3. Please clarify and expand paragraphs 1.10 Method of Approach and para 1.11; e.g. these paragraphs could be incorporated into the 'National, Regional and Local Policy Context' section.	Paragraphs 1.10 and 1.11 incorporated into 'Policy Context' section.
Page 5. Amend the end of Paragraph 1.15 to Appendix 6 for 4nw contact details.	Text amended.
<i>Chapter 2: The Village Context</i>	Map inserted to show

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
Page 6. Para 2.1. An extract from the Proposals Map could be used to illustrate this context.	details of Green Belt and Open Countryside.
<i>Chapter 3: Landscape Setting</i> Page 12. You may wish to delete “where appropriate” from the guidelines, to provide more certainty.	See previous comment from GONW (11/05/09).
Page 12. The last paragraph should state.. “the above guidelines supplement..”	Text amended.
<i>Chapter 4: The Settlement Pattern</i> Page 17. Settlement Guidelines could mention sustainability and also cohesive and/or complementary design and anything specific relating to Green Belt.	Information on sustainability can be found in SPD 4: Sustainable Development. Further design guidance can be found within the SPD.
<i>Chapter 5: Buildings</i> Buildings Guidelines. The previous point about describing low density made in previous GONW comments, and the need to fit with Local Plan policies, has not been addressed.	Text amended within the guideline with regards to low-density. The guideline is not contrary to local plan policy.
<i>Chapter 6: Open Spaces</i> The point made in previous GONW comments that the paragraph could refer to the existence of Tree Preservation Orders to protect threatened trees has not been addressed.	Text amended.

Comments/Issues Raised	Response
<p><i>Chapter 7: Highways and Traffic</i> This Chapter could be illustrated with a map of the roads, but does not really contain any guidance or say how it relates to the Local Plan or other policies.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Figure 4 incorporates a map of the roads.</p>
<p><i>Chapter 8: Vision for the Future</i> Para 8.2. Delete the word “any” from “support any measures...”</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>This Chapter could include expectations relating to population, rural economies, and facilities including schools, utilities, and infrastructure.</p>	<p>Although this is outside the scope of the existing document, this is something to be considered in future reviews.</p>
Draft Sustainability Appraisal	
Natural England (Kieran Preston, by email 13/04/10)	
<p>While we do not wish to comment on individual aspects of the reports, we acknowledge that you have broadly covered topics related to our interests of conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, geo-diversity, green infrastructure, landscape character and quality, sustainable use of resources and access to green spaces and countryside.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>
Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment	
Natural England (Kieran Preston, by email 13/04/10)	
<p>Given the nature of the SPDs, we are satisfied with the selection methodology and description of the European site, and welcome the interpretation of the site information to pick out the key points. We are satisfied that the methods of assessment and prediction are clearly explained and that the potential effects of the plan on the conservation objectives of the site are clearly demonstrated. Overall, we are satisfied with the assessment and concur with the conclusion that the proposed SPD is not likely to have a significant effect on European sites, alone or in combination with other plans or projects.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>