

# APPENDIX 1

Cheshire East Local Plan

The Garden Village at Handforth SPD

## **Report of Consultation: The Garden Village at Handforth Draft SPD**

---

December 2018

# Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
Draft SPD consultation .....	2
2. Consultation documents .....	3
First Draft Site Allocations and Development Policies Document.....	3
Background evidence and supporting documents .....	3
3. Document availability .....	4
4. Publicity and engagement .....	5
Consultation notifications.....	5
Other publicity.....	5
Consultation 'drop-in' session.....	6
5. Submitting comments .....	7
6. Representations received .....	7
7. Next steps.....	8

## Appendices

Appendix 1: Notification letter and email .....	9
Appendix 2: Screen shots from the council website .....	13
Appendix 3: Press releases.....	16
Appendix 4: Consultation response forms.....	20
Appendix 5: Summary of key issues and responses.....	23

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Local Plan Strategy allocates land east of the A34 in Handforth for the development of a new village. Referred to as the North Cheshire Growth Village in the plan, the new settlement is now referred to as the Garden Village at Handforth as it is one of a series of garden villages recognised nationally by the government.
- 1.2 When the LPS was adopted in July 2017 the site was identified as strategic site LPS 33 'North Cheshire Growth Village, Handforth East'. The allocation states:

*“The North Cheshire Growth Village presents an opportunity to deliver a high quality, comprehensively masterplanned new settlement, embodying sustainable development principles and incorporating the highest quality of design to represent an exemplar sustainable community, contributing to the identified housing, employment and infrastructure needs of the borough.”* (LPS paragraph 15.395).
- 1.3 In addition, in January 2017 the government announced the site as one of 14 new garden villages to be created across the UK. The government’s support to deliver new homes through the creation of new settlements was set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and further supported by the announcement of a new wave of garden villages, towns and cities in the 2016 budget. The 2016 budget was accompanied by the Garden Villages, Towns and Cities Prospectus (March 2016) published by the Department for Communities and Local Government which set out the government’s proposed approach to facilitating the delivery of the new garden villages, towns and cities. The inclusion of the site in the first tranche of government-backed new garden villages reflects a clear commitment and expectation that this new settlement will deliver a distinctive and very high-quality place.
- 1.4 The SPD is intended to provide the over-arching guidance for the development of the site.

## Draft SPD consultation

- 1.5 The Garden Village at Handforth draft SPD was published for consultation between 11 September and 22 October 2018. This report of consultation sets out the details of the consultation exercise. carried out on the first draft SADPD, the Interim Sustainability Appraisal, the Habitats Regulations Assessment and the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople ‘call for sites’.
- 1.6 In addition, there were also consultations on The First Draft Site Allocations and Development Policies Document. The Garden Village at Handforth draft supplementary planning document and the draft Statement of Community Involvement which took place at the same time. There are separate reports of consultation covering these documents.

- 1.7 The draft Statement of Community Involvement sets out how the council intends to involve all sectors of the community in the planning process in the future. As this document was only in draft form at the time of consultation on The Garden Village at Handforth draft SPD, consultation was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the council's approved Statement of Community Involvement (2010).

## 2. Consultation documents

- 2.1 Comments were invited on The Garden Village at Handforth draft SPD. An extensive series of supporting documents and background evidence was also published as appendices to the consultation document. Comments could be made on these documents by relating the comments to the corresponding text in the draft SPD.

### First Draft Site Allocations and Development Policies Document

- 2.2 The SPD is intended to provide the over-arching guidance for the development of the site. It will need to be supported by a more detailed design code which will flesh out much of the detail necessary to achieve the desired quality.
- 2.3 The overall vision for The Garden Village is: "To create a sustainable, integrated, inclusive, and vibrant community, where people of all ages and backgrounds can find a home that meets their needs through the different stages of their lives. A beautiful and characterful Cheshire Village in which to live, work and play. A place that is very well connected to its natural and urban surroundings. A distinct place with its own identity and a strong sense of community embedded within the highest quality environment."
- 2.4 The Core Objectives are:
- Establish the Vision and Strategic Objectives.
  - Identify the need for a comprehensive approach.
  - Identify the key infrastructure and key development requirements.
  - Provide a Comprehensive Masterplan.
  - Provide a Design Guide.
  - Outline the delivery plan, planning process and delivery programme.
- 2.5 Once adopted, although it is not part of the Development Plan, the SPD will be a material consideration that carries weight in decision making as a Local Development Document

### Background evidence and supporting documents

- 2.6 The background evidence and supporting documents were also published:
- A. Garden Village Principles and UK Settlement Case Studies

- B. Cheshire Village Centre Case Studies
- C. Supporting Plans and Technical Studies, including:
  - Agricultural Land Classification
  - Air quality Assessment
  - Arboricultural Impact Assessment
  - Archaeological Desk Based Assessment
  - Ecology Assessment
  - Economic and Social Impact Assessment
  - Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy and Sustainability Assessment
  - Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Assessment
  - Framework Travel Plan
  - Heritage Statement
  - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
  - Noise and Vibration Constraints Assessment
  - Ordnance Survey Site Location Plan
  - Parking Study
  - Phase 1 Desk Based Ground Conditions Assessment
  - Phase 2 Site Investigation Report
  - Outline Sports Need Assessment
  - Topographical Survey
  - Transport Assessment
  - Utilities Statement
- D. List of Development Plan Policies and relevant Background Documents
- E. Glossary

2.7 In addition, an executive summary document was produced to provide an easy to read overview of the draft SPD.

### 3. Document availability

- 3.1 Electronic copies of the consultation documents and the background evidence and supporting 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 and the background evidence and supporting documents 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 available for inspection at:
- Crewe Customer Service Centre, Delamere House, Delamere Street, Crewe CW1 2JZ;
  - Macclesfield Customer Service Centre, Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA;
  - Handforth library, The Green Wilmslow Road, Handforth SK9 3ES;
  - Poynton library, Park Lane, Poynton SK12 1RB; and
  - Wilmslow library, South Drive, Wilmslow SK9 1NW

- 3.4 All of the consultation documentation was made available in the above locations from 05 September 2018, ready for the start of the consultation period on 11 September.

## 4. Publicity and engagement

### Consultation notifications

- 4.1 Following adoption of the Local Plan Strategy in 2017, the council contacted all stakeholders on the council's local plan consultation database to ask them if they wished to continue receiving local plan updates and consultation notifications.
- 4.2 Notification of the consultation was sent to all active stakeholders on the council's local plan consultation database. This consisted of 56 printed letters sent on 10 September and 1,564 emails sent on 11 September. The stakeholders on this consultation database include local residents, landowners and developers, as well as planning consultants, businesses and organisations.
- 4.3 Copies of the notification email and letter are included in Appendix 1.
- 4.4 Separate email letters were also sent to Natural England, Historic England, the Environment Agency and Natural Resources Wales as statutory consultees, as well as all town and parish councils in Cheshire East and all MPs whose constituencies lie partly or wholly within Cheshire East Borough.
- 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](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk)
  - The Cheshire East Local Plan page: [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan)
  - The Local Plan consultations page: [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/planning/spatial\\_planning/cheshire\\_east\\_local\\_plan/local\\_plan\\_consultations](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/planning/spatial_planning/cheshire_east_local_plan/local_plan_consultations)
- 4.7 Screen shots from each of these pages are included in Appendix 2.
- 4.8 Two press releases were issued, informing people of the consultations. The first was issued on 12 September with the title 'Garden Village takes another step closer' and the second was issued on 17 September with the title 'Consultation begins on next phase of borough's development plan'. Copies of these press releases are included in Appendix 3.

- 4.9 The press releases resulted in a number of articles on the consultation being published, including:
- ‘Cheshire East moves 1,500-home Handforth Garden Village forward’, Place North West 22/08/18. [www.placenorthwest.co.uk/news/cheshire-east-moves-1500-home-handforth-garden-village-forward/](http://www.placenorthwest.co.uk/news/cheshire-east-moves-1500-home-handforth-garden-village-forward/)
  - ‘Council sets out vision for new garden village’, alderleyedge.com 24/08/18. [www.alderleyedge.com/news/article/17964/council-sets-out-vision-for-new-garden-village](http://www.alderleyedge.com/news/article/17964/council-sets-out-vision-for-new-garden-village)
  - ‘Council sets out vision for new garden village’, wilmslow.co.uk 24/08/18. [www.wilmslow.co.uk/news/article/17963/council-sets-out-vision-for-new-garden-village](http://www.wilmslow.co.uk/news/article/17963/council-sets-out-vision-for-new-garden-village)
  - ‘Delivery of Handforth Garden Village takes a step forward’, socheshire 08/09/18. <http://www.so-cheshire.co.uk/delivery-of-handforth-garden-village-takes-a-step-forward/>
  - ‘Public invited to consultation session on plans for Handforth Garden village’, wilmslow.co.uk 12/08/18. [www.wilmslow.co.uk/news/article/18019/public-invited-to-consultation-session-on-plans-for-handforth-garden-village](http://www.wilmslow.co.uk/news/article/18019/public-invited-to-consultation-session-on-plans-for-handforth-garden-village)
- 4.10 The consultation was also highlighted in the September edition of the council’s ‘Spatial Planning Update’ newsletter which is sent to all town and parish councils and displayed on the council’s website.
- 4.11 In addition, there was an article in the September / October edition of the Connected Communities newsletter, which was distributed at the end of September and is also available on the council’s website at [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/council\\_and\\_democracy/connected-communities/connected-community-newsletters/](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/council_and_democracy/connected-communities/connected-community-newsletters/)

## Consultation ‘drop-in’ session

- 4.12 A consultation drop-in session was held at Handforth Library on Tuesday 25 September from 3pm-7pm. This was publicised on the council’s website, as well as the notification letter / emails and the press release dated 17 September.
- 4.13 Representatives from Cheshire East Council and Engine of the North were available to discuss the SPD proposals.
- 4.14 Approximately 50 people attended the session, with a variety of comments made, including:
- The need to ensure high quality housing, rather than a typical housing estate;
  - Issues around impact on neighbouring properties;
  - Concerns over the release of safeguarded land;

- The need to improve public transport;
- Concerns around highway capacity; and
- Drainage issues.

4.15 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](mailto:locaplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk); or
- By post to Spatial 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, 36 different people / organisations submitted comments to the consultation. These comments can be viewed on the consultation portal at <http://cheshireeast-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/spd/gardenvillage?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:

- Better cycling provision
- Improvements to public transport; links to station and station facilities need an upgrade
- Need to consider how public transport can be better integrated
- Clearer guidance required on education and medical provision at the site
- Insufficient mitigation for lost green areas
- SPD could be strengthened by more emphasis on the important habitats and species on site
- Need to consider impact on adjacent green belt areas and especially Blossoms Lane
- Concern over merging of Handforth and Woodford.
- Concerns over the secondary access to Dairy House Lane

- Concern over drainage arrangements
- Questions regarding the need for employment land.
- Need more detail on the future for MoD / Total Fitness sites.
- Responses from statutory bodies and infrastructure providers.
- Provision of infrastructure and phasing.

6.3 A full summary of the key issues raised, the council's response and how the SPD has been amended as a result is set out in Appendix 5.

## 7. Next steps

7.1 All comments received on the first draft SADPD have been fully considered and the draft SPD has been revised to take account of as many of these representations as possible, as set out in Appendix 5.

7.2 The amended document will be presented to the council's Strategic Planning Board and the Housing Planning and Regeneration Portfolio Holder with a recommendation that the document be approved as a supplementary planning document.

# Appendix 1: Notification letter and email



*Working for a brighter future: together*

«AddressBlock»

**Planning and Sustainable Development**  
Westfields, Middlewich Road  
Sandbach  
CW11 1HZ  
Tel: 01270 685893  
Email: [localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk)

DATE: 10/09/2018      OUR REF: FDSADPD      YOUR REF: «Person\_ID»

«GreetingLine»

## **Cheshire East planning documents consultations 11 September – 22 October**

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

Following the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy last year, the council is preparing a number of additional planning policy documents. These are being consulted on between 11 September and 22 October 2018. They are:

- First Draft Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD);
- SADPD Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment;
- The Garden Village at Handforth draft supplementary planning document;
- Revised and updated Statement of Community Involvement; and
- A 'call for sites' that may be suitable for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation.

A brief explanation of each of these is set out overleaf.

The consultation documents and comments forms are available on the council's website at [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan) and in Cheshire East customer service centres and libraries. Responses should be returned to us using the consultation portal on our website, by email to [localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk) or by post to Spatial Planning (Westfields), C/O Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe CW1 2BJ by no later than **Mon 22 October**. 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 "A. Fisher".

**Adrian Fisher**  
**Head of Planning Strategy**

## Cheshire East planning policy consultations 11 September – 22 October 2018:

The **Site Allocations and Development Policies Document** (SADPD) will contain detailed planning policies and site allocations. Once adopted, its policies will be used alongside the Local Plan Strategy and neighbourhood plans to help determine planning applications. This consultation is on the first draft of the SADPD and is an important opportunity to help shape its policies and proposals, and to help us make sure that the document will provide an up-to-date planning framework to support our ambition of making the borough an even better place to live, work and visit.

In addition to the First Draft SADPD, we are also consulting on its accompanying **Sustainability Appraisal** and **Habitats Regulations Assessment** which look at the SADPD's contribution to sustainable development and its impact on internationally-designated nature conservation sites.

There is also a consultation on the draft supplementary planning document for **The Garden Village at Handforth** which includes a masterplan and design guide to inform development on this important site. We are holding a consultation drop in session at Handforth Library from 3pm – 7pm on Tuesday 25th September where more information will be available.

We are consulting on a revised and updated **Statement of Community Involvement** which sets out how the council will engage with stakeholders and the wider public when preparing planning policies and considering planning applications.

Finally, we are also carrying out a 'call for sites' that may be suitable for **Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation**.

Further information is available on our website [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan), at Cheshire East libraries and customer service centres, or by contacting the Spatial Planning Team:

Tel: 01270 685893

Email: [localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk)

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

**Printed letter sent to the local plan consultation database**

**From:** LOCAL PLAN

**Sent:** 11-Sep-2018 09:24

**To:** LOCAL PLAN

**Subject:** Cheshire East planning documents consultations 11 September - 22 October

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

Following the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy last year, the council is preparing a number of additional planning policy documents. These are being consulted on between 11 September and 22 October 2018. They are:

- First Draft Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD);
- SADPD Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment;
- The Garden Village at Handforth draft supplementary planning document;
- Revised and updated Statement of Community Involvement; and
- A 'call for sites' that may be suitable for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation.

A brief explanation of each of these is set out below.

The consultation documents are available on the council's website at [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan) and in Cheshire East customer service centres and libraries. Responses should be returned to us using the consultation portal on our website; by email to [localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk); or by post to Spatial Planning (Westfields), C/O Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe CW1 2BJ by no later than **Mon 22 October**. 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.

The **Site Allocations and Development Policies Document** (SADPD) will contain detailed planning policies and site allocations. Once adopted, its policies will be used alongside the Local Plan Strategy and neighbourhood plans to help determine planning applications. This consultation is on the first draft of the SADPD and is an important opportunity to help shape its policies and proposals, and to help us make sure that the document will provide an up-to-date planning framework to support our ambition of making the borough an even better place to live, work and visit.

In addition to the First Draft SADPD, we are also consulting on its accompanying **Sustainability Appraisal** and **Habitats Regulations Assessment** which look at the SADPD's contribution to sustainable development and its impact on internationally-designated nature conservation sites.

There is also a consultation on the draft supplementary planning document for **The Garden Village at Handforth** which includes a masterplan and design guide to inform development on this important site. We are holding a consultation drop in session at Handforth Library from 3pm – 7pm on Tuesday 25th September where more information will be available.

We are consulting on a revised and updated **Statement of Community Involvement** which sets out how the council will engage with stakeholders and the wider public when preparing planning policies and considering planning applications.

Finally, we are also carrying out a 'call for sites' that may be suitable for **Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation**.

Further information is available on our website [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan), at Cheshire East libraries and customer service centres, or by contacting the Spatial Planning Team at [localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk) or on 01270 685983.

Yours faithfully,

Adrian Fisher  
Head of Planning Strategy  
Cheshire East Council

**Email sent to the local plan consultation database**

# Appendix 2: Screen shots from the council website

**Cheshire East Council** A to Z site Index

Enter Keywords Search

---

**I want to find...**

<a href="#">Jobs at the Council</a>	➤	<a href="#">Library books to renew or reserve</a>	➤	<a href="#">Care and support for children and adults</a>	➤
<a href="#">Payments to the Council</a>	➤	<a href="#">Council Tax</a>	➤	<a href="#">Housing</a>	➤
<a href="#">Bins and recycling</a>	➤	<a href="#">Benefits entitlements</a>	➤	<a href="#">Leisure and culture</a>	➤
<a href="#">Planning and planning applications</a>	➤	<a href="#">Business and Business Rates</a>	➤	<a href="#">Births, marriages and deaths</a>	➤
<a href="#">Schools and education</a>	➤	<a href="#">Roadworks and highway services</a>	➤	<a href="#">Rangers and outdoor recreation</a>	➤
<a href="#">Council and democracy</a>	➤	<a href="#">Car parks and parking</a>	➤	<a href="#">Environment</a>	➤
		<a href="#">Bus timetables and travel information</a>	➤		

---

**In Focus**

**2000 couples marry in Cheshire East**  
Breathtaking settings make Cheshire East a popular location for weddings

**News**

- [26/09/2018 - Digital programme proves a hit](#) ➤
- [25/09/2018 - Forgotten war heroes' names finally added to memorial](#) ➤
- [24/09/2018 Borough's road repairs continue apace](#) ➤
- [24/09/2018 Funding boost for homeless support](#) ➤
- [21/09/2018 - Regeneration plans for Crewe town centre take step forward](#) ➤

[Public Notices](#) | [Media Hub >>](#)

---

**Have your say**

**Consultations**

- [Planning policy consultations](#) - ends Monday 22 October, including the First Draft Site Allocations and Development Policies document; The Garden Village at Handforth draft supplementary planning document; and a revised Statement of Community Involvement.
- [Learning disabilities strategy consultation](#) - ends Friday 5 October 2018
- [Mental health strategy consultation](#) - ends Friday 5 October 2018
- [Join the digital influence panel](#)

**Planning applications**

- [Comment on a current planning application](#)

[More consultations](#)

**THE VoICE**  
The new Cheshire East Council resident magazine

**live well**  
Cheshire East

Live Well Cheshire East offers a range of services so you can find support, care and social activities for yourself or a loved one.

---

**Contact**

- [Contact the council](#)
- [Find your local councillor](#)

**Social media**

[Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [YouTube](#) [Google+](#) [LinkedIn](#)

[Other social media channels](#)

**Concerned about...**

- [Concerned about children?](#)
- [Concerned about adult abuse?](#)

---

**Maps and Services**

Screen shot of [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk) (taken 28 September 2018)

[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.

### Submit your views

Following the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy last year, work is in progress on some further documents to set out planning policies in the borough and there are a number of different consultations taking place between 11 September and 22 October 2018.

- The Site Allocations and Development Policies document will contain detailed planning policies and site allocations. Once adopted, its policies will be used alongside the LPS and neighbourhood plans to help determine planning applications. Further information on the [First Draft SADPD consultation](#) is available on our consultation portal.
- In addition to the SADPD, there is a [Sustainability Appraisal consultation](#) and a [Habitats Regulations consultation](#), which looks at the SADPD's contribution to sustainable development and its impact on internationally-designated nature conservation sites.
- There is also a [consultation on The Garden Village at Handforth draft SPD](#) which includes a masterplan and design guide to inform development on this important site.
- We are [consulting on a revised and updated Statement of Community Involvement](#) which sets out how the council will engage with stakeholders and the wider public on all of its principal planning functions.
- Finally, we are also carrying out a 'Call for Sites' that may be suitable for [Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation](#).

### 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
<a href="#">Local Plan Strategy</a>	Adopted 27 July 2017	The Local Plan Strategy 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.
<a href="#">Site Allocations and Development Policies document</a>	Consultation on the first draft runs until 22 October 2018	The SADPD will allocate the remaining sites needed for future development and set out further detailed planning policies to be used when considering planning applications. The <a href="#">First Draft SADPD consultation</a> runs from 11 September - 22 October 2018.
<a href="#">Minerals and Waste Development Plan Document</a>	Draft in preparation	The MWDPD will set out policies for dealing with minerals and waste, and identify sites. Consultation on an Issues Paper took place between 24 April and 05 June 2017, alongside a 'call for sites' for minerals and waste sites.

#### In this section

- [Local Plan Strategy Development Plan Document](#) >
- [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

All other planning enquiries (including planning application queries)

[Email Planning Department](#)

0300 123 5014

#### Rate this page

We value your feedback. How do you rate this information?



Screen shot of [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan) (taken 28 September 2018)

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

## Local Plan consultations

This page gives details of all consultations that have taken place on the new Local Plan and all those that are currently scheduled. The consultations are listed in reverse chronological order. Community engagement is very important in developing the new Local Plan. Responses received during each previous consultation stage have been considered and have helped to influence the production of the Local Plan. Consultations on Neighbourhood Plans are shown separately on the [Neighbourhood Planning](#) page.

### Current consultations

Following the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy last year, work is in progress on some further documents to set out planning policies in the borough and there are a number of different consultations taking place between 11 September and 22 October 2018.

- The Site Allocations and Development Policies document will contain detailed planning policies and site allocations. Once adopted, its policies will be used alongside the LPS and neighbourhood plans to help determine planning applications. Further information on the [First Draft SADPD consultation](#) is available on our consultation portal.
- In addition to the SADPD, there is a [Sustainability Appraisal consultation](#) and a [Habitats Regulations consultation](#), which looks at the SADPD's contribution to sustainable development and its impact on internationally-designated nature conservation sites.
- There is also a [consultation on The Garden Village at Handforth draft SPD](#) which includes a masterplan and design guide to inform development on this important site.
- We are consulting on a [revised and updated Statement of Community Involvement](#) which sets out how the council will engage with stakeholders and the wider public on all of its principal planning functions.
- Finally, we are also carrying out a 'Call for Sites' that may be suitable for [Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation](#).

### Previous consultations

#### Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule (September - November 2017)

Cheshire East Council intends to introduce a [Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule](#) for new development. Following consultation on a preliminary draft charging schedule in February - April 2017, we produced a Draft Charging Schedule for the proposed introduction of CIL. This sets out the level of CIL charge which is considered to be viable in different parts of the borough. Consultation ran from 25 September until 6 November 2017. To view the consultation documents and response received, please see the council's [consultation portal \(draft charging schedule page\)](#).

#### Minerals and Waste Issues Paper (April - June 2017)

The Minerals and Waste Development Plan Document will set out policies for dealing with minerals and waste, and identify sites. [Consultation on the Minerals and Waste Issues Paper](#) took place between 24 April and 05 June 2017, alongside a 'call for sites' for minerals and waste sites.

#### Site Allocations and Development Policies document - issues paper (February - April 2017)

The [Site Allocations and Development Policies document](#) will form the second part of the new Local Plan, allocating 'non-strategic' sites for development and setting detailed planning policies to guide development. Consultation on an issues paper took place between 27 Feb and 10 April 2017. We have now published the [SADPD Issues Paper Report of Consultation \(PDF, 2.6 MB\)](#). Further information and consultation responses are available to view on the Council's consultation portal: [Site Allocations and](#)

#### In this section

- [Development Strategy - Local Plan Consultation](#) >
- [Issues and Options Consultation 2011](#) >
- [Local Plan Consultations](#)
- [Mineral Issues Discussion Paper](#) >
- [Place Shaping Consultation](#) >
- [Sustainability Appraisal](#) >
- [Town Strategies 2012](#) >
- [Playing pitch strategy consultation](#) >

#### Contact us

Local Plan matters only

[Email Local Plan Team](#)

01270 685893

All other planning enquiries (including planning application queries)

[Email Planning Department](#)

0300 123 5014

#### Rate this page

We value your feedback. How do you rate this information?



Good



OK



Poor

Screen shot of

[www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/planning/spatial\\_planning/cheshire\\_east\\_local\\_plan/local\\_plan\\_consultations](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/planning/spatial_planning/cheshire_east_local_plan/local_plan_consultations) (taken 28 September 2018)

## Appendix 3: Press releases



### Garden Village takes another step closer

**12/09/2018**

The Garden Village at Handforth has taken a major step forward – passing another key delivery milestone.

Cheshire East Council's strategic planning board has already approved the consultation draft of the planning framework for the site and yesterday (Tuesday 11 September) the council's cabinet approved a suite of key practical measures necessary to progress delivery of the village.

These measures include authorising the council's executive director of place to enter into commercial, infrastructure and delivery agreements with other principal landowners and the successful tender developer. This will be funded from a £23m grant the council has secured from Homes England.

The proposed scheme is one of the government's 14 Garden Villages in the UK and locally, strategically and nationally significant.

This new Cheshire village will deliver 1,500 high-quality homes by 2030 in a sustainable, landscape-led development. A total of 47 hectares – more than 40 per cent of the site – will be green open space.

The draft supplementary planning document (SPD) sets the quality and design principles for The Garden Village and, once adopted, will form part of the planning policy that any future planning applications submitted for the site will be judged against. The SPD will ensure that the council's vision to deliver a high-quality, community-led Garden Village is realised and builds on the Local Plan Strategy and 'visioning' document for the site, as well as a suite of technical studies.

The council has now launched its consultation on the draft SPD, giving local stakeholders, interested parties and the public the opportunity to comment on the framework.

Councillor Ainsley Arnold, cabinet member for housing, planning and regeneration, said: “The Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy establishes the principle of creating a new plan-led settlement east of Handforth, promoting good growth for the region.

“This implementation strategy is one of the first of a number of steps the council will be taking to ensure the Garden Village becomes a reality as a great place to live and work. We therefore welcome as many comments as possible on the draft document.

“The draft SPD sets out the overarching design principles for the ‘Village Heart’ and each of the character areas of the Garden Village.”

Engine of the North will act as lead developer on behalf of the council and will submit a planning application to deliver the Village Heart and infrastructure.

Councillor Jamie Macrae, chairman of Engine of the North, said: “Engine of the North are the custodians of the council’s vision to create a truly sustainable and characterful new village for Cheshire East. This lifetime community will support its inhabitants as their lives grow and evolve, from first-time buyers to families, as well as older people looking to downsize.

“As over 40 per cent of the site will be green open space, amenity space and habitat protection, the Garden Village will not only be a great place to live but also somewhere for new and existing residents to come and enjoy their surroundings for generations to come.”

**Press release dated 12 September 2018.**



## Consultation begins on next phase of borough's development plan

**17/09/2018**

Public consultation has begun on the next phase of Cheshire East Council's development plan.

The finalised document will provide the approved framework for housing, employment, and other key infrastructure sites up to 2030.

With the Local Plan Strategy adopted last year, the council has now launched a number of consultations, which will help identify further non-strategic sites for sustainable development, including housing. However, no final decisions will be made until the consultation process is concluded and all feedback considered.

The site allocations and development policy document (SADPD) follows a similar pathway to the Local Plan Strategy, with two rounds of six-week public consultations, supported by a range of evidence documents and followed up with a series of public hearings chaired by a government planning inspector.

When adopted, the SADPD will replace the policies of the three former borough local plans, covering Macclesfield, Congleton and Crewe and Nantwich.

The majority of development needs have already been provided for through the Local Plan Strategy.

The sites in the SADPD will be non-strategic – generally sites of fewer than 150 homes or five hectares (12.4 acres) in size. Some will be focused in key employment areas in principal towns, or in smaller key service centres.

The council must also meet its obligation to provide affordable housing, Gypsy and Traveller sites and sites for Travelling Showpeople and, as part of the consultation process, is now calling for potential sites to be identified.

A further element of public consultation is the review of planning boundaries, such as those for greenbelt and built-up areas. But there will also be measures to protect land regarded as important for biodiversity and recreation.

Consultations on sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations have now begun, which look at the SADPD's contribution to sustainable development and its impact on internationally-designated nature conservation sites.

Councillor Ainsley Arnold, Cheshire East Council cabinet member for housing, planning and regeneration, said: "I would urge all interested members of the community to get involved in this important consultation process.

"We know that Cheshire East is a truly great place to live, work, do business, raise a family and have access to good schools and quality housing. It is crucial that this next phase in the local plan process is open and transparent and that we encourage as many people as possible, including stakeholders and partners, to engage in this consultation process.

"Our Local Plan Strategy and the SADPD are absolutely central to the achievement of sustainable development in the borough – so I would urge people to get involved and have their say."

The council is also consulting on a revised and updated 'statement of community involvement', which sets out how the council will engage with stakeholders and the wider public when preparing planning policies and considering planning applications.

As previously announced, this week also saw the start of a consultation on the draft supplementary planning document for the Garden Village at Handforth, which includes a masterplan and design guide to inform development on this important site.

The council will hold a consultation drop-in session at Handforth Library on Tuesday 25 September from 3pm-7pm, where more information will be available on this draft.

Links to all the consultation documents can be found by visiting the web page: [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan)

The consultations run until 22 October 2018.

**Press release dated 17 September 2018**

## Appendix 4: Consultation response forms

### Cheshire East Local Plan Consultation Response Form (Autumn 2018)



Following the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy last year, work is in progress on some further documents to set out planning policies in the borough and there are a number of different consultations taking place between 11 September and 22 October 2018. The consultation documents are listed below and can be viewed online at [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan](http://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
- Public libraries in Cheshire East\*.

You can use this consultation response form to submit comments on any of these documents:

- The **Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD)** will contain detailed planning policies and site allocations. Once adopted, its policies will be used alongside the Local Plan Strategy and neighbourhood plans to help determine planning applications. This is an important opportunity to help shape the policies and proposals in the SADPD and to help us make sure that the document will provide an up-to-date planning framework to support our ambition of making the borough an even better place to live, work and visit.
- In addition to the First Draft SADPD, we are also consulting on its accompanying **Sustainability Appraisal** and **Habitats Regulations Assessment** which look at the SADPD's contribution to sustainable development and its impact on internationally-designated nature conservation sites.
- There is also a consultation on the draft supplementary planning document for **The Garden Village at Handforth** which includes a masterplan and design guide to inform development on this important site.
- Finally, we are consulting on a revised and updated **Statement of Community Involvement** which sets out how the council will engage with stakeholders and the wider public on all of its principal planning functions.

We are also carrying out a 'call for sites' that may be suitable for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation, but there is a separate form available for this purpose.

#### 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.

**Online:** Via the consultation portal at [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/localplan)  
**Email:** To [localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto: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 **22 October 2018**. 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.

\* The Handforth Garden Village documents are available online and in Handforth, Wilmslow and Poynton libraries only.

# Cheshire East Local Plan Consultation Response Form (Autumn 2018)



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

**Please return by:** Monday 22 October 2018

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 type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
First Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Last Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 2	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 4	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Postcode	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Email Address (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Your Reference No. (if known)	<input type="text"/>	<input 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](mailto:localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk) or by telephone on 01270 685893.

## Comment Form Part B: Comment

Name and  
Organisation:

Office Use Only:

PID:

RID:

### Q1. Which document are you commenting on? (please tick one box)

- First Draft Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD)
- Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the First Draft SADPD
- Habitats Regulations Assessment of the First Draft SADPD
- The Garden Village at Handforth Draft Supplementary Planning Document
- Draft Statement of Community Involvement

### Q2. Which section of the document are you commenting on?

Paragraph / Policy / Site / Chapter / Figure

(please delete as appropriate and state which): \_\_\_\_\_

### Q3. What is your overall view on this section? (please tick one box)

- Support       Object       Comment only

### Q4. Please set out your comments or views on this section:

Printed consultation response form

## Appendix 5: Summary of key issues and responses

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
1	The document is lengthy and repetitive	The garden village site is a large and complex development site which seeks to become an exemplar new community. It is necessary for the SPD to provide extensive guidance to provide an appropriate framework for its development. A number of the issues are cross-cutting and in order to provide clarity in each section, it has been necessary to address some issues across different sections. However, every effort has been made to avoid repetition wherever possible.	Review draft document to use succinct language and remove unnecessary repetition where possible.
1	The principles cited within Paragraph 1.9 do not fully align with the TCPA Garden City Principles. It is our consideration that the principles should be applied in full, not simply on an ad-hoc basis, i.e. the removal of homes “which are generally affordable”. The SPD should therefore be amended., and the TCPA principles incorporated within the SPD.	There does not appear to be any reference to homes “which are generally affordable” either in the TCPA Garden City Principles or the principles set out in the SPD. The garden city principles have been tailored to this site (which is not a city) and are relevant to its local context.	Amend para 1.9 to further explain how the garden village principles have come about.
1	Further clarification of how the new community will “stand out from the ordinary” and will “embrace new architecture and technology to enrich people’s lives” is required.	The SPD provides a framework for the development of the new village. In particular, sections on the strategic objectives, key development requirements, the comprehensive masterplan and the design guide set out the ambitions for the site and give guidance on matters that will be determined through the planning	Add additional wording to the wording in para 1.19 in respect of access, community facilities, heritage and biodiversity..

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
		application process.	
1	<p>These initial site works will be paid for using Housing Infrastructure Funding from Homes England, which will then need to be subsequently repaid and is only provided on the basis that the site is completed by 2030. The repayment mechanism and timing of this needs to be made clear at the outset of the SPD.</p> <p>Clarification is also required as to whether the HIF is sufficient to meet the initial infrastructure requirements, or if further contributions will be required. Clarification is also required of the Council's contingency plan, should the HIF is subsequently made unavailable what the Council's contingency plan is.</p>	It is agreed that the SPD could provide additional guidance around this issue.	Include further guidance in chapter 1 (and elsewhere) of the SPD.
1	<p>The option of retaining Council ownership of the land does not seem to be considered. Why don't Cheshire East Council develop at least part of the asset themselves (possibly through an ASDV) and rent out some of the houses?</p> <p>If Cheshire East Council followed some of the innovative land arrangements used by CWAC then it could retain some control over the type and style of houses being built. It could insist on well insulated houses laid out in ways to promote communities and encourage cycling and other sustainable travel.</p>	Noted. The council's function as a landowner differs from that as the planning authority. It is considered that the retention / disposal of land and long term ownership arrangements are not the domain of a SPD.	Remove information on arrangements for disposal of plots from this section.

<b>Document section</b>	<b>Summary of key issues</b>	<b>Response to issues</b>	<b>Changes required</b>
1	Clarification is required from the Council as to when development plots will be made available and delivered. We re-emphasise the need for further involvement with landowners and developers to ensure the proposed plots are deliverable and fit for purpose.	The plots will be made available in a timely manner to support development in accordance with the phasing plan. The need for further involvement is noted. It is considered that the retention / disposal of land and long term ownership arrangements are not the domain of a SPD.	Remove information on arrangements for disposal of plots from this section
1	Further clarification of the role between the Council and the Engine of the North is required.	Engine of the North is a wholly-owned company of Cheshire East Council and will act for the council in respect of its role as landowner. Engine of the North will not act for the council in its role as the local planning authority.	Include further guidance in chapter 1 (and elsewhere) of the SPD.
2	Whilst it is accepted that the SPD will be a material consideration, it is considered that further engagement with individual landowners/ housebuilders is required to ensure that what is being proposed is deliverable, particularly as paragraph 2.9 states that this is the only opportunity for engagement in this document.	The SPD provides a framework for delivery of the new garden village. Ongoing engagement with individual landowners and housebuilders will be essential to its successful delivery.	No changes proposed.
2	Chapter 2 suggests that the SPD would provide a set of objectives and guidance for site at a single point in time, and that applications over the remainder of the Plan period which are not consistent with the SPD would be resisted. This provides little opportunity to respond to market signals or changes to the wider policy framework to both update the SPD and/or to respond positively to planning applications that are submitted later but could otherwise be found acceptable in planning terms.	The preparation of the SPD does not alter the statutory development plan, which remains the basis for determining planning applications, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. A whole range of issues (potentially including national policy changes and market signals) could be regarded as material considerations alongside the SPD.  However, the issue around changing context is recognised and it is proposed to	Add text to chapter 2 to confirm the council will monitor and review the SPD to make sure it remains up to date.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	This chapter should be redrafted to provide a mechanism where the SPD could be reviewed and/or that proposals which are inconsistent should instead be given no positive weight and then the planning balance test set out by s38 (6) of the Act be invoked.	add a commitment to monitoring and review.	
2	The outcome of the EIA screening request should be made available to developers/landowners.	The outcome of the EIA screening request will be published on the council's website in the usual manner.	No changes proposed.
3	Dairyhouse Farm should become a farming museum akin to that in Tatton Park	The LPS policy for the site requires that "development must facilitate the preservation and refurbishment of the Grade II listed Dairy House Farm". In the SPD, CA002 requires the restoration of Dairy House Farmhouse for a suitable use.  The farm could have a number of suitable uses but the SPD requirements would not preclude its use as a farming museum if suitable proposals were put forward.	No changes proposed.
3	The bulleted commentary which refers to Total Fitness (para 3.8) neglects to refer to the associated parking and also the sports court which is laid out to the south of the main Total Fitness building. For completeness, these should be expressly referred to.	Noted. The SPD could be updated to add further information on each of the existing uses on site.	Update paragraph 3.8 to add further detail to each of the existing uses.
3	The Coppice Way roundabout on the A34 will need to be upgraded. Its companion roundabout (immediately to the west) on Coppice Way will also need an upgrade. This	The highway mitigation proposals will upgrade the A34 / Coppice Way roundabout to accommodate development traffic.	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	complex junction already becomes congested at peak times and the problem will be greatly exacerbated by not only the opening of the Garden Village but also by the opening of the care village and housing estate south of Coppice Way. Intelligent traffic light control of this complex junction is warranted.	The roundabout within the retail park was included within the VISSIM modelling work and there was no indication that mitigation work would be required at it.	
3	Access to Handforth is currently almost impossible as the footbridge over the A34 links an area of marshy field and a woodland area, along the route of an old footpath	The proposals are to improve the quality of the footpath connections and their construction across the site, as well as replace the existing bridge with a new, more appropriately design bridge, which will address the concerns raised.	Add references to the details of pedestrian and cycle access being included within the Transport Assessment (Appendix C).
9	The Transport Plan places an excessive weight on the provision of a 'Rapid Bus Transport' proposal but the delivery of such a scheme and a timescale for delivery appears uncertain.	The proposed bus service would form the key public transport access to / from the site, the BRT would simply be an addition to this. The TA outlines how the new village will be provided with accessibility via public transport, particularly the proposed bus service to the development. A minor amend is proposed to signpost this information.	Add references to detailed information on proposed public transport access to the site being provided within the Transport Assessment, (Appendix C).
3	There is a shoppers 1 day per week and a service bus which goes to Cheadle via Heald green. It is not possible to get to Handforth from Handforth Dean on a regular service bus.	Paragraph 13.8 makes reference to bus stops in Handforth Dean Retail Park, not Handforth itself. The bus service to the retail park (No. 312) provides hourly services throughout the day (although not to Handforth centre). The public transport requirements in chapter 13 note that development should (where possible) provide direct access for bus services the connect The Garden Village to Handforth station, the district centre and beyond.	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
3	The Bus Rapid Transit route should pass through the station car park (park and ride system) that is proposed adjacent to Handforth Youth Centre and through the existing village high street rather than down Earl Road (which already supports a bus route).	Noted. The Bus Rapid Transit scheme is being proposed to run between Hazel Grove and Manchester Airport. Cheshire East Council, Stockport MBC and the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) are working together to plan and deliver this route.	No changes proposed.
3	The number of trains stopping at Handforth station has now been reduced to only 1 per hour and 2 at rush hour, not as stated in your document. There is 1 bus per hour, which travels from Macclesfield to Manchester. The local buses through the estates to Stockport have been discontinued. It is worth noting that while Handforth is only 4 miles from Manchester airport there are no public transport services. The only method of travel is car or taxi	The current Northern Rail timetable (May 2018 - Dec 2018) details two services throughout the day between Handforth to Manchester with three services in peak hours. The upcoming timetable (Dec 2018 - May 2018) maintains the exact same service.  According to the TfGM website all five services are still in existence with operating times and frequencies that match those noted in the TA. One of these timetables came into effect in April 2018, three in September 2018 and one in October 2018. It is proposed that the Bus Rapid Transit route will run to Manchester Airport.	Update the TA appendices (which present the bus timetables) accordingly.
3	The proposed new village would have an impact on the number of passengers likely to travel by rail to/from Handforth station, therefore it is vital that the Council works with developers to ensure that this impact is fully assessed, with adequate funding identified to enable all necessary enhancement works to be undertaken. Focus should be on accessibility (to and within the station), passenger facilities, security, capacity and	Noted. The council will continue to engage with Network Rail and developers regarding impacts on Handforth railway station  As noted below, the Friends of Handforth Station, in conjunction with CEC, Northern Rail and Handforth Parish Council have commissioned a GRIP 2 study. This study will allow the consortium to apply to Access for All for funding to support the installation	No changes proposed

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>parking (both for cars and cycles).</p> <p>The Council and developers should seek to engage with Network Rail and the Train Operating Company to understand the impact of increase passenger usage at Handforth Station as a result of this development and identify any necessary enhancements through the production of a feasibility study.</p>	<p>of a pair of lifts.</p>	
3	<p>The car parks in Handforth are full already. The prospect of extra commuters from the Garden Village driving to the village to catch trains to Manchester is a real concern</p> <p>There are three solutions. Firstly a pay and display station car park with bicycle storage on the Cheshire East owned land adjoining the Youth Centre off Old Road - this may need some realignment to to improve the present dangerous Junction of Old Road with Station Road. Secondly the introduction of limited time free shopping car parking by way of a disc system or meters allowing say 2 hours ticketed free parking. Thirdly a complimentary bus service from the Garden Village to the Station car park along Coppice Way and Lower Meadow Way - this should be considered separately from the proposed BRT until it can be shown that the BRT is reality</p> <p>There is an opportunity to form a toilet facility</p>	<p>Noted. The use of this land for station parking is identified on the parameter plan as a potential park and ride facility with car and cycle parking and a bus connection. The potential provision of free shopping parking in Handforth district centre, is beyond the scope of the SPD. The proposed bus service between the garden village and Handforth would be routed past the station, with the proposal being for a stop within the park and ride site.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	in the library or in the expanded doctors surgery and this should be a community improvement provided and funded by the Garden Village		
3	While there is currently no suitable access for the disabled at Handforth station, The Friends of Handforth Station, in conjunction with CEC, Northern Rail and Handforth Parish Council have commissioned a GRIP 2 study. This study will allow the consortium to apply to Access for All for funding to support the installation of a pair of lifts.	Noted	No changes proposed.
3	<p>The Station does not have any facility for disabled or pushchair access to the station platforms - this is not mentioned in the SPD and needs to be addressed</p> <p>This will exclude those with small children, the disabled and the elderly because there aren't any lifts or ramps at the station they won't be able to access the platforms.</p>	Noted. Para 3.20 in the SPD acknowledges the lack of disabled access at Handforth railway station and consideration is being given to access improvements.	No changes proposed.
3	Only limited reference is made to existing ground conditions (Paragraph 3.21) within this section. a permit for closure has not yet been submitted for the southern landfill because gas emissions had not stabilised (at the time of survey) and that elevated methane concentrations and gas flows had previously been encountered. Whilst the report is clear that this appears to be low, clarification on the impact on public health for residential development is required, due to elevated levels within the groundwater and	The previous industrial and military operations of the site have been thoroughly investigated and assessed by way of both desk based and intrusive ground investigation fieldworks. Sources of contamination are noted on site and the council will require a suitably robust remediation strategy to be submitted for the review (and approval of) by the council and the Environment Agency in advance of any construction works in order to mitigate risks posed.	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	the need for passive protection measures for low-rise housing.		
4	NPPF is clear that SPDs are a “framework” to guide development, rather than a requirement which needs to be so strictly adhered to that any future development which potentially conflicts in part with this SPD would be refused. This needs to be reflected throughout the SPD.	Future planning applications will be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan (particularly the policy for strategic site LPS 33) with reference to other material considerations (including this SPD which sets out a framework for the development of the site).	Amend the wording of key requirements boxes to reflect the SPD’s status as guidance.
4	The neighbourhood Plan for Handforth was adopted by CEC in July 2018.	Noted; the SPD will be updated.	Update the SPD to reference the Handforth Neighbourhood Plan as part of the statutory development plan.
5	Further clarity is required to confirm the Council’s approach, on the basis that each developer/housebuilder will want to submit their own reserved matters application.	It is intended that developers will submit their own reserved matters applications for plots in due course, which will be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.	Minor amends to clarify the approach to the planning process.
5	We don’t believe there are enough planned infrastructure facilities and services built into the draft SPD to make the vision a reality.	The SPD already provides significant levels of detail regarding the green infrastructure, community infrastructure and other infrastructure proposed. Whilst not wishing to add duplicate, the SPD could further emphasise the importance of infrastructure.	Add further details to the SPD regarding the provision of infrastructure and the delivery mechanisms to achieve this.
5	It is unclear what the developers’ role will be given that Engine of the North will be submitting the application and applying the masterplan requirements so rigidly. A degree of flexibility within the SPD is required.	It is intended that developers will submit their own reserved matters applications for plots in due course, which will be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.	Amend the wording of key requirements boxes to reflect the SPD’s status as guidance.
6	To ensure the social objectives fully align with the Vision, policy requirements derived	The use of the word ‘village’ is considered appropriate in describing the strategic	Amend the heading for social objective 1 to include the word

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>from LPS33 and Garden Village Principles, the following amendments are required:            Create an inclusive, diverse and vibrant village. Amend to state “create a sustainable, inclusive, diverse and vibrant community” rather than a village, to reflect the Garden Village principles.            Create a self-managing and self-sufficient village. Amend bullet point 2 – clarification of how a community run “managed village” will work in practice is required, again to ensure compliance with the Garden Village principles.</p>	<p>objectives for the garden village. It would also be appropriate to add the word ‘sustainable’.</p> <p>Further detail on the community management, maintenance and governance is set out in section 9 of the SPD.</p>	sustainable.
6	Specific reference to provision of education should appear among the social objectives.	It is agreed that reference to education should be included in the social objectives.	Add a specific reference to education to the social objectives.
6	<p>To ensure the environmental objectives fully align with the Vision, policy requirements derived from LPS33 and Garden Village Principles, the following amendments are required:            Create a distinctive village. Bullet point 3 refers to the provision of “self-build and community build homes” within each area. It is unclear where this will be proposed and clarification is required.            Create a timeless village. The site will be delivered by a number of different landowners and housebuilders with different house type styles. Clarification on the type of development envisaged by the Council is required.</p>	<p>The SPD provides guidance and sets the framework for the future development of the site but it does not provide detailed layout plans. It requires the provision of self build homes within each character area, but it will be for the future planning application to propose the precise details for delivering this requirement.</p> <p>The SPD provides significant levels of design guidance which (alongside the Cheshire East Design Guide) will inform further design codes. The preparation of further design codes is explained in chapter 12 (The planning process section).</p>	No changes proposed to the objectives but add further information on the process for preparing further design codes to chapter 12..
6	Strongly support the objective to achieve a biodiversity net gain for the Garden Village	The Defra biodiversity metric will be used to calculate the extent of habitat creation	Add reference to environmental objectives to retain key habitat

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>but recommend that the SPD provides clear advice on how biodiversity net gain should be measured e.g. use of the Defra metric. This will provide consistency for developers and will simplify the application determination process.</p> <p>We would like to see an additional objective around conserving important existing habitats like trees, hedgerows and ponds.</p>	<p>required to deliver a net gain for biodiversity.</p> <p>The masterplan seeks to retain key habitats across the site where possible, including ponds, trees, hedgerows, woodland and connecting green features. The objectives could be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>An update can to clarify that existing trees shown to be retained on the parameters plan must be retained and protected wherever possible.</p>	<p>features where possible.</p> <p>Amend the biodiversity section in chapter 9 to clarify that the Defra biodiversity metric will be used and that existing trees shown on the parameters plan must be retained where possible.</p>
6	<p>Inclusion of sustainable drainage systems and application of the surface water hierarchy are very important. Recommend the inclusion of two additional environmental objectives:</p> <p>‘A village with exemplary sustainable drainage for the management of surface water.’</p> <p>‘A village that incorporates sustainable construction techniques including water efficiency measures.’</p>	<p>The SPD already requires exemplary sustainable drainage and water efficiency measures but it could include a further environmental objective to highlight the importance of these issues.</p>	<p>Add a new environmental objective to address sustainable drainage and water efficiency measures.</p>
6	<p>To ensure the economic objectives fully align with the Vision, policy requirements derived from LPS33 and Garden Village Principles, the following amendments are required:</p> <p>Be an economic generator. The scheme will create a number of employment benefits, but it is unclear whether these opportunities will be for local people. Clarification is required.</p>	<p>The economic objectives already include an objective for sourcing local labour supplies to build, grow and maintain the village.</p> <p>The economic objectives are clear that the village should provide flexible work spaces, homes, wi-fi and superfast broadband, encouraging working from home and</p>	<p>Add information on the requirements for delivery of communications infrastructure in chapter 9.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>Create an integrated village. The SPD seeks to deliver flexible workspace, homes, WiFi and superfast broadband to encourage home working and shared spaces. However, this is not included as part of the economic objectives of the Site. This needs to be updated to reflect this.</p>	<p>through shared workspaces.</p> <p>Further information on communications infrastructure could be added in chapter 9.</p>	
7	<p>There is a licensed groundwater abstraction borehole located on the site. Any proposals to redevelop this area of the site will need to be accompanied by an appropriate plan and method statement to ensure that the borehole is decommissioned in accordance with relevant standards and guidance.</p>	<p>Noted. This will need to be addressed through the planning applications.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>
7	<p>Due to the former land use(s), soil and /or groundwater contamination may exist at the site and the associated risks to controlled waters should be addressed by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Following the risk management framework provide in CLR11, Model procedures for the management of land contamination.</li> <li>2. Referring to the Environment Agency guiding principles for land contamination and the land contamination sections in the Environment Agency’s Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice.</li> <li>3. Further information may be found on the land contamination technical guidance pages on the direct.gov website.</li> </ol> <p>All investigations of land potentially affected by contamination should be carried out by or</p>	<p>Noted. Assessments will be required at planning application stage with reference to the guidance and principals identified.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>under the direction of a suitably qualified competent person and in accordance with BS 10175 (2001).</p> <p>Contaminated soil that is, or must be, disposed of is waste. Therefore it's handling, transport and disposal is subject to waste management legislation which includes:  Duty of Care Regulations 1991  Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2005  Environmental permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010  The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011</p> <p>Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised both chemically and physically in line with British Standard BS EN 14899:2005</p>		
7	<p>Further clarification needs to be provided at the outset in terms of what the costs for infrastructure and ongoing maintenance will be because it is unclear at this stage what contributions and legal agreements the landowners will enter into and the extent of contributions sought.</p>	<p>Noted. Further general information can be added to the SPD regarding the provision, funding and delivery of infrastructure as well as the arrangements for future community governance and maintenance. It is not within the scope of the SPD to give precise detail on the level of contributions that will be required.</p>	<p>Add further information regarding the provision, funding and delivery of infrastructure as well as the arrangements for future community governance and maintenance.</p>
7	<p>The purpose of an SPD is to add detail and clarification to DPD policy, but not to compete and conflict with it. The LPS33 policy makes no requirement or reference to</p>	<p>The policy for strategic site LPS 33 refers to development of the village over the LPS period, i.e. by 2030.</p>	<p>Amend wording of relevant paragraphs in chapter 7 and add a commitment to monitoring and review in chapter 2.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>an intent that the allocation should be fully delivered within the Plan period or perhaps more quickly than that. Whilst the timely delivery of the objectives underpinning LPS33 is to be preferred, we do not think it is appropriate for the SPD to mandate when the objectives should be fully realised. It would also be inappropriate to dictate an inflexible "end date" which might very well conflict with market signals and (without intending to do so) suppress the potential to maximise delivery in a timely manner.</p> <p>We therefore suggest that the wording of paragraphs 7.4-7.6 should be fundamentally adjusted to provide support for timely delivery but not to suggest that it is absolutely necessary for all of the ambitions of the SPD to be met within the Plan period for it to be construed that the LSP33 policy objectives to have been met.</p>	<p>The wording of the relevant paragraphs can be reviewed but it is the intention of the LPS and the SPD that the site will be complete by 2030. However, a commitment to monitoring and review of the SPD can also be added.</p>	
7	<p>KR003 creates uncertainty for the developer that planning permission will not be granted if the Council does not fully support what is proposed at this stage. The Council cannot have full control over the design and layout of the scheme proposed by individual housebuilders. The purpose of the SPD should be to guide development, not restrict it. Overly ambitious design requirements may hinder the delivery of the site, not support it.</p>	<p>Future planning applications will be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan (particularly the policy for strategic site LPS 33) with reference to other material considerations (including this SPD which sets out a framework for the development of the site).</p>	<p>Amend the wording of key requirements boxes to reflect the SPD's status as guidance.</p>
7	<p>This is an overly prescriptive approach which would not address future changes in the local</p>	<p>The wording of key requirements boxes can be amended to reflect the SPD's status</p>	<p>Amend the wording of key requirements boxes to reflect the</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	residential and employment market. The additional of ‘...unless changes in the market or other factors justify a review of the masterplan’ will enable some flexibility to respond to future changes.	as guidance and a commitment to monitoring and review can be added.	SPD’s status as guidance.
8	The intention (described in the SPD) is that much of the site preparation works – remediation, utility services, access roads etc – will be done by the Council before any of the building development starts. This is sensible and practical, but the costs for this are clearly very substantial – does the Council have sufficient funds available?	There are a number of mechanisms for funding the initial infrastructure works. Further information on the phasing of infrastructure works and securing their provision could be added to the SPD.	Add further detail to the SPD regrading phasing and delivery of initial infrastructure.
8	The council should use its position as majority landowner to influence a legally binding strategy which seeks to secure a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure alongside the delivery of development for the Garden Village. The main challenge is to go beyond the planning system and tie infrastructure requirements in as part of a legally binding framework, which includes drainage requirements for new development. 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 implementation of infrastructure.	Noted. It is beyond the scope of the SPD to specify the mechanisms for such agreements between landowners. It is expected that the hybrid planning application will demonstrate how the site can be delivered in a comprehensive manner (through a detailed delivery plan).	No changes proposed.
8	Despite the emphasis on ensuring a comprehensive approach to site delivery, the SPD is silent on the need and application of an equalisation agreement across the	Noted. It is beyond the scope of the SPD to specify the mechanisms for such agreements between landowners. It is expected that the hybrid planning	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	various landowner interests. We consider the absence of any equalisation mechanism - that reflects garden village principles of comprehensiveness and better enables the delivery of lower value uses alongside higher value development – fundamentally risks the delivery of the NCGV in the manner expected. The absence of an equalisation agreement will act to undermine the willingness of landowners to deliver lower-value development that is considered integral to the success and delivery of the NCGV.	application will demonstrate how the site can be delivered in a comprehensive manner (through a detailed delivery plan).	
8	The scope of infrastructure to be financed by developer contributions is broad but is not itemised in detail by the draft SPD, and we are not aware of any separate evidence setting out detailed, or even estimated, costs. Similarly the draft SPD provides no proposed methodology for how the proposed 'proportionate' calculation on contributions will be applied. The SPD should set out the intended methodology and costs in a more forensic manner.	It is beyond the scope of this SPD to provide detailed costs of infrastructure provision but further detail around the process of securing the infrastructure provision could be added	Add further detail around securing infrastructure provision to the key infrastructure requirements chapter.
8	Current water and wastewater assets have limited capacity to support the planned growth. Collaboration with United Utilities in a co-ordinated approach will be necessary. The masterplan should include an overall drainage strategy for the management of surface water.	Noted. The council will continue to collaborate with United Utilities in respect of the infrastructure required.  A drainage assessment has already been completed as part of the flood risk assessment and drainage issues will be fully considered as part of the hybrid planning application.	No changes proposed.
8	There should be a clear mechanism within	There are a number of mechanisms for	Add further detail to the SPD

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>the SPD to ensure that if public funding is not successful or is delayed, that key developers who have interest in land within the Garden Village have the option to assist in funding the delivery of the primary strategic infrastructure and other relevant infrastructure which is relevant to their land interests. In addition to providing the above mechanism for developers to assist in bringing forward the Phase 1 infrastructure if public funding was to be delayed or unsuccessful, the SPD should also make provision for developers who have contributed to the initial primary infrastructure works to have their Section 106 contributions to be dealt with in a holistic way to ensure that money recouped by the Council takes the monies already paid into consideration.</p>	<p>funding the initial infrastructure works. Further information on the phasing of infrastructure works and securing their provision could be added to the SPD.</p>	<p>regrading phasing and delivery of initial infrastructure.</p>
8	<p>The SPD states that contributions will be proportionate throughout the document, however, paragraph 8.19 states that this will be negotiated on a case-by-case basis depending on the type and scale of infrastructure. We would urge the Council to be consistent in their terminology and provide clarity at the outset whether these costs will be negotiated or are on a proportionate basis, and at what stage of the reserved matters process these will be secured.</p>	<p>Further detail around the process of securing the infrastructure provision could be added.</p>	<p>Review and add further detail around securing the provision of infrastructure.</p>
8	<p>The Garden Village at Handforth can support a CIL levy and that 25% of the monies accruing from such a levy should pass to</p>	<p>Issues concerned with the proposed CIL charging schedule are being considered through the examination process for that</p>	<p>Update text to confirm that the approach to CIL will be dependent on the outcome of the CIL</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	Handforth Parish Council for the purpose of funding infrastructure projects that are listed in the Handforth Neighbourhood Plan.	document. The form of contributions payable will reflect the final adopted version of the CIL charging schedule.	examination and the charging schedule subsequently adopted by the council.
9	There are a number of day to day facilities – doctors, dentist, other health and social care, day nurseries/ childcare, secondary education - which are either not currently provided on site with no clarity over how residents will access these facilities off-site or for which provision on site seems low. Access to these facilities is important for long term sustainability, to minimise vehicular movements and impacts on the highways network, to minimise the potential adverse impacts on existing health and education services in the area and should be given further consideration.	A number of day to day facilities and services are planned to meet the needs of future residents as set out in the Land Uses section of the SPD. However, given the size of the proposed village, it will not be practical or desirable to locate some higher-order facilities on site. In particular, The NHS Eastern Cheshire CCG has indicated its preference for healthcare provision is the redevelopment of the existing Handforth Health Centre, either on its current site or a nearby site (within a few hundred metres of the existing site and west of the A34).	No changes proposed.
9	It will be essential that development proposals within the Garden Village follow the hierarchy of drainage options for surface water with the expectation that no surface water will discharge to public sewer. The SPD should repeat a strengthened form of Policy ENV15 to ensure developers follow the hierarchy of drainage options for surface water outlined in the NPPG. It is fully expected that only foul water will communicate with the existing public sewer and surface water discharges to more sustainable alternatives. It is important that any strategy ensures that each parcel can discharge to a watercourse with unfettered rights to discharge. Without such agreements	Drainage issues will be important considerations through the planning application process but it is not considered necessary to repeat national or local policy and guidance within the SPD as these will be taken into account in any case.  The environmental objectives could be amended to refer to exemplary sustainable drainage for the management of surface water.	Amend environmental objectives to refer to exemplary sustainable drainage for the management of surface water.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>in place, it is possible that ransom situations can arise which will compromise the most sustainable approach to the delivery of drainage and the speedy delivery of new housing. In this context, United Utilities recommends that consideration is given to producing a drainage strategy for the sustainable management of foul and surface water. This should include identifying the preferred body into which surface water will discharge from each 'Character Area' if infiltration of surface water is not an option for surface water discharge. Consideration should also be given to a strategy for new clean water infrastructure in liaison United Utilities. The document should specify opportunities to ensure maximum contribution from design and topography to reduce surface water run-off. The SPD should state that there is a requirement for new development to be innovative when considering drainage design, for example to include using only permeable surfaces as a way to reduce the volume and rate of surface water discharge. Including exemplary sustainable drainage as part of the development principles will reinforce the planning policy requirements of SE13 and ENV15, helping to ensure that the allocation is drained in the most sustainable way, whilst not impacting on the developable area in the scheme.</p>		
9	Is there a plan for social housing to let?	The SPD requires homes with a mix of	Add text to the land use

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
		tenures and sizes as well as a minimum of 30% affordable homes under the provisions of LPS Policy SC 5. The affordable provision will include a proportion of social rented housing. The SPD could be amended to confirm that the mix of homes should have regard to identified local needs.	requirements for housing to confirm that housing should have regard to identified local needs.
9	Originally the Council's planners had envisaged a housing development mix of 5-bedroom houses (150), 4-bed (675), 3-bed (450), and 2-bed (225), a seemingly reasonable spread. However, having been requested by the Inspector (at the CIL Examination) to re-appraise the Garden Village in light of the SPD publication, the Council have now advised him that the mix is to be changed substantially. The 4-bed houses are to be slashed from 675 to 251, 3-bed increased by almost a quarter to 554, 2-beds almost double from 225 to 403, and 66 1-bed apartments and houses have been introduced. The latter includes a clutch of 1-bed houses, an extremely uncommon configuration. The sum effect of these changes is to demonstrate that the original presumptions upon which the residential part Garden Village was presented in the Local Plan Strategy, was over-stated by 16% and the Local Plan is far less viable – and thus deliverable – than originally anticipated. I am concerned that the Garden Village will be developed in an ultimately unsuccessful	The SPD specifies that a mix of housing types and tenures should be provided and the precise mix of types and tenures will be determined through planning applications. The Garden Village needs to create a mixed and vibrant settlement and create a real community and so a mix of homes will be created from starter homes, through to large detached family homes. 1 bed homes would be primarily located in apartments or small maisonettes with 2 bed homes located in apartments, townhouse or in smaller semi-detached properties. In order to create a sense of place the density of the proposed homes will vary depending how far from the village centre they are, like a traditional settlement. Thus, the higher density townhouses and apartments will be located close to the village centre and have densities of between 45 to 60 dwellings per hectare or up to circa 20,000sqft/acre (net) with the medium density areas being at about 14 to 16,000 sqft/acre and the lower density fringe areas dropping to 10,000 to 12,000sqft. These types of figures are	Add text to the land use requirements to confirm that housing should have regard to identified local needs.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	fashion if this permutation of housing types goes forward.	typical of a range of house builders from the national companies down to local builders and the range allows choice and opportunities for all sectors of the community to be able to live in the village.	
9	The policy refers to the need to provide 30% affordable, 5% self-build/community-build homes, and to provide a mixture of housing including bungalows and level access accommodation. This concept is supported in principle by Bloor Homes, however, it is unclear whether the location of these units is predetermined by the Council.	The SPD provides guidance and sets the framework for the future development of the site but it does not provide detailed layout plans. It will be for the future planning application to propose the precise details for delivering the requirements for self build, affordable homes and an appropriate mix of housing.	No changes proposed.
	Further consideration should be given to “live work” units, etc. to facilitate the objectives of the Garden Village principles.	New forms of employment space are likely to increase in importance in the future and it will be appropriate for the SPD to reference these.	Add references to communal shared workspace and home working to the key development requirements
9	The CIL calculation shows that the proposed form of development will generate a significant loss - clearly if those figures are correct the development will not go ahead , and if a more viable form of employment use cannot be identified it would be better to bite that particular bullet now and reallocate the employment land for a use which is likely to go ahead	The provision of employment land is an important component of the overall mix of uses on site and is required by policy. Issues concerned with the proposed CIL charging schedule are being considered through the examination process for that document. The form of contributions payable will reflect the final adopted version of the CIL charging schedule.	Update text to confirm that the approach to CIL will be dependent on the outcome of the CIL examination and the charging schedule subsequently adopted by the council.
9	Reference should be made to the inclusion of homeworking/ shared spaces within the employment land allocation to ensure it accords with the Garden City Principles, the SPD’s objectives, and the changing nature of living and employment arrangements.	One of the strategic objectives for the garden villages is “employment uses which blend a diverse range of uses, including communal shared workspace and home-working”. It would be appropriate to expand on this further within LU002.	Add text to land use requirements for employment to reference new forms of employment use.
9	Handforth Neighbourhood Plan (pages 86	The Local Plan Strategy sets the	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	and 87) questions the wisdom of allocating land for employment purposes within the Garden Village when other locations such as Airport City offer a far more attractive location with enterprise zone status and reduced business rates. The allocation of Garden Village land for employment use also reduces the viability of the development and hence its ability to support a CIL levy.	overarching policy context for the development of the site within the statutory development plan. The LPS site allocation includes the provision of employment land, which has been found sound through examination. The role of SPD is to provide guidance and a framework to guide delivery within the bounds of the development plan policies, which include the provision of employment land.	
4	The £347,081 of S106 money (ref 513C) accruing from the Jones Homes development south of Coppice Way should be used to help fund the primary school within the Garden Village. This money is designated for “primary education within 2 miles of the development site”.	Noted. It is beyond the scope of the SPD to specify how S106 monies from other sites should be allocated, although the garden village would be an appropriate location for primary provision to service the adjacent development site, and accommodating pupils from adjacent sites would assist in providing the school at the outset of The Garden Village construction.	No changes proposed.
9	<p>Suitable medical facility with a health centre and play grounds, and swimming pool and pet centre. To have a community centre, for social activity and encourage tenants and residents associations to hold monthly meetings with local councillor and police to attend in order to stop anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Of significant concern is the provision of sufficient healthcare in Handforth and Wilmslow and the fact that all Wilmslow GP surgeries are located in the south of the town. The draft SPD contains little or no detail on health services and how and where</p>	The NHS Eastern Cheshire CCG has indicated that it would not support provision of a new health centre within the garden village and its preference is for the redevelopment of the existing Handforth Health Centre, either on its current site or a nearby site (within a few hundred metres of the existing site and west of the A34). LU003 confirms that the village centre will include a community centre (village hall). Reference to children’s play facility could be included.	Add reference to children’s play facility to the land use requirements for the local centre.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	these will be provided for this very significant sized community. This should be considered critical to the infrastructure requirements of the Garden Village and its ability to be a sustainable development.		
9	The provision of just one nursery on the site seems low and there is no data on the intended size of the nursery and how many children this would accommodate. While the local market would presumably pick up any latent or outstanding demand, this may necessitate conversion of dwellings into nursery space or, again, generate additional traffic movements on and offsite for families to access these essential services.	In accordance with the strategic site policy LPS 33, the SPD makes provision for a children’s day nursery. It is intended that this would be provided by a private operator to service the market demand. The SPD does not specify a limit on the size of this facility, therefore does not restrict the number of children that could be accommodated.	No changes proposed.
9	There is also included, a group of 175 additional dwellings on one of the largest land parcels on the entire site, in the form of an “Extra Care” ‘village’. Although an extra care facility was contemplated in the Local Plan Strategy (adopted in 2017) nothing on this scale was presented during the Inspection of the Plan, and this scale has never been consulted upon nor widely discussed, and it seems widely divergent from what the Plan intended. In any event, this ‘extra care village’ is loss-making by over £12 million. A developer would not consider building such a project, and there is also the fact that such a care village is already being developed at the Coppice Way / A34 “gateway” into the Garden Village by Jones Homes, which would present significant	<p>Issues concerned with the proposed CIL charging schedule are being considered through the examination process for that document. The form of contributions payable will reflect the final adopted version of the CIL charging schedule.</p> <p>The SPD does not specify the size of the extra care facility but there is operator interest and it will form an important component of the overall mix of uses on the site, to meet the needs of all sectors of the community.</p>	Update text to confirm that the approach to CIL will be dependent on the outcome of the CIL examination and the charging schedule subsequently adopted by the council.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>competition.</p> <p>The previously-proposed loss-making office development has been dropped in the latest appraisal in CIL/PH06, but the day nursery which loses over £ ½ million remains.</p>		
9	<p>Reference is made throughout the SPD to the need for the mixed-use local centre to be community focused and run, however, it is unclear how this will be facilitated. Reference is also made to the potential to restrict retail and leisure space at the outset which will then be considered and reviewed through the process. It is unclear what mechanism will be in place to facilitate this.</p>	<p>The community management section of chapter 9 in the SPD confirms that a Community Management and Maintenance Plan (“CMMP”) should be prepared as part of the Hybrid Planning Application to govern the long-term use, maintenance and management of community facilities.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>
9	<p>The statement that retail and leisure floorspace will be considered and approved as part of the hybrid planning application is premature and will be a decision at that time having regard to the development plan and material considerations.</p> <p>The policy should make appropriate reference to any development which is not consistent with an up-to-date development plan having to pay regard to the provisions of the NPPF and specifically the sequential approach and impact with specific reference to the availability of sites within and the potential impact on existing defined centres.</p> <p>The SPD should be prescriptive in setting upper thresholds for retail and other town</p>	<p>All applications are considered on their own merits, having regard to the development plan and material considerations. The wording in the draft SPD will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Development proposals should have regard to the requirements of the NPPF (including sequential approach and impact tests where relevant) as well as the requirements of LPS policy EG 5 ‘Promoting a town centre first approach to retail and commerce’ but it is not necessary to repeat the requirements of policy set out elsewhere.</p> <p>The future planning application will need to set out evidence to demonstrate that the</p>	<p>Amend text of the land use requirements for the local centre to clarify that retail and leisure floorspace will be considered as part of future planning applications.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>centre uses. To not set upper thresholds for the floorspace generates uncertainty over the scale of development for which planning permission might be sought.</p>	<p>town centre floorspace proposed is appropriate and policy-compliant.</p>	
9	<p>The existing scale of Wilmslow High School and the delivery of numerous Strategic Housing Sites ahead of the Garden Village we believe makes the option of using Wilmslow High School both unfeasible and detrimental to students. Wilmslow Town Council feel that the need for a new High School should be reintroduced in to the plans.</p> <p>There is a planned financial contribution to expand Wilmslow High School as the village grows but the capacity to be provided here is not quantified. Further detail should be provided on how much capacity can be created here and whether this is likely to fully meet the needs of the Garden Village.</p> <p>These concerns are compounded by the safeguarded land site (LPS35) which has potential to deliver a high quantum of further housing in the future and therefore a significant additional secondary age population who will need accommodating.</p> <p>There should be a concerted push to include a secondary school on site as it appears they are attempting to water down what was suggested in LPS 33.</p>	<p>A planned extension to Wilmslow High will increase capacity for an extra 600 children (although noting the plans are not finalised and planning permission has not sought to date). The phase 1 extension will provide capacity for extra 300 (360 PAN, an increase of 60 children per year group) children. Financial contributions will be required through S106 agreements.</p> <p>The safeguarded land is not allocated for development. If a future review of the local plan proposed to allocate this land, then consideration of education needs would be required at that time.</p> <p>The policy for strategic site LPS 33 requires "...provision of, or contributions to, secondary school provision to meet projected needs. Proposals should consider the potential to include a secondary school on site".</p>	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
9	<p>Despite the proposal that the new primary school will be built by 2020-21 it clearly cannot be operational until there is a critical mass of pupils on the Garden Village development - there is no apparent plan for accommodating the new arrivals until such time as that new facility is available</p> <p>It is unclear how and when this requirement for financial contributions will be required (i.e. if there is a threshold for number of units to be constructed)</p>	<p>Ideally, a single form primary school should be operational prior to the first dwelling occupancy (suitable and accessible alternative interim provision is available in the local area). The school would then be expanded to a two form entry as the village grows. The text in the land use requirements for education could be updated to clarify this.</p>	<p>Update the text for education land use requirements to clarify that an initial single-form school should be provided prior to the first new residential occupancy on the site (unless it can be demonstrated that suitable and accessible alternative interim provision is available in the local area).</p>
9	<p>It is unclear how and when this requirement for financial contributions for education will be required (i.e. if there is a threshold for number of units to be constructed) and when this will be facilitated, and the costs spread proportionality.</p>	<p>The full cost of the two form entry school will be paid by S106 monies through S106 agreements with each housing developer. If the single form school needs to be provided upfront then it will be funded by the S106 monies overall but to accelerate delivery, the council will bring forward funding through developer agreements / land disposals at the outset and reclaim the costs through S106 monies later.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>
9	<p>The SPD refers in several places to formal sports facilities but the reality of the proposal seems to fall well short of the principle. The Cheshire East study of local playing / recreation facilities throughout the Council area identified a significant shortfall in playing fields in Handforth with no full size facilities available</p> <p>The development proposes to almost double the population of Handforth with this and</p>	<p>LU005 gives an indication of the minimum level of sports provision required resulting from the garden village proposals.</p> <p>A Sports Needs Assessment has already been undertaken and accounts for population growth and requirements as set out in both the Playing Pitch and Indoor Built Facility Strategies. In the SPD, LU005 requires that sports provision should be in line with these strategies and LPS Policy</p>	<p>Add text to sports land use requirements to clarify that sports provision will be provided in consultation with Sport England.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>other developments but there is only provision for one full size grass pitch and one half size junior 3G artificial surfaced pitch ( so still no all-weather full size pitch in the whole of Handforth)</p> <p>Wilmslow Hockey Club based just over the border in Styal has one AstroTurf pitch for its 10 teams which is fully utilised during the week by other clubs demonstrating a shortfall in available accommodation- the Club would be happy to take on the administration and bookings of a full size Astro pitch provided on the Garden Village in return for first call on its use on Saturdays</p> <p>It seems that the absence of a full size Astro pitch on the land misses an opportunity to make good the existing shortfall in recreational facilities and fails to provide additional facilities for the increased population</p>	<p>SC 2. Future planning applications will need to demonstrate compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>The SPD could be updated to clarify that new sports provision will be provided in consultation with Sport England.</p>	
9	<p>The population of the proposed development is estimated to be 3500 new residents, generating additional demand for indoor sports facilities. If this demand is not adequately met then it may place additional pressure on existing sports facilities, thereby creating deficiencies in facility provision. In accordance with the NPPF, Sport England seeks to ensure that the development meets any new sports facility needs arising as a result of the development. Sport England's</p>	<p>A Sports Needs Assessment has already been undertaken and accounts for population growth and requirements as set out in both the Playing Pitch and Indoor Built Facility Strategies. In the SPD, LU005 requires that sports provision should be in line with these strategies and LPS Policy SC 2. Future planning applications will need to demonstrate compliance with this requirement.</p>	<p>Add text to sports land use requirements to clarify that sports provision will be provided in consultation with Sport England..</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>Sports Facilities Calculator (SFC) can help to provide an indication of the likely demand that will be generated by a development for certain facility types. The SPD makes reference to off-site contributions but no detail is given. It is assumed that the Indoor Built facilities strategy 2017 will be used to understand the off-site indoor sports requirements generated by this development.</p> <p>The IBFS advises as a key challenge – ‘To take account of housing and population growth in both Wilmslow and Handforth and to improve the quality of the facilities currently available at Wilmslow LC.’</p>	<p>The SPD could be updated to clarify that new sports provision will be provided in consultation with Sport England</p>	
9	<p>Clarification of the associated costs of sports facilities for developers is required.</p>	<p>It is beyond the scope of this SPD to set out the detailed costings for infrastructure provision. However, further detail around the process of securing the infrastructure provision could be added.</p>	<p>Review and add further detail around securing the provision of infrastructure in chapter 8.</p>
9	<p>You were directed to the very real significance of the views of the Peak District hills to the East, which together with more distant views of the landscape, the foreground and middle ground, offer a truly distinctive and “proper view” not often experienced across the flat Cheshire plain. The softness to the Eastern fringe and these splendid views create an immediate sense of a real village.</p> <p>Consider “cranking the grid” to direct the street pattern more to the distant Eastern</p>	<p>The parameters plan and green infrastructure sections could be amended to better orientate development and require proposals / green infrastructure to take better advantage of views and vistas.</p>	<p>Amend the parameters plan and green infrastructure sections better orientate development and require proposals / green infrastructure to take better advantage of views and vistas.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	views and to give much more attention to the sloping Eastern open end of the Garden Village.		
9	Insufficient mitigation of lost green wilderness. The green strip that is provided in the plan is adjacent to the heavily used A34, noise & pollution will be prominent, so inadequate.	The proposals retain large areas of the current ecological habitats and improve access to a wider area of green spaces which are currently inaccessible agricultural land. A range of habitats are proposed in this green infrastructure network to help in mitigating any losses. Off-site mitigation is also being explored to ensure a net gain of habitats in the wider area. Whilst some areas of ecological habitat will not be accessible to the public to ensure minimal disturbance to wildlife and comprehensive network of footpaths and cycleways is proposed within the Green Infrastructure network to ensure dog walkers and joggers can access a series of circular routes through and around the site. The SPD could provide additional information on the green infrastructure proposed.	Add a new 'Green Infrastructure Network Plan' to the comprehensive masterplan.
9	We support the requirements in this section and the recognition of the multi- functional benefits that Green Infrastructure brings. The Defra metric should define the proportion of enhancement required in order to achieve the biodiversity net gain aspect of Green Infrastructure.	The Defra biodiversity metric will be used to calculate the extent of habitat creation required to deliver a net gain for biodiversity. The SPD could be amended to clarify this.	Update the biodiversity section of chapter 9 to confirm that the Defra metric will be used.
9	Whilst it is appropriate to acknowledge existing uses and to set out that they might well change in the future, it does not appear	It is not the intention of the SPD to prevent future changes from happening at the MoD or Total Fitness sites. SPD text could be	Amend SPD text to make it clear that the SPD does not seek to prevent changes from happening at

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>appropriate or justified to effectively reject any such changes to occur within the Plan period. We therefore conclude that the Total Fitness building should be included within the village centre allocation and this would mean that both the existing use is appropriate and that there is a properly considered framework for potential future uses for the site within the remainder of the Plan period and potentially beyond that.</p>	<p>amended to make this clearer.</p> <p>The local centre is intended to provide small scale retail and other services to meet the day to day local needs of The Garden Village.</p> <p>There is some uncertainty over any potential future use of the Total Fitness site should it come forward for redevelopment, and the site as presently configures attracts visitors from a much larger area so would not form part of the local centre intended to meet the local needs of The Garden Village.</p>	<p>the MoD or Total Fitness sites.</p>
9	<p>As set out in the Better Defence Estate programme, the DBS site will be vacated in 2023, but the SPD assumes that the current use will continue.</p>	<p>Dialogue with the MoD has confirmed that there is no certainty regarding any future plans for the MoD site. The SPD could be updated to confirm the approach to any future application and also to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD if circumstances change.</p>	<p>Amend text to indicate the approach to any future planning applications on the MoD or Total Fitness sites and to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD.</p>
9	<p>The majority of the supporting evidence documents assume that the MOD's existing use at the DBS site will remain unchanged but this is not an accurate assumption.</p> <p>The TA (at para 2.4) acknowledges that the MoD may relocate from the site and describes the expected future use of the site, including details of the expected replacement built form. It is not the role of a TA to provide detailed design requirements for the</p>	<p>Dialogue with the MoD has confirmed that there is no certainty regarding any future plans for the MoD site.</p> <p>The 'other technical requirements' section of the SPD notes that the supporting documents use development assumptions for the purpose of their own assessments. The TA does not set detailed design requirements for the redevelopment of the MoD site.</p>	<p>Amend text to indicate the approach to any future planning applications on the MoD or Total Fitness sites and to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	redevelopment of a site.		
9	It is noted that the creation of an exemplar garden village will be informed by design codes, which will be approved as part of the hybrid planning application and must be adhered to as part of any future application. It is therefore essential that comments from developers are taken into consideration as part of the proposed masterplan, particularly as there is a requirement for all planning applications to demonstrate they are consistent with the development requirements.	There will be the usual process of consultation on the hybrid planning application. However, the SPD could clarify that an overall spatial design code would be considered as part of the hybrid planning application. Further 'character area design codes' could be produced and consulted on by the council following the hybrid application. This would allow further input.	Amend the design codes section and planning process section to clarify that an overall spatial design code will be considered as part of the hybrid planning application. Further 'character area design codes' will be produced and consulted on by the council following the hybrid application.
9	The first sentence refers to 'no net loss' of biodiversity whereas, elsewhere in the DPD 'net gain' is referred to. We suggest that the first line is amended to say 'net gain'.	LU006 in the draft SPD seeks to deliver an overall gain for biodiversity. The revised NPPF and draft policy on the First Draft SADPD has an emphasis on 'net gain' rather than 'no net loss'. To ensure the SPD is consistent and to better align with the NPPF and first draft SADPD, it would be better to refer to 'net gain' throughout.	Amend SPD to refer to 'net gain'.
9	Cheshire Wildlife Trust raise a concern about the impacts of the SPD on the local wildlife site and how this is contrary to Local Plan Policy SE3	The site is allocated for development in the LPS and the developable area of the site allocation covers part of the LWS. Protection of the LWS has been a key factor taken into account through the SPD. It has been considered as an important feature in terms of the fauna and supporting habitats. Retained areas of the LWS will be protected (both during and post construction) and habitat creation and enhancement measures are proposed ensuring connectivity between the retained	Add further information to set out how the retained area of the LWS will be protected and enhanced.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
		<p>area of the LWS. The impact on the LWS will be considered in detail within the EIA to support the future planning application.</p> <p>Further information to clarify the protection measures could be added to the SPD</p>	
9	<p>CWT raise a concern that the development of the site will be likely to deliver a net loss for biodiversity rather than achieve a net gain due to the significant areas of habitat lost and the relatively modest extent of new habitats proposed on-site. They are also concerned that retained areas of habitat will be damaged by public access including the creation of footpaths and cycleway. CWT acknowledge that off-site habitat creation is proposed, but no details of this are provided as part of the SPD. In their view there is consequently no assurances that the SPD objectives in respect of biodiversity would be delivered.</p>	<p>The SPD is clear that there should be an overall net gain for biodiversity (e.g. in the environmental objectives and para 9.8). This will be measured using the Defra biodiversity metric and following the mitigation hierarchy, off-site habitat creation, enhancement and management proposals will be required where avoidance of impacts and other mitigation measures on-site cannot delivered an overall net gain. The planning application will need to give details of the mitigation and habitat creation measures proposed to ensure that the overall net gain is delivered.</p> <p>The SPD could clarify that publicly accessible areas, paths and cycleways should be designed to avoid impacts on areas of particular ecological importance.</p>	<p>Add text to clarify that paths, cycleways and publicly-accessible areas of green infrastructure must be designed to minimise potential impacts on areas of ecological importance. This should include the choice of materials used.</p>
9	<p>The SEMMMS refresh is absolutely critical to any proposals of development of the North Cheshire Growth Village. The refresh which is currently in progress will further raise a number of issues. Cheshire East Council do not show how they will incorporate these into their plans. We would like to see the draft SPD to take into account the issues raised</p>	<p>As noted in the SPD, the conclusions of the SEMMS refresh will continue to inform development decisions – including those relating to The Garden Village.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	within the refresh.		
9	<p>The council should look at the example provided by Exeter City Council who have made a name for themselves by building houses to passivhaus standards.</p> <p>When Exeter City Council, was offered a funding opportunity by the to develop council housing in Exeter, they decided to provide exemplary, affordable housing, built to the highest standard of sustainable construction.</p> <p>I can find no mention of passivhaus standards in the consultation “The Garden Village at Handforth Draft Supplementary Planning Document”. Why not?</p>	<p>Noted. The council’s function as a landowner differs from that as the planning authority. In terms of planning requirements, it is considered that it may be difficult to justify a requirement to build to passivhaus standards.</p> <p>However, further information could be added to the SPD regarding energy efficiency measures.</p> <p>The requirements set out in the SPD would not preclude the construction of houses to passivhaus standards should any developer or landowner propose this.</p>	<p>Add further information on energy efficiency to the environmental objectives.</p>
9	<p>There has to be suitable parking space for residents or to have a multi-storey car park with reserved parking spaces also to incorporate charging points, for electric vehicles</p> <p>To have two water supplies for houses with gardens as filtered water is not necessary to water gardens or for use to flush toilets, also to have storage facility to save rain water from roof.</p> <p>Energy saving for homes - to draw heat from ground as they do in Sweden, to have small rotary turbines to heat water in header tanks - turbines to be mounted on top of roof, also to use solar cells</p>	<p>Car parking is a major consideration for the emerging proposals and they will accord with CEC Policies and be designed in accordance with the adopted CEC Design Guide.</p> <p>It is proposed that every house will have an overnight vehicle trickle charging point and that the Village High Street will also have fast electric charging points for vehicles, located either in the car parks or laybys in appropriate/prominent locations for ease of access.</p>	<p>Add text to the renewable and energy efficient development section and the land use requirements for the village centre to refer to electric vehicle charging points.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
9	We would reject aspirations to achieve high standards of BREEAM. The assessment under BREEAM is bespoke and is not necessarily consistent with other approaches to reduce net energy demand or improve resilience to climate change. It may also be the case that over the remainder of the Plan period that the subject matter moves on, and there is a more effective approach which is developed and recognised. We would instead suggest that development should promote a low carbon approach and that major applications should be accompanied by a sustainability assessment which can make reference to an appropriate methodology for assessment.	The aspiration to achieve a high rating under schemes such as BREEAM is consistent with LPS Policy SE 9 'Energy efficient development'. It is not an absolute requirement and expects development to <b>seek</b> to achieve a high rating under schemes <b>such as</b> BREEAM.	No changes proposed.
9	Has the council evaluated the impact on the traffic moving north and south on the A34? And, during the works, the impact on other roads (Manchester Rd through Handforth centre and the road from Prestbury Road Wilmslow to Woodford)?  Both these roads become congested as we road users try to find other ways to reach our destination when there are queues on the A34.	The VISSIM modelling presented in the TA clearly shows that the mitigation works proposed will satisfactorily mitigate the development impact, and therefore will not worsen the current situation on the road network.	No changes proposed.
9	The A34/A555 are extremely busy roads and are currently being widened to cope with existing traffic. A potential further 3000 cars joining the A34 through one egress from the estate will cause considerable congestion particularly in rush hours.	Table 13 in the TA shows that in the morning peak hour there will be a total of 1201 cars associated with the whole development (not just the residential element), with 709 of these egressing the site. There will be two points of egress onto	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
		the A34 not one. The VISSIM modelling presented in the TA clearly shows that the mitigation works proposed will satisfactorily mitigate the development impact, and therefore will not worsen the current situation on the road network.	
9	<p>We do not currently believe that the proposed vehicle access planned for the site is realistic and would question whether the local and strategic highways will be able to absorb the additional traffic flows created by 1,500 houses given the limited actions proposed in the draft SPD, current traffic flows in the area and a number of highways or landscape constraints which exist.</p> <p>We do not agree that the junction and highways improvements proposed will sufficiently address capacity issues and congestion caused by the Garden Village. The traffic movements out of the Garden Village are likely to result in journeys which are predominantly north-south. We believe that the adverse impacts on the local and strategic highways network have not been sufficiently addressed. In particular, traffic movements from the 1500 dwellings North wards into Stockport Borough at morning peak will severely impact on our residents and will cause delays, congestion and increased journey times. This is exacerbated by the under provision of education, child care and health services on the Garden</p>	The VISSIM modelling presented in the TA clearly shows that the mitigation works proposed will satisfactorily mitigate the development impact, and therefore will not worsen the current situation on the road network.	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>Village site which will create more peak time A34 north-south car movements as people will have to travel daily to access educational provision in particular.</p>		
9	<p>Para 7.1 notes that the site has limited access on foot cycling and public transport which must be addressed. However apart from the replacement Bridge over the A34 it is unclear where there are to be any improvements to cycle and foot access</p> <p>The primary means of walking and cycling connection the Garden Village to the village of Handforth appears to be by the new Garden Bridge and the footpath through the Jones Homes Coppice Way housing development and Hallwood Road and onto Station Road. However the pavements on both sides of Station Road are dangerously narrow and unsuitable for use by pushchairs or wheelchairs - and there seems to be little opportunity to widen these to a safe standard - even after negotiating these the route from the station to the shops is tortuous. The other route referred to is via Spath Lane but again that is not convenient</p> <p>The better and much more straightforward pedestrian route to the Village is by the footpath on Coppice Way and Lower Meadow Way under the railway to Church Terrace meeting the village at the library with an easy journey from there to the shops - this</p>	<p>The existence of the Coppice Way - Lower Meadow Way - Church Terrace route for pedestrians is detailed within the text of the TA when discussing existing footway provision (Section 3.3). The provision of a signal pedestrian crossing at the A34 / Coppice Way roundabout then links this route directly into GVH. The route of this path is also included in the pedestrian and cycle permeability plan.</p> <p>The SPD could be strengthened by adding further references to pedestrian access, particularly the provision of a signal pedestrian crossing at grade across the A34.</p>	<p>Add text to end of para 3.16: “Detailed information on proposed pedestrian and cycle access routes is provided in the Transport Assessment, which is contained in Appendix C.”</p> <p>Add a further reference to the at grade pedestrian crossing.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	is not mentioned in para 3.16 and does not appear to have the attention of those planning the Garden Village.		
9	Despite the originally assumed link to the A555 dual carriageway now being dropped, the costs for highways described in the SPD (page 43 onwards) have increased alarmingly from £15 million to £25.8 million in CIL/PH06. Now that the Airport Relief Road (A555) is open, we shall soon be able to assess how effective the traffic mitigation measures taken by Stockport MBC (to relieve the severe peak-hours congestion at the A34 intersection) have been. Initial impressions are not encouraging, but a proper evaluation obviously cannot be made for some months. Yet decisions about the Garden Village will have been taken before this crucial data is available. Traffic volumes in the WYG transport assessment (appendix to the SPD) show significant volumes, and the cumulative impact with the other LPS developments planned in Handforth, Wilmslow, and elsewhere in the north of the Borough will have a serious combined impact. The transport assessment forecasts at least 2,000 extra vehicles on the A34 in each of the peak periods.	<p>The VISSIM modelling work undertaken is based on the SATURN model that was produced for the A6MARR study, and accounts for changes in traffic flows on the network following the opening of this new stretch of highway.</p> <p>The VISSIM modelling presented in the TA clearly shows that the mitigation works proposed will satisfactorily mitigate the development impact, and therefore will not worsen the current situation on the road network.</p> <p>Table 13 in the TA shows that the worst case two-way traffic generation (in the morning peak hour) will be 1201 cars associated with the whole development (not just the residential element).</p>	No changes proposed.
9	With the recent opening of the A6MARR, the additional traffic brought on by the new development could mitigate any congestion relief that will be seen over the coming weeks and months. Further to this, while the	The VISSIM modelling work undertaken is based on the SATURN model that was produced for the A6MARR study, and accounts for changes in traffic flows on the network following the opening of this new	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>SEMMMS Refresh is ongoing, I note that CEC do not state how any further issues raised by this will be taken into account.</p> <p>I do not share the view of CEC that a 10 year 'window of opportunity' is suitable to resolve any issues arising from this. Journeys stemming from the garden village would be predominantly north-south, and while long-standing issues on this route like the A34/560 Gatley continue to cause huge delays to residents purely due to outdated infrastructure, there is too great a risk of total gridlock without this being taken into account by CEC now, rather than waiting to see just how bad any future impact gets.</p>	<p>stretch of highway.</p> <p>The requirements under planning are for the development to mitigate its own impact, not rectify any existing issues there may be on the network.</p> <p>The VISSIM modelling presented in the TA clearly shows that the mitigation works proposed will satisfactorily mitigate the development impact, and therefore will not worsen the current situation on the road network.</p> <p>The scope of the TA, and therefore the potential extent of traffic impact, has been discussed with SMBC, TfGM and at no point has there been the requirement to assess impact at the A34/560 junction.</p> <p>It is understood that there are congestion issues at this junction and this is of interest to Highways England due to the junction's proximity to the M60. There has been no request from Highways England to directly assess development impact at this junction.</p>	
9	<p>The projected level of bus and cycle usage does not seem to be realistic when considering current commuting trends and patterns, and where the jobs of people living on the site will likely be located. It does not appear that the current proposals would encourage residents of the site to use buses</p>	<p>Targets for sustainable transport use are defined in the Framework Travel Plan, which is appended to the SPD. It is noted in the FTP that these are based on Census Travel to Work statistics in the absence of any specific data related to the garden village. These will be amended accordingly</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	and cycling to the extent which is projected.	when the first travel survey on the garden village is undertaken.	
9	<p>Unclear how the Poynton Relief Road will improve highway capacity on A34. A contribution to the PRR may not be appropriate given that Poynton Town Council object to the CIL zero rate and also no CIL monies will flow to Handforth Parish Council which has its own list of infrastructure projects that require funding.</p> <p>Providing a bus service to run between the Garden Village and Handforth train station is surely crucial for obtaining connectivity between the two. This bus service should run onwards from the proposed park and ride facility (car park adjacent to the youth centre) into Handforth village centre, round the Spath Lane loop and onwards via the A555 to the airport. As part of the park and ride facility, and in order to provide access for all at the station (see above), a pelican crossing should be installed on Station Road immediately on the station side of the entrance to the new car park.</p>	<p>Traffic data used in the TA comes from an area wide SATURN model which allows for re-routing of traffic when conditions on the highway network change, for example provision of the PRR. This model shows that PRR will cause a reduction in traffic along the A555 and A34.</p> <p>A bus service between the GVH and Handforth is proposed, and detailed within the TA. While this notes the potential for extending it to the airport, the exact further routing would be something for the operator to consider. Notwithstanding this, the BRT would operate through the garden village and would serve the airport.</p>	No changes proposed.
9	A public footpath runs along Blossoms Lane and we understand that Cheshire East is responsible for its maintenance, at present it is in a very poor state of repair and if residents of the new estate would like to benefit from 'country walks' CEC will need to spend some money on it to avoid injury.	The SPD could be amended to require opportunities to improve public rights of way linkages via Blossoms Lane to be explored.	Amend the SPD to require opportunities to improve public rights of way linkages via Blossoms Lane to be explored.
9	The SPD requirements for an overall	It is beyond the scope of the SPD to set out	Update the SPD to clarify the

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>management organisation should be expanded to ensure that a suitable management body and regime is delivered. Requirements for the management organisation should include:</p> <p>The management organisation must be a charitable or non-profit making body constituted for the purpose of maintaining open spaces.</p> <p>The body must have a proven track record, over at least three years, showing its financial viability, experience of the operation of service charges, long term financial modelling and management of open spaces.</p> <p>The body must have a proven track record of at least 3 years of managing sensitive wildlife habitats including SBI's and SSSI's.</p> <p>The body must have a proven track record of at least 3 years of community engagement, education and training programmes.</p> <p>There are a range of models available for how this might be delivered. The Land Trust model offers the potential to deliver value for money whilst still securing a wide range of local benefits and community involvement.</p>	<p>detailed requirements for an overall management organisation. However, the SPD does required the preparation of a site-wide community management, maintenance and governance plan as part of the hybrid planning application, which sets out the proposed management arrangements.</p> <p>Some minor amends could be made to clarify its scope and funding arrangements.</p>	<p>scope and funding arrangements to apply to the site-wide community management, maintenance and governance plan</p>
9	<p>It will be necessary to set up a Governance Board, comprising representatives from the local community, local business owners, stakeholders, developers, community interest groups &amp; political members. In the short</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>term, we would recommend an Advisory Board that could be established as a precursor to the setting up a formal Governance Board.</p> <p>One of the keys going forward is to establish a Garden Village Development Charter, which requires developers, landowners &amp; stakeholders to sign up to the ethos, values &amp; principles of a Garden Village development. In the future, as the Garden Village is developed, the citizens of Garden Village those who choose to live, work and participate will also be required to sign up to a Garden Village Citizens Charter.</p>		
9	<p>We are concerned at the environmental and air quality impacts created by the traffic flows generated from the Garden Village and the resulting congestion (particularly on the A34). These have not been addressed by the draft SPD and further examination of this issue is required, particularly given the existence of very nearby locations where there are already exceedances of emissions and air quality issues and the emerging GM Clean Air Plan.</p>	<p>An Air Quality Assessment has been prepared as a supporting document to the SPD which has fully considered air quality matters. This issue will be further considered through the planning application process.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>
9	<p>KR005 is an overly prescriptive approach which would not address future changes in the local residential and employment market. The additional of ‘...unless changes in the market or other factors justify a review of the masterplan’ will enable some flexibility to respond to future changes.</p>	<p>The wording of key requirements boxes can be amended to reflect the SPD’s status as guidance and a commitment to monitoring and review can be added.</p>	<p>Amend the wording of key requirements boxes to reflect the SPD’s status as guidance.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
9	<p>The supporting appendices of the TA include the scoping study documents that were sent to each of the parties, however the scoping correspondence itself is not provided in either the TA or its supporting appendices. It is recommended that this is included, for transparency.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment is considered to be robust given the proposed quantum of development. It is WSP's opinion that the cumulative impacts of the site alongside other stated committed developments in the wider area, most notably growth proposals set out as part of the proposed Manchester International Airport expansion on the SRN is likely to be Highways England's key concern.</p>	<p>The TA is already a lengthy document but the scoping correspondence can be included in the relevant TA appendices.</p> <p>Highways England were consulted extensively during the Local Plan Strategy process and did not have any objections to the scheme. They have also been consulted about the TA and not provided any adverse comments. All this is understandable given that the nearest point on the SRN is the M60, and development traffic will have significantly dissipated by the time it reaches this.</p>	Include scoping correspondence in the TA appendices.
9	CWT are very concerned that TEP's ecological appraisal completely overlooks the presence of the Local Wildlife Site (LWS).	It is expected that the ecological assessment accompanying future hybrid planning application will include an assessment of the impacts of the proposed scheme on the LWS.	No change proposed.
10	This is an overly prescriptive approach which would not address future changes in the local residential and employment market. The additional of '...unless changes in the market or other factors justify a review of the masterplan' will enable some flexibility to respond to future changes.	The wording of key requirements boxes can be amended to reflect the SPD's status as guidance and a commitment to monitoring and review can be added.	Amend the wording of key requirements boxes to reflect the SPD's status as guidance.
10	The site plan is condensed and does not show as to what The Garden Village at Handforth will look like.	The SPD is a high-level spatial masterplan, the additional detail will be included in the Design Codes for the site as well as the planning applications. Creating quality	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
		<p>design and a sense of place as key to the development of this Garden Village and the emerging design will conform with the adopted CEC Design Guide as well as create its own unique sense of place.</p>	
10	<p>We welcome the designation of the southern element of the Total Fitness within the Mixed Use Local Centre and the reference to the potential for a Landmark Element which we conclude to be appropriate.</p> <p>However, we note with concern that the remainder of the Total Fitness is excluded from the village centre and is effectively left to remain as is. The existing use is a main town centre use in NPPF terms and should reasonably form part of the identified village centre both in land use terms but also in the context that the more flexible allocation does provide the planning framework for potential new uses should the existing TF use become sub-viable.</p> <p>It is also of some concern that there is no apparent vehicular access into both the identified frontage zone and the TF land behind it. The parameters plan should identify an indicative access solution which could then be taken forward as necessary and subject to broader considerations in terms of design quality.</p>	<p>The local centre is intended to provide small scale retail and other services to meet the day to day local needs of The Garden Village.</p> <p>There is some uncertainty over any potential future use of the Total Fitness site should it come forward for redevelopment, and the site as presently configures attracts visitors from a much larger area so would not form part of the local centre intended to meet the local needs of The Garden Village.</p> <p>The SPD could add some text to clarify the approach in the case of an application to redevelop the Total Fitness site and a commitment to monitoring and review can be added.</p>	<p>Amend text to indicate the approach to any future planning applications on the MoD or Total Fitness sites and to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD.</p>
10	<p>The Masterplan should provide specific guidance for the future use of the TF and</p>	<p>There is considerable uncertainty over if and when these plots may become</p>	<p>Amend text to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>MOD plots within the Plan period. We have set out and maintain that the entire TF plot should be included within the Village Centre allocation for appropriate main town centre uses which could include reference to town centre living. The residual TF area which is all within the Village Heart Character Area should also be located within the Village Centre boundary.</p>	<p>available for development. The SPD could be updated to confirm the approach to any future application and also to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD if circumstances change.</p>	
9	<p>Parcel 1 (MoD) is currently marked as employment land, but we would like clarity on the future of this land should the MoD choose to withdraw. Would this remain as employment land or would a further residential/ housing use be sought? This is a significant sized parcel of land and should the Council seek to bring forth further housing this would have considerable impact on the sustainability of the Garden Village as a whole, creating a greater need for supporting infrastructure which we believe is already below an optimal level in the draft SPD and planned site delivery.</p>	<p>There is considerable uncertainty over if and when these plots may become available for development. The SPD could be updated to confirm the approach to any future application and also to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD if circumstances change.</p>	<p>Amend text to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD.</p>
9	<p>Parcel 6 (Total Fitness) is currently marked as leisure use and is occupied by Total Fitness. It is our understanding that the land is in the ownership of Cheshire East Council and is leased to the current occupier. Should Total Fitness withdraw from this site or the lease run-out/ not be renewed, what is Cheshire East Council's intention for this parcel of land? Would they seek a further leisure use? Is it intended that the current</p>	<p>There is considerable uncertainty over if and when these plots may become available for development. The SPD could be updated to confirm the approach to any future application and also to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD if circumstances change.</p>	<p>Amend text confirm approach to any future applications on these sites and to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>occupier is in situ long term, or is the lease likely to end during the period identified for delivery of the site? This is a significant size parcel of land and again should the Council seek to bring forth further housing development on this part of the site, we believe this would significantly and fundamentally alter the infrastructure requirements of the settlement as a whole and would impact further on the neighbouring areas in terms of roads, transport, health and social care provision, education provision and policing.</p>		
9	<p>The layout of the housing adjacent to Blossoms Lane will severely impact on the rural character of Woodford. The current draft SPD does not currently note that Blossoms Lane has a quiet lane designation to protect and maintain its rural character, allow shared use by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and motorised users and to contain rising motorised traffic.</p>	<p>It is intended to create a landscape buffer between the proposed development of the Garden Village and Blossoms Lane (as shown as strategic green infrastructure on the parameters plan), in part to retain the rural character of the Lane and also to ensure existing properties are not adversely impacted by the development. The character area principles for Kissing Gate and Blossoms Lane character areas could be amended to reference the protection of the character of Blossoms Lane</p>	<p>Amend the character area principles for Kissing Gate and Blossoms Lane character areas to reference the protection of the character of Blossoms Lane.</p>
10	<p>It is a fact that families prefer houses on culs de sac rather than through routes - it is appreciated that current planning thinking is against culs de sac but I would ask that the design reflects what people actually want , rather than possibly transitory planning philosophy</p>	<p>Detailed design will be guided by the design codes and the Cheshire East Design Guide. In line with the SPD, homes with a mix of tenures, sizes and locations should be provided to meet the needs of all sections of the community.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
9	The proposed layout of the site would reduce the already limited space between Handforth and the Cheadle constituency, particularly Woodford and Blossoms Lane. This increases the likelihood of our towns and villages merging together.	The layout of the site is designed to minimise the impact on the surrounding countryside. Development densities reduce significantly at the edges of the site and the interfaces with the open countryside. Significant areas of strategic green infrastructure are proposed around the site which will serve a number of benefits including screening of development plots.	No changes proposed.
9	The MoD land and Total Fitness, both at the north of the site, remain marked for employment and leisure use respectively. Any clarity on the future use of these sites would be greatly appreciated, as any housing development further to what is already proposed would even further reduce urban sprawl directly on the Stockport/Cheshire East boundary, and compound the transport and infrastructure issues that would arise.	These sites are not identified for housing in the SPD. There is considerable uncertainty over if and when these plots may become available for development. The SPD could be updated to confirm the approach to any future application and also to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD if circumstances change.	Amend text confirm approach to any future applications on these sites and to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD.
10	To ensure the new Garden Village is delivered “comprehensively”, there is a need to include the safeguarded land allocation within the masterplan at the outset as part of the overall design approach, in order to provide certainty of the safeguarded land’s role in the delivery of this key site. It is our view that excluding this parcel of land at this stage will result in piecemeal development and will effectively be contrary to the Council’s aspirations for the site. This is reflected in the masterplan proposed by Bloor Homes. It is Bloor Homes’ position that further land release of their site	The safeguarded land is not allocated for development and as set out in LPS Policy PG 4, policies related to development in the open countryside apply.	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	to the south will help to improve the viability of the overall scheme to enable more land to be released in a comprehensive manner.		
10	<p>The overall masterplan should include the safeguarded land, ensuring a more comprehensive overall strategy.</p> <p>The Masterplan could be further improved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retaining the alignment of existing PROWs, where possible, in order to more completely satisfy Design Aims 3 &amp; 5 which call for “a village which is well-connected within and to the wider area” and “attractive cycling and walking routes”.</li> <li>The integration of more well-connected development blocks and minimising single-sided aspect roads (i.e. the integration of isolated blocks such as the ones in the southwestern portion of the site) would better achieve Design Aim 4 which is to “promote social interaction and help to create and maintain a sense of community”.</li> <li>The consolidation of high to medium density residential development in the western fringe of the site, by providing more community members and residents would also contribute to the potential success of the proposed local centre, which is also a goal of Design Aim 4, “to create a vibrant heart during the daytime</li> </ul>	<p>The safeguarded land is not allocated for development and as set out in LPS Policy PG 4, policies related to development in the open countryside apply.</p> <p>The masterplan could look again at the alignment of PROWs.</p> <p>The areas of green infrastructure separating development blocks, particularly in the southwestern portion of the site is important for minimising harm to ecological features and to link ecological assets.</p> <p>Whilst parcels 22 and 23 are identified as being higher density than some parcels (e.g. to the south east), it would not be appropriate to increase density further in this location. A relatively low density form of development is required here to help minimise the impacts on the retained area of the LWS and to reflect its location at the edge of the site with an interface to the open countryside beyond. As expressed in the character area principles, development should also respect the rural character of the adjacent Blossoms Lane.</p>	Amend the masterplan to retain the alignment of existing PROWs where possible.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>and evenings”.</p> <p>We support the principles of CA003: Kissing Gate Character Area, however, we suggest that parcels 22 and 23 on the Parameters Plan should be developed at higher densities with the expectation that the Safeguarded Land forms part of the Comprehensive Masterplan.</p>		
10	<p>Along the north western boundary of the site is Spath Lane and adjacent to this is Handforth Brook, which is designated "main river".</p> <p>Under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016, a permit may be required from the Environment Agency for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within eight metres of the brook.</p>	Noted.	No changes proposed.
9	<p>The proposed location for the village centre is at the entrance to the site adjacent to the A34. The village centre should be located centrally within the site, and indeed would have to be if it is to perform the function of a village centre as part of a walkable garden village settlement. This is a pre-requisite to ensuring convenient access for all new residents and to serving local needs.</p> <p>The site is large with an area of 114 hectares. If the village centre is in the currently proposed position along the A34, inevitably, some new residents will drive to</p>	<p>The location of the village centre is in line with the LPS site allocation. This notes that the proposed village centre is intended to be in the north-west portion of the site to take advantage of the existing primary vehicular access points which provide connectivity with Handforth Dean and the A34.</p> <p>The village centre is intended to serve a local function to serve day to day needs of The Garden Village. Some additional text could be added to the land use requirements for the local centre to clarify</p>	Add text to the land use requirements for the village centre to clarify that retail uses must be small scale to serve the local needs of The Garden Village.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>the local centre, which is completely at odds with garden village principles and those of achieving a sustainable form of development. A village centre located along the A34 would also attract passing trade from non-garden village residents, furthering the potential impact on existing centres by diverting the trade of those who might otherwise shop in such protected locations as the centres of Handforth or Wilmslow.</p>	<p>this.</p>	
9	<p>Concern over the secondary access via Dairy House Road to Hall Moss Lane. The roads are narrow with sharp bends and traffic calming measures have already been necessary.</p> <p>If buses were to use the Dairy House Lane (restricted) access, this would result in their entry and exit via Hall Moss lane. This is unsuitable due to the nature and layout of the road, and it would have a negative impact on residents in the Cheadle constituency.</p> <p>There are no proposals and no detail on what mitigation might be undertaken to improve this situation and make it suitable for a buses and other road users. The draft SPD does not indicate how the Stockport roads will be maintained and who will bear the cost of the impact on infrastructure on Hall Moss Lane and any mitigation measures that might be required here to adequately accommodate the new and increased use.</p>	<p>With regard to the Dairy House Lane / Hall Moss Lane junction, this contains large kerb radii (circa 10m) that could accommodate larger vehicles such as buses. With regard to Hall Moss Road, which southbound towards Woodford then becomes Moor Lane, the minimum width is circa 6m and in many places is in excess of 6.5m. A 6m wide road carriageway is the minimum width required to accommodate busses (as detailed in in Manual for Streets) and therefore this route could satisfactorily accommodate bus services.</p> <p>The only increase in traffic along Dairy House Lane, and therefore Hall Moss Lane, would be buses. The frequency of buses along this route (a 12-hour service with buses every 15 minutes would equate to an additional two-way flow of 84 vehicles per day) would not significantly impact on the road carriageway infrastructure.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
9	Lower density housing adjacent to Woodford is welcomed but a green buffer of trees and shrubs would help to screen the village.	The layout of the site is designed to minimise the impact on the surrounding countryside. Development densities reduce significantly at the edges of the site and the interfaces with the open countryside. Significant areas of strategic green infrastructure are proposed around the site which will serve a number of benefits including screening of development plots.	No changes proposed.
9	Properties on Blossoms Lane are directly adjacent to parcel 22 and development may completely overwhelm the houses. The electricity supply, septic tank / land drains and water supply runs through the site and there is concern that essential services will be interrupted.	The SPD envisages the implementation of large areas of the green infrastructure network prior to development taking pace and thus would in some measure mitigate tot impact of the construction phase on adjoining properties. This concern/issue will be explored further as the phasing is further developed through the planning applications.	No changes proposed.
10	The need for employment land is questioned: the LPS sets a maximum amount of employment land (12ha) but no minimum.  'The Garden Village at Handforth Economic and Social Impact Assessment, June 2018' finds that "The ELR concludes that as a worst case scenario, Handforth could require up to 2.79 ha [to 2030]. The ELR made no allowance made for any flexibility factor and it took no account of the current quality of jobs provision in each town or any policy interventions such as economic regeneration programmes that would require extra land.	The overall employment land requirement as 2010-2030 as set out in LPS Policy PG 1 is a minimum of 380ha, as evidenced by the Employment Land Review and the Alignment of Economic, Employment and Housing Strategy Report.  LPS Policy PG 7 'Spatial distribution of development' states that Handforth is expected to accommodate in the order of 22 ha of employment land. This is based on a large body of published evidence and was found to be sound at examination.  The 12 ha employment land at the garden	Amend text to indicate the approach to any future planning applications on the MoD or Total Fitness sites and to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>Nevertheless, if a 30% flexibility factor were added to the demand requirement for Handforth (as per page 139 of the 2012 ELR) , this would only increase the gross demand to 3.63ha, whilst Handforth is located in one of the more affluent areas of the North West and has a wide variety of good quality jobs in the vicinity.</p> <p>The provision of between 12500 sqm and 22750 sqm of B-Class employment floorspace at TGV site, setting aside other employment land that is already available in the vicinity, suggests that there is more than enough employment land to meet local needs.” (Paragraphs G5.29-5.31)</p> <p>The Economic and Social Impact Assessment (for example at paragraph G5.22), incorrectly assumes that the MoD use at the DBS site will ‘remain unchanged’.</p> <p>Evidence presented to the Planning Inquiry for the recovered appeals for various development proposals at Handforth Retail Park includes evidence in respect of demand for employment space at Handforth and which concluded that there is little market appetite for employment space within the Handforth area.</p> <p>There is no evidence to demonstrate that the</p>	<p>village (as per Site LPS 33) forms an important part of the overall employment land provision in Handforth as well as being vital in the delivery of an exemplar sustainable new community at the garden village site.</p> <p>The site is currently in use for employment purposes and dialogue with the MoD has confirmed that there is no certainty regarding any future plans for the MoD site. The SPD could be updated to confirm the approach to any future application and also to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD if circumstances change.</p>	

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>allocation of the DBS site for employment use is a viable and deliverable proposition. There is no justifiable basis for the allocation of the DBS site for employment use within the draft SPD, and the site's proposed allocation for employment should not be carried forward.</p> <p>Rather, the future use of the DBS site and its potential 'allocation' by the emerging NCGV Masterplan should have regard to the opportunity of the site to contribute fully and appropriately to the Better Defence Estate programme and Government expectations for the public estate to deliver new homes.</p>		
10	<p>The DBS site has established access rights to the use of Dairy House Lane. The provision of a controlled access regime, of whatever arrangement, to the current unfettered access provisions enjoyed by the DBS site along Dairy House Lane will not be supported by the MoD.</p>	<p>Measures will be required to manage and / or limit the use of Dairy House Lane by traffic (other than for existing authorised users, buses, cyclists and pedestrians) to appropriately manage traffic movements and prevent new through routes being created. A minor change is proposed to clarify access arrangements via Dairy House Lane.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to clarify considerations relating to access arrangements via Dairy House Lane.</p>
10	<p>Your plans indicate that allotments and orchards are to be created, would it be possible to include some of these to the SSE of Parcel 22 to minimise pollution. These fields are prime agricultural land so would be suitable, not sure what's buried underneath the plot earmarked for allotments near the 'Village Green' because it was part of 61MU a WWII maintenance unit for the RAF and</p>	<p>It is intended to create a landscape buffer between the proposed development of the Garden Village and Blossoms Lane (as shown as strategic green infrastructure on the parameters plan), in part to retain the rural character of the Lane and also to ensure existing properties are not adversely impacted by the development. Native woodlands, grasslands and if</p>	<p>Remove the reference to 'allotments and orchards' next to the village hill from the parameters masterplan and instead include a number of allotment locations on the new green infrastructure network plan.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>there have been problems with 'buried' hazards from the war at the Woodford Garden Village site.</p>	<p>appropriate other landscape uses such as allotments could be located in this buffer zone.</p> <p>The previous industrial and military operations of the site have been thoroughly investigated and assessed by way of both desk based and intrusive ground investigation fieldworks. Sources of contamination are noted on site and the council will require a suitably robust remediation strategy to be submitted for the review (and approval of) by the council and the Environment Agency in advance of any construction works in order to mitigate risks posed. This remediation strategy must include a specification for soil chemical quality within which are areas of garden, allotment and public open space must fall within in order to be rendered suitably for intended uses. The detail of the remediation solutions will be confirmed in due course but is likely to comprise the use of clean soil cover systems and removal of contamination sources in areas deemed to be at risk.</p> <p>The masterplan could remove the reference to 'allotments and orchards' next to the village hill and instead include a number of allotment locations on the new green infrastructure network plan.</p>	
10	The Garden Village Principles set out in the	The location of the employment uses on	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>SPD (para. 1.9) include the provision of ‘a wide range of local jobs within easy commuting distance of homes and without reliance on the use of the private car’. As such, it would be considered more appropriate to disaggregate the employment uses across the site, with particular focus on the village core.</p> <p>It is requested that the parameters plan be revised to show the DIO and Mr. Russell’s land as predominately residential parcels, delivering housing at a medium density of 35-50 dph. We recognised that there would be some scope for delivering small scale employment within this area, but the revision would ensure that the DIO’s land is disposed of in line with the MOD and government’s aim of releasing the land for housing.</p>	<p>site would mean they are within easy commuting distance of new homes within The Garden Village but they are also easily accessible from locations outside of the village.</p> <p>Whilst shared workspaces, home working and other new forms of employment use may be best suited to be pepper-potted around the new village, in general it is most appropriate to locate the employment uses in the area identified to provide flexibility over the development form to meet the needs of modern occupiers.</p>	
10	<p>As we have alluded to previously, we conclude that the only appropriate way forward for the TF site is for it to be identified within the Mixed Use Local Centre allocation. We also think it important that the movement hierarchy plan provides an opportunity to move into the site from the Village High Street frontage both by car and by non-car mode. The Figure 10 layout currently provides no direct access into the TF site from the Village High Street which would render this a backland site and compromise the opportunity for it to properly connect with other sustainable economic uses within the</p>	<p>It is not the SPD’s intention to render the Total Fitness site a ‘backland site’. The movement and public realm could be updated to show links into the site.</p>	<p>Update movement and public realm plan to show links into the site.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	defined centre.		
10	The proposed realignment of Dairy House Lane crosses the location of an existing property which benefits from an extant consent for a replacement dwelling (16/1533M). It is requested that the alignment of Dairy House Lane be revised to avoid crossing this consent.	The proposed alignment of Dairy House Lane has been designed to accommodate buses and is considered the most appropriate alignment.	No changes proposed.
10	There is very little detail of the cycle routes planned. In order to be effective a cycle route must be safe along its entire route. As an example of the level of detail I would like to see please see the Sandbach Town Cycling Plan and the routes included in that document	<p>There is a comprehensive and well-connected set of proposed footpath /cycleways around the site, both adjoining the road network and within the proposed Green Infrastructure connecting the development out to Handforth and wider area. The detail on the form and construction of the paths will be set-out in the Spatial and Detailed Character Codes that will follow, in line with the Adopted Cheshire East Design Guide.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposed cycle routes is also presented in section 5.3 of the TA, which includes a route map as Figure 6. A minor amend is proposed to signpost this information.</p> <p>Further information could be added to the pedestrian and cycle permeability plan to give additional details of proposed cycle linkages.</p>	<p>Signpost the detailed information on proposed pedestrian and cycle access routes that is provided in the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Add further information to the pedestrian and cycle permeability plan to give additional details of proposed cycle linkages.</p>
10	We note that the movement hierarchy plan at Figure 10 provides no opportunity to move	The pedestrian and cycle permeability plan could be updated to include links into the	Update the pedestrian and cycle permeability plan to include links

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	into the TF site from the Village High Street frontage by car. It is plain by reference to Figure 11 that the same regrettable conclusion is drawn in terms of access and linkage by non-car mode.	Total Fitness site.	into the Total Fitness site.
10	<p>We believe the south-western part of the site should correspond to Phase 1B (as illustrated on the alternative Phasing Plan) in order to bring forward housing delivery early, given the issues of remediating the eastern part of the site.</p> <p>The Council's proposals are to bring the green infrastructure forward as part of Phase 1. We believe there should be an integrated approach between the development of the green spaces and the delivery of houses, which is why it would be beneficial to endorse Bloor Homes' approach to phasing. The success of open space relies on active surveillance and interaction with its context. Allowing more of the houses to come forward earlier would support this principle.</p> <p>The west boundary of the site sits next to the A34, which acts as a 'shop front' for the development. Allowing the delivery of more houses as part of Phase 1 will improve this gateway corridor. Locating key buildings along this fringe will help legibility for existing and new residents.</p>	The SPD could be amended to clarify that the phasing plan is indicative. Amends could also be made to the phasing plan to facilitate early delivery of dwellings and to clarify timing on delivery of primary infrastructure.	Amend SPD to clarify that the phasing plan is indicative. Amend the phasing plan to facilitate early delivery of dwellings and clarify timing on delivery of primary infrastructure.
10	At this point, the phasing plan simply identifies the residual TF land as "existing"	There is some uncertainty over any potential future use of the Total Fitness site	Amend text to indicate the approach to any future planning

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>with no reference for change over the Plan period.</p> <p>We also note with concern that there is no reference on the phasing plan to any alternate or temporary access solution to the TF during what will be a substantive construction period to deliver the key infrastructure</p>	<p>and the associated timing should it come forward for redevelopment during the plan period.</p> <p>The SPD could be updated to confirm the approach to any future application and also to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD if circumstances change. An amend could be made in chapter 12 to reference the need for the detailed delivery plan to consider construction phasing and temporary access arrangements.</p>	<p>applications on Total Fitness site and to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD. Amend text to reference the need for the detailed delivery plan to consider construction phasing and temporary access arrangements.</p>
10	<p>The Phasing Plan attached to the SPD (Figure 13) indicates that Bellway's land interest at Dairy House Farm is located within Development Phase 2 which will be delivered within Years 4 – 6. The Phase 1 enabling infrastructure would not preclude this land coming forward in an earlier phase as the current route of the proposed spine road would enable appropriate access into this development parcel.</p>	<p>The SPD could be amended to clarify that the phasing plan is indicative. Amends could also be made to the phasing plan to facilitate early delivery of dwellings and to clarify timing on delivery of primary infrastructure.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to clarify that the phasing plan is indicative. Amend the phasing plan to facilitate early delivery of dwellings and clarify timing on delivery of primary infrastructure.</p>
9	<p>The plan shows that the village centre, other non-residential uses and only 100 homes would be constructed within Phase 1 (years 1-3). This is completely illogical as it makes no sense to build out the local centre in its entirety at the same time as only 100 of the 1,500 dwellings that it is considered could be accommodated within the garden village. The local centre should be there to serve the local needs of new residents once a community is well on the way to being</p>	<p>The phasing plan shows the enabling infrastructure for the village centre being delivered in phase 1.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>established and should be built out as part of the later phases of development, and most appropriately in a phased manner itself, when a higher number of dwellings are constructed and occupied.</p>		
10	<p>It is noted that within the Masterplan there are Phase 2 land parcels (namely parcels 22 and 23, as shown in the Parameters Plan) which are located in the peripheries of the Garden Village area and would not follow a systematic pattern of build out from the core infrastructure out.</p> <p>This may result in isolated areas of housing coming forward, and lead to piecemeal development across the site. A revised phasing plan would allow for a logical build out of the site, focusing on the north of the site in the early phase, with the development of land between the A555 and the Gateway routes and infrastructure into the site. The build-out would then progress south towards the Green Belt and open countryside.</p>	<p>The SPD could be amended to clarify that the phasing plan is indicative. Development will not be 'piecemeal' if it comes forwards in accordance with the overall masterplan for the village. Amends could also be made to the phasing plan to facilitate early delivery of dwellings and to clarify timing on delivery of primary infrastructure.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to clarify that the phasing plan is indicative. Amend the phasing plan to facilitate early delivery of dwellings and clarify timing on delivery of primary infrastructure.</p>
10	<p>The DVS site will be vacated from 2023 and should be included in development phase 2 or 3.</p>	<p>There is some uncertainty over any potential future use of the Total Fitness site and the associated timing should it come forward for redevelopment during the plan period.</p> <p>The SPD could be updated to confirm the approach to any future application and also to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD if circumstances change.</p>	<p>Amend text to indicate the approach to any future planning applications on the MoD site and to commit to monitoring and review of the SPD.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
10	<p>The proposed Infrastructure Works plan would appear to place public transport infrastructure across the entirety of the TF frontage to the new High Street which would therefore impede the opportunity to deliver future access to that plot.</p> <p>We agree that it is important to provide appropriate infrastructure and the proposed siting does emphasis the centrality and importance of this site. However, the proposed arrangement does fundamentally impede the opportunity to access the site (other than to the rear) which could render it something of a backland site and prejudice its deliverability.</p>	<p>It is not the purpose of the primary infrastructure plan to be quite so prescriptive over the exact positioning of bus stops and the diagram could be amended to remove such information.</p>	<p>Amend the primary infrastructure plan to remove the exact positioning of bus stops.</p>
11	<p>To ensure that the development at Handforth is in line with Garden Village principles it should ensure the following:</p> <p>Hedges and trees should be retained where possible, to allow for the conservation of biodiversity links.</p> <p>Open space should ultimately be designed to encourage interaction and community building.</p> <p>Green spaces should be accessible to all and enhance the natural environment, providing a comprehensive green infrastructure network that uses zero-carbon and energy-positive technology to ensure climate resilience.</p>	<p>The SPD could be updated to add further detail on the matters raised.</p>	<p>Add further detail around retention of hedges and trees, community interaction and accessible green spaces.</p>
11	<p>Para 11.4 states that the “design guide is not a rigid set of rules. However, it is a design</p>	<p>The text of key requirement 7 could be updated to reflect the SPD’s status and</p>	<p>Update text of key requirement to reflect the SPD’s status and</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	framework which all planning applications should be guided by". Identifying that development which does not comply with the design guide and SPD will be refused contradicts this position.	provide a little more flexibility.	provide a little more flexibility.
11	<p>It is noted that Active design principles are referenced in GI006 Outdoor sports facilities, but the principles extend much further than outdoor sports facilities and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Sport England, in conjunction with Public Health England, has produced 'Active Design' (October 2015), a guide to planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, more often in the interests of health and wellbeing. The guidance sets out ten key principles for ensuring new developments incorporate opportunities for people to take part in sport and physical activity. The Active Design principles are aimed at contributing towards the Government's desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design. Sport England would commend the use of the guidance in the master planning process for new residential developments.</p>	Issues around Active Design will need to be addressed through the detailed planning applications for the school and community build elements of the site.	No changes proposed.
11	Lighting should be kept to a minimum near to Woodford and the wildlife area.	Noted. This is a detailed issue which should be considered further through the application process.	No changes proposed.
11	The GI Principles and the SPD in general could be strengthened by providing more	The GI principals section could be strengthened by referring to the particular	JB to suggest text

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	emphasis on the important habitats and species on the site. Ponds and newts are referred to but are not really emphasised in the GI Principles. It could also define any other known habitats and species that should be a key consideration when planning biodiversity enhancements for the site.	species and habitats that the site supports (ponds, species rich grassland, butterflies dragonflies and damselflies, ponds and amphibians including great crested newts etc.) and stating that the GI will be developed to deliver benefits for these identified assets.	
11	It is unclear how the sports facilities provision as detailed in GI0006 is derived. The Cheshire East Playing Pitch strategy identifies for example the need for two full size 3G Artificial grass Pitches to meet training demand. Issues with regard to the capacity of existing cricket facilities in the area (particularly around training) Overplay of rugby at Wilmslow Rugby Club and the need to resurface the Hockey facility at Wilmslow High School. Part 7 of the PPS indicates the increase in demand for sports facilities of the growth in the population of the area. Has the Playing Pitch New Development Calculator be used to understand the demands generated specifically by this development?	The green infrastructure principles section provides a guide as to the green infrastructure needs arising at the new village rather than the surrounding area. The section on land use requirements for sports facilities could be updated to clarify that Sport England should be consulted on the sports provision.	Update the section on land use requirements for sports facilities to clarify that Sport England should be consulted on the sports provision.
11	The local watercourse into which surface water drainage is to discharge already has a history of flooding and high water table - although the development is to have SUDS and possibly water retention swales there is concern that these measures may not be enough to alleviate flooding danger	Noted. A drainage assessment has already been completed as part of the flood risk assessment and drainage issues will be fully considered as part of the hybrid planning application.	No changes proposed.
11	As noted above, we suggest the following text is added to Policy GI009, which can be	The SPD could be amended to reflect the text suggested.	Amend the text in the green infrastructure principles section to

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>amended to reflect any local circumstances: 'The development of the site will be expected to follow the surface water hierarchy and incorporate exemplary Sustainable Drainage methods. The expectation will be for only foul flows to communicate with the public sewer.</p> <p>The preference will be for new development to incorporate surface level sustainable drainage systems with multi-functional benefits as opposed to underground tanked storage systems for the management of surface water.</p> <p>Any proposal as part of the Handforth Garden Village will be expected to be part of a site wide strategy for infrastructure (foul and surface water and clean water supply) that considers topography to avoid a piecemeal approach to infrastructure. Proposals should demonstrate how the site delivers infrastructure as part of a wider strategy having regard to interconnecting phases of development. It will be necessary to ensure the infrastructure proposals are part of a wider, holistic strategy which coordinates the approach to infrastructure between phases, between developers, and over a number of years of construction. The applicant will be expected to include details of how the approach to infrastructure on a phase of development has regard to interconnecting phases within a larger site.</p>	<p>A drainage assessment has already been completed as part of the flood risk assessment and detailed drainage issues will be fully considered as part of the hybrid planning application.</p>	<p>refer to the surface water hierarchy and exemplary sustainable drainage methods.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>Infrastructure should be sized to accommodate flows from interconnecting phases and drainage strategies should ensure a proliferation of pumping stations is avoided on a phased development. This will ensure a piecemeal approach to infrastructure is avoided and that any early phases of development provide the infrastructure to meet the needs of any later interconnecting phases of development. In delivering drainage as part of a wider strategy, applicants will be expected to ensure unfettered rights of discharge to watercourses between the various parcels of development within a wider development to prevent the formation of 'ransom situations' between separate phases of development.</p> <p>Approved drainage schemes will be expected to be supplemented by appropriate maintenance and management regimes for the lifetime of any surface water drainage schemes.'</p>		
11	<p>Suggested design principles for the safeguarded land:</p> <p>This land lies to the most south-western point of the site, below the Kissing Gate Character Area.</p> <p>This area will contain mid-density residential development of 25-40 dwellings per hectare. Density will be higher in the northern part, fading out towards the south, to create a softer</p>	<p>The safeguarded land is not allocated for development and as set out in LPS Policy PG 4, policies related to development in the open countryside apply.</p>	<p>No proposed changes.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>edge.</p> <p>This area will have a suburban to rural feel with a mix of short townhouse rows, semi-detached and detached homes, consistent with a mid-to-low-density area, as the site extends outwards.</p> <p>Public realm will comprise a series of squares and gardens within the development parcels, enclosed by the surrounding built form.</p> <p>The fringe of development to the south of this area will blur the edge of the village with the wider countryside.</p>		
12	<p>There is reference in paragraph 12.4 to a necessity to complete the development by 2030. That is inconsistent with the stated requirements and advice of DPD policy LPS33 and if it is the intention of the Council to invoke this then the SPD approach is procedurally incorrect.</p> <p>We conclude that the approach taken within the DPD is both more pragmatic and more likely to deliver sustainable economic development and new homes- that development should be taken forward in a timely manner and that early delivery should be afforded positive weight.</p>	<p>The policy for strategic site LPS 33 refers to development of the village over the LPS period, i.e. by 2030.</p> <p>The SPD seeks to comply with this requirement and the reference in para 12.4 that “the site must be completed by 2030” is in the context of the detailed delivery plan to be submitted as part of the hybrid planning application process.</p> <p>Whilst there is every expectation that the site will be complete by 2030, it may be appropriate to make a minor adjustment to reflect that development should be programmed to be complete by 2030.</p>	Amend wording to clarify the expected approach to development timings.
12	There are some concerns over deliverability in terms of timescales. This is on the basis that it is evident that there are some inconsistencies within the Council and the	The SPD sets out the council's requirements for the delivery of the site in terms of its function as the local planning authority. The SPD could refer to the	Update the indicative delivery programme to take account of the latest information.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>Engine of the North's programme.</p> <p>For example, the Cabinet Paper (of 11th September 2018) included a detailed timetable for delivery of the Site, but these timescales do not accord with the timescales identified in Figure 29, i.e. the target date for determination within the Cabinet Report timetable is the end of May 2019, rather than April 2019 (as indicated by Figure 29).</p> <p>This also applies to conditions as the Cabinet Paper states that these will not be discharged until November 2019, but start on site is envisaged in April 2019. Whilst we fully appreciate not all the conditions will be precommencement and the Council will have had sight of the condition requirements prior to determination, consistency between the two documents is required.</p>	<p>envisaged timings as the 'indicative' delivery programme and update to take account of the latest information.</p>	
12	<p>The draft SPD contains very limited information on the phasing of the site delivery and only shows indicative phasing. We believe this needs early agreement and formal tying-in so that adequate infrastructure is in place at the earliest possible stage. For example, consideration of conditions on the number of houses which may be built before completion of critical infrastructure such as the primary school and full highways mitigation measures. The current illustrative phasing diagram shows that the single form entry primary school</p>	<p>Ideally, a single form primary school should be operational prior to the first dwelling occupancy (unless it can be demonstrated that Wilmslow Academy can be used in the interim subject to review and suitable access). The full cost of the two form entry school will be paid by S106 monies through S106 agreements with each housing developer. If the single form school needs to be provided upfront then it will be funded by the S106 monies overall but to accelerate delivery, the council will bring forward funding through developer</p>	No changes proposed.

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>should be completed in the first phase with around 100+ houses expected at this point. Cheshire East Council should identify a phasing which ensures that further house building cannot take place beyond an identified number unless the school is complete. We would recommend that there can be no building beyond the four hundredth house until the primary school is fully complete and open.</p> <p>The draft SPD proposes full site delivery by 2030. Is this deliverable? For a fully sustainable, high quality development with adequate infrastructure and considerable highways and transport works required this seems like a relatively short timescale</p>	<p>agreements / land disposals at the outset and reclaim the costs through S106 monies later.</p>	
12	<p>Start of site in April 2019 is unlikely:  It presumes an immediate signing of any legal agreement;  That the application is not recovered by the Secretary of State;  Provides no allowance for CPO and inquiry;  Presumes no legal challenge is mounted to the permission and/or CPO;  All pre-commencement conditions are discharged to the effect there are none applied to require any such discharge – a matter that is more likely to extend the application determination process;  All contracts are let for the Phase 1 infrastructure for an immediate start;</p>	<p>The SPD sets out an ambitious but realistic programme for delivery of The Garden Village. The indicative delivery programme could be updated to take account of the latest information.</p>	<p>Update the indicative delivery programme to take account of the latest information.</p>

Document section	Summary of key issues	Response to issues	Changes required
	<p>Other regulatory controls and consents are received, some of which may be unable to be processed until a grant of permission is received;  Environmental mitigation measures are secured for start of works; and,  That all future tenders, reserved matters, conditions discharge, and implementation falls into sequence without delay</p>		
12	<p>The outline delivery plan has a possible post-2030 date. The SPD may be using Jan-Dec rather than Apr 2029 – Mar 2030 that is relevant to the plan period.</p>	<p>The diagram should be amended to reflect the correct end date of March 2030.</p>	<p>Amended the diagram to reflect the correct end date of March 2030.</p>