



Consultation Statement

In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning regulations, the proposed plan should be subject to a formal pre-submission consultation with the local community and statutory consultees prior to its submission to the local planning authority. A full list of consultees can be found at Appendix 1. It should be noted that this formal consultation is in addition to the community engagement activities conducted during the preparation of the plan (see the Supporting Document for details of community engagement activities). A minimum period of 6-weeks is required for the statutory consultation process.

The Central Gowy South NDP consultation period commenced on Monday 26th October 2015 and was to close on Sunday 6th December.

The consultation was well advertised to people living and working within the neighbourhood area. Flyers advising of the process were hand delivered to every property in the area and notices were published on public notice boards and in local retail outlets. A notice was also provided within the local community newsletter 'down our way'. A copy of the flyer can be found in figure 1.

Electronic copies of the draft plan were posted on the Hargrave and Huxley Parish Council web site and hard copies were placed in St Peter's Church and both village halls. Statutory consultees were extended electronic copies.

A public open day was held in Huxley Village Hall on the 14th November 2015, as advised in the flyer and by banners erected at strategic points in the area.

Attendance to the open day was reasonable, and many people took the opportunity to leave feedback.

Central Gowy (South) Neighbourhood Development Plan

Public Consultation

The Central Gowy (South) NDP is now published for public consultation before it is submitted to Cheshire West and Chester Borough Council for examination and being made (subject to referendum). You are a resident within the area of the plan – so it is of importance to you. Once made, it will affect any development proposal within the area.

You are invited to inspect the draft document and to make any comment you believe important. This will be considered prior to the final version of the plan being submitted to CWaC.

Questions you might consider include:

- Is the data used in forming the plan accurate?
- Is the analysis of that data appropriate?
- Are the developed policies reasonable?

The period of this consultation is required to be 6-weeks. Accordingly it will run from **Monday 26th October until Sunday 6th December 2015.**

The documents may be seen in (and downloaded from if desired) the Parish Council website: www.hargraveandhuxley.org.uk

There are also hard copies available for viewing at:

- St Peter's Church, Hargrave
- Hargrave Village Hall
- Huxley Village Hall

Comments may be uploaded onto the site or may be mailed to the Parish Clerk or given to your village representative.

There will be an Open Day held at Huxley Village Hall on **Saturday 14th November** between **11.00 and 16.00** at which members of the Action Group charged with producing the plan will be present to answer any questions.

Figure 1 Consultation Flyer

A schedule of all comments received has been collated and is provided in Appendix 2. This schedule includes the details of comments received and what action was taken to address comments with the plan as necessary.



Central Gowy (South) **Neighbourhood Development Plan**

Consultation Statement

Addendum – Second Regulation 14 stage consultation

The neighbourhood plan was submitted to Cheshire West and Chester Council in April 2016 and, following a statutory six week publicity period, was the subject of an independent examination. The report of the Examiner was received in January 2017 and recommended that, due to a legal technicality relating to the Neighbourhood Area, the Neighbourhood Plan should not progress to referendum. Despite this issue, the examiner supported the policies of the plan, suggesting minor modifications to ensure that they can meet the ‘basic conditions’ set out in legislation.

In order to overcome the legal technicality, a revised neighbourhood area was designated in April 2017. Whilst this was ongoing, the minor modifications to plan policies which the examiner had suggested were incorporated into the plan.

These changes to the plan meant that it was necessary to repeat the Regulation 14 stage consultation. This was undertaken between Thursday the 27th April 2017 and Wednesday 14th June 2017. This re-consultation was ‘light touch’ as there had previously been significant opportunity for interested parties to make comments on the plan.

The plan was made available online on the parish council’s Facebook page and the council’s website. Notices were placed on parish noticeboards and paper copies of the documents were made available in Huxley Village Hall, Hargrave Village and Church Hall and St Peter’s Church, Hargrave. Statutory consultees, neighbouring parish councils and major landowners were notified by email.

Over the consultation period responses were received from:

- Environment Agency
- Canal & River trust
- Homes and Communities Agency

Natural England and HSE also responded to say they had no comments to make.

These additional comments have been addressed as outlined in the schedule in Appendix 3 below.

Appendix 1 – List of organisations consulted

- Natural England
- National Grid Company
- Homes and Communities Agency
- United Utilities Water Limited
- Mobile Operators Association
- Cheshire Racial Equality Council
- Network Rail
- Dee Valley Water plc
- Dwr Cymru Welsh Water
- West Cheshire Clinical Commissioning Group
- Marine Management Organisation
- Highways England
- Environment Agency
- Cheshire West & Chester Council Public Health Team
- Historic England
- The Coal Authority
- Waverton Parish Council
- Clotton Hoofield Parish Council
- Tarvin Parish Council
- Duddon Parish Council
- Tarporley Parish Council
- Tiverton & Tilston Fearnall Parish Council
- Tattenhall & District Parish Council
- Handley & District Parish Council
- Alford & Saughton Parish Council
- BT
- English Heritage
- Cheshire Community Action
- Cheshire Wildlife Trust
- Cheshire Landscape Trust
- Lesbian and Gay Foundation
- Cheshire Police
- Cheshire Fire
- Travellers/Gypsy Community
- Sir Thomas Moulson Trust
- CWaC Planning

Appendix 2 – Schedule of Comments and Actions Taken

ID	Comment	Source	Name	Response / Action Taken
NDPCons01	Refer to letter from Historic England.	Statutory		A full list of heritage assets is to be added to the relevant appendix of the supporting document. We see no need to modify the protection already provided for by the NPPF and local plan for heritage assets.

ID	Comment	Source	Name	Response / Action Taken
NDPCons02	<p>Page 7 - 2.2 Community Facilities, third paragraph - please may I suggest the following wording:-</p> <p>In Hargrave there is St Peter's Church and burial ground with the adjacent Church/Village Hall. There is also a small playing field, bowling green and garden - these and the Village Hall are assets of the charity, The Sir Thomas Moulson Trust, founded by Sir Thomas Moulson who was born in the village, later becoming Lord Mayor of London, and who had St Peter's Church built in 1627. The new burial ground, consecrated in 1928, extends without hindrance from the small playing field and this overall area is used as a recreational space as well as providing the venue for the annual Happy Days 3 day festival held every June.</p> <p>Page 18 - what is the house referred to as a heritage asset in Foulk Stapleford?</p> <p>Pages 54 and 67 - could St Peter's Church be made more of as a description of a community asset? - open throughout daylight hours and available to all for weddings, baptisms, funerals and regular services - requiring funds from loyal parishioners to maintain this Grade 2* building and surrounding churchyard</p> <p>Page 130 - a good proportion of our garden at Half Crown Cottage in The Nook is an old established orchard and can be shown and included as such on the map</p> <p>I do acknowledge the hard work of Ian Hunt and the committees who have put this Plan together. It is an excellent document.</p>	Email to PC clerk	Edward Thornton-Firkin, Chairman of The Sir Thomas Moulson Trust	<p>Some details to be added to descriptions of community facilities.</p> <p>Full historical background is not considered necessary, or appropriate for the purpose of this plan.</p> <p>Heritage assets are labelled on plans, see also response to NDPCons01 - a full list of heritage assets is to be added to the appendix.</p> <p>Orchard to be added to map.</p>
NDPCons03	<p>Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above.</p> <p>Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we</p>	Statutory	Coal Authority	No action required.

ID	Comment	Source	Name	Response / Action Taken
	have no specific comments to make on it at this stage.			
NDPCons04	There are plans for development of Home Farm, Burton into housing (barn conversion and new build) with 7plus properties. Also an 'infill' property is already undertaking planning process.	Drop In	Paul Edgar	Considered as an observation - no change to the NDP
NDPCons05	Historical growth a very appropriate guide - support the 20 houses over 15 years	Drop In		Positive support thank you - no change to the NDP
NDPCons06	Affordable housing - if the NDP is relying on local plan policy here, state that this is the case	Drop In		Agreed, this statement will be added to Policy 1.
NDPCons07	State more explicitly how 20 houses was derived = PC workshop estimated future supply	Drop In		Reference to where this is outlined in the supporting document (Appendix A3) to be added to Policy 1.
NDPCons08	I support all the policies described in the plan	Drop In	Simon Bury	Positive support thank you - no change to the NDP
NDPCons09	How will development be managed against the '20 unit' growth level? The policy does not refer to the number of units	Drop In		The NDP does not specify a target, simply a growth rate that is considered acceptable. It will not be actively managed, but the plan will be reviewed every 5 years, and could involve a re-consideration of this figure.
NDPCons10	The policy does not refer to affordable housing. The need data does not support a particular focus on it, but should the plan 'support CWaC policy' or similar?	Drop In		Explicit reference to the NDP supporting CWaC policy in this area to be added.
NDPCons11	Has there been any assessment of whether the policies will realistically deliver c.20 units? If so, it would add credibility to include it.	Drop In		A PC workshop was held, at this session it was found that the policies could be accommodated.
NDPCons12	Fully support the 'historic growth' approach, and 20 units seems quite sufficient	Drop In		Positive support thank you - no change to the NDP

ID	Comment	Source	Name	Response / Action Taken
NDPCons13	Infill needs to be more clearly defined - what is a 'built up frontage'?	Drop In		The definition is defined by CWaC, and cannot be refined further
NDPCons14	We fully support the policies set out in this plan.	Drop In	Mr and Mrs Vincent	Positive support thank you - no change to the NDP
NDPCons15	An extremely useful document, clearly has been well researched. Provides a terrific insight and record of our neighbourhood. Very helpful stuff!	Drop In	John Lles	Positive support thank you - no change to the NDP
NDPCons16	Where are the 'brownfield sites' and potential areas for 'infill' development? As it is a neighbourhood development plan without this detail it is more like a 'strategy' than an actual plan. Affordable homes if there is only a reality for barn conversions where is there potential for affordable homes for young people / young families?	Drop In	Jon Levenson	It was a conscious decision by the NDP action group, with advice from CWaC and our planning consultant, not to specify specific sites. There is no reason why barn conversions can not be affordable, smaller units. It should also be noted that there is no great demand for affordable housing in the resident consultations. Social housing is hard to deliver within the rural area due to the lack of services (p17 copy words) making living difficult for those likely to need affordable and social housing. The NDP follows the local plan policies on affordable and social housing. We don't seek to modify the local plan requirement.
NDPCons17	It is not just the development of facilities but also the community development - clubs etc.	Drop In		Considered as an observation - no change to the NDP
NDPCons18	Paths are not maintained in order that walking should be safe. Cheshire cycle ways versus increased traffic around our villages.	Drop In	Chris McEwan	A quiet lanes policy is encouraged to be considered by the PC, but not part of the NDP.
NDPCons19	difficult to enhance public rights of way as we have not authority or means to do so	Drop In	O De Braekeleer	It is not within the power of the PC to enhance PROW, but where there is development this will be encouraged.

ID	Comment	Source	Name	Response / Action Taken
NDPCons20	How is it suggested public rights of way are 'enhanced'?	Drop In		It is not within the power of the PC to enhance PROW, but where there is development this will be encouraged.
NDPCons21	refurbishment of local properties indicates that planning consent allows any size of development	Drop In	Chris McEwan	Considered as an observation - no change to the NDP as this is not concerned with extension.
NDPCons22	this is so much of what makes our area special - fully support protecting it	Drop In		Positive support thank you - no change to the NDP
NDPCons23	No employment policy when home working should be encouraged - so many self employed, and reduces traffic. The redundant Methodist chapel would easily be a 'home-workers hub', already has all the facilities, just needs satellite broadband. A joint venture between the PC and Methodist circuit = Methodists social agenda	Drop In		A draft policy was considered in earlier phases of the development of the plan and supporting document, little need was shown and so this policy was not pursued.
NDPCons24	Don't understand this plan - how can population density apply to empty fields? At least needs a better legend / depiction otherwise examiners will query and devalues other rigorous data.	Drop In		A description of how the plan was developed to be added to the supporting document section 6.1.
NDPCons25	Broomheath plantation is not a designated open space. It is owned by Broomheath plantation (Simon Harding) there is no public access.	Drop In	RSRalph	This error is marked as such on the CWaC maps. Will adjust wording in plan to reflect this factual error.

ID	Comment	Source	Name	Response / Action Taken
NDPCons26	Traffic very busy, very bad bend, cars drive very fast. Currently we are aware of a development at the side of our property 'the gables' on the bend, planning submitted already, and the intent to build and develop the farm across the way home farm at round 8 developments. this would be far too busy, further increase the danger on the bend, this is a significant increase compared to the existing infrastructure.	Drop In	??	Considered as an observation - no change to the NDP Objections should be sent directly to Duddon and Burton PC, aswell as straight to CWaC. Express concerns.
NDPCons27	the traffic survey missed the traffic flow down broomheath lane / guy lane	Drop In	RSRalph	We were short of volunteers to man all areas identified for the survey. The busier cross roads were chosen. Any volunteers for surveying this areas would be greatly appreciated, please contact I Hunt.
NDPCons28	To maintain and 'enhance' - what does 'enhance' mean? How do we achieve that? Also use the word enhance later in the policies - 2B.	Drop In	Malcolm & Bridget Sarstedt	It is not within the power of the PC to enhance aspects of the area, but where there is development this will be encouraged as appropriate
NDPCons29	The figure in the NDP (figure 1) doesn't have A&B (possibly C) from Plan 02, and hasn't lost the relevant areas. It is not clear what the dotted line around Hargrave and Huxley is showing, make is look like this is the neighbourhood area. How do the two maps relate. Also the map in the plan (figure 1) is low quality, can't zoom in.	Drop In	Malcolm & Bridget Sarstedt	Originally A and B were outside of the parish and so not part of the NDP designated area. They are now part of Hargrave and Huxley PC and so will be looked at in accordance with the NDP. Plan 02 Line of Parish Boundary to be indicated clearly to identify it.

ID	Comment	Source	Name	Response / Action Taken
NDPCons30	the plans are very impressive and comprehensive - except plan 4. I don't understand how great blobs, including fields, can have high population densities. This is meaningless and ludicrous! Where is the methodology? What is the point of this - it devalues the whole document! Finally, plan 9 could do with a key.	Drop In		A description of how Plan 04 was developed to be added to the supporting document section 6.1. Key to be added to Plan 09 and a reference into the supporting document.
NDPCons31	There doesn't seem to be any priority on economic / employment policies. What should our area offer to small businesses? To keep employment local and reduce out of area travel? Overall this is a really impressive document and deserves to be supported	Drop In		A draft policy was considered in earlier phases of the development of the plan and supporting document, little need was shown and so this policy was not pursued.
NDPCons32	No adverse comments, but development of current services e.g. sewerage and broadband more important short term.	Drop In		Considered as an observation - no change to the NDP. Note: mains drains and broadband were considered within the questionnaires.
NDPCons33	There exists in Hatton a small area of private land set aside for the use of the Chester Astronomical society. This society exists for the benefit of its members for the propagation and enjoyment of knowledge in Astronomy.	Drop In	A Bate	Some text to be added to section 2.2 of the supporting document.

ID	Comment	Source	Name	Response / Action Taken
NDPCons34	Refer to full comment	Website form	M Smart	<p>Neither village hall committee has expressed concern about the viability.</p> <p>There is no guarantee that new village residents would join societies or use facilities. Wider society is changing and becoming less collective, and therefore churches, pubs and voluntary organizations all experience reduced use and membership.</p> <p>The supporting document analysis shows that the statement re: ageing populations is not correct, compared to elsewhere we have a larger number of families.</p> <p>The NDP follows the local plan policies on affordable and social housing. We don't seek to modify the local plan requirement.</p> <p>No change to the NDP.</p>
NDPCons35	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Hargrave and Huxley Parish Council.</p> <p>I confirm Highways England has no comments to make on this.</p>	Statutory	Highways	No action required.
NDPCons36	CWaC	Statutory	CWAC	Following a meeting with Graham Bench actions were agreed.

ID	Comment	Source	Name	Response / Action Taken
NDPCons37	Refer to letter	Statutory	Tattenhall & District Parish Council	<p>With reference to points made in the letter received:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreed. 2. The NDP supports growth in line with CWaC policies. 3. The NDP follows the local plan policies on affordable and social housing. We don't seek to modify the local plan requirement. 4. It was a conscious decision by the NDP action group, with advice from CWaC and our planning consultant, not to specify specific sites. 5. Commitments to improve broadband are not within the scope of the NDP. The Parish Council will provide for these in other policies.

Letter from Historic England



Historic England

Rebecca Turner
Clerk to Hargrave and Huxley Parish Council
The Old Police House
Nesscliffe
Shrewsbury
SY4 1DB

Our ref: 1912
Your ref: 26th October 2015
Telephone: 07500 121974

2nd November 2015

Dear Rebecca,

Re: Designation of Central Gowy (South) and District Development Plan –Pre-submission Consultation.

Thank you for consulting Historic England about the Central Gowy (South) and District Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan area includes a number of designated heritage assets (list attached); including the Church of St Peter, Burton Hall, Lower Huxley Hall and the Bridge over the moat at Huxley Hall all listed in GdII*, 3 scheduled ancient monuments, 15 buildings or structures listed in GdII and 2 Conservation Areas. It will be important that the strategy you put together for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the importance of those historic assets. This will assist in ensuring they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area and make sure it is in line with national planning policy.

The conservation officer at Cheshire West and Chester Council is the best placed person to assist you in the development of your Neighbourhood Plan. They can help you to consider how the strategy might address the area's heritage assets. At this point we don't consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the development of the strategy for your area. We are however, disappointed to see no mention of the areas rich heritage in your draft plan, or any associated policies to conserve heritage assets, or protect their settings (given the projected housing growth- see: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/hpg/has/setting/>).

If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the staff at your Historic Environment Record (HER).



Historic England, Suite 3.3, Canada House, 3 Chepstow Street, Manchester M1 5FW
Telephone 0161 242 1416 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.
Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



Historic Environment Record Officer, Archaeology Planning Advisory Service
Cheshire Shared Services
The Forum,
Chester
CH1 2HS
Tel: 01244 973997

Email: moya.watson@cheshirewestandchester
Visit: www.cheshirearchaeology.org.uk

The HER can provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and historic landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society, local history groups or building preservation trusts in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.

Your local authority might also be able to provide you with general support in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan. National Planning Practice Guidance is clear that where it is relevant, Neighbourhood Plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide planning decisions and to put broader strategic heritage policies from the local authority's local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. If appropriate this should include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions.

Further information and guidance on how heritage can best be incorporated into Neighbourhood Plans has been produced by Historic England; this signposts a number of other documents which your community might find useful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at:-

<http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/>

If you have any queries about this matter or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely



Darren Ratcliffe RIBA
Historic Places Adviser

Listed Buildings - Grade I and II*

HA Uid	Name	Grade
1130559	BURTON HALL	II*
1130643	CHURCH OF ST PETER	II*
1130648	BRIDGE OVER MOAT AND ARCHWAY TO LOWER HUXLEY HALL	II*
1330237	LOWER HUXLEY HALL	II*
Listed Buildings - Grade II		
HA Uid	Name	Grade
1130557	STAPLEFORD HALL	II
1130558	BARN 25 METRES EAST OF STAPLEFORD HALL	II
1130641	MEMORIAL STONE 250 METRES NORTH WEST OF BRERETON PARK FARMHOUSE	II
1130642	MEADOW FARMHOUSE	II
1130644	FARMBUILDINGS 10 METRES EAST OF GREENLOOMS	II
1130645	CANAL BRIDGE NO 114NIXONS BRIDGE	II
1130646	CAUSEWAY OVER MOAT AT HATTON HALL	II
1130647	CANAL BRIDGE NO 111WILLIAMSONS BRIDGE	II
1313273	SHIPPON 25 METRES NORTH WEST OF LEADGATE FARMHOUSE	II
1313274	HIGHER HUXLEY MILLMILL FARMHOUSE	II
1330234	GREENLOOMS	II
1330235	BRERETON PARK FARMHOUSE	II
1330236	HATTON HALL	II
1330272	SUNDIAL IN FRONT OF STAPLEFORD HALL	II
1330273	GARDEN WALL AND GATEWAY AT BURTON HALL	II
Scheduled Monuments		
HA Uid	Name	Date Designated
1011787	Hatton Hall moated site	29/10/1991 00:00:00

1011790	Foulk Stapleford moated site	29/10/1991 00:00:00
1011796	Lower Huxley Hall moated site	29/10/1991 00:00:00
Conservation Areas		
Date of Designation		
25/07/1973	Burton, Cheshire West and Chester	
31/08/1974	Sheaf, Cheshire West and Chester	

Section(s) of NDP comment is relevant to:

Policy 1a, 1b, 1c. Policy 2.. Section 3.3 Facilities and Sustainability.

Comment:

Much of the plan content is almost self-evident but the main purpose for a Neighbourhood Development Plan is to influence the future development of the neighbourhood, and it is believed the factors which should be addressed to enable this to take account of the main issues should have been addressed more rigorously than appears to be the case.

In particular, statements are made in the Plan without obvious supporting evidence. E.g. In Policy 2 – Community Facilities it is stated that the village halls are well used and financially sustainable. No evidence seems to be presented to support this statement. In fact the situation regarding the two village halls is understood to be as follows. (The figures exclude usage for meetings needed for preparation of the NDP). (Note that that the statement regarding exercise classes is incorrect. There have been no exercise classes in either hall in the last 12 months, having had to cease due to lack of support.)

HUXLEY VILLAGE HALL

In the last 12 months Huxley Village Hall has actually only been used as follows:

- for 6 evenings per year by the WI.
- for 6 evenings per year by the Historical group
- A few afternoons/evenings for private parties
- For a maximum of 12 evenings a year for film showings
- For about 3 evenings per year by the Parish Council.

This is an extremely low utilisation and the hall is only sustained financially by means of additional fund-raising. The hall would benefit from better facilities and current utilisation would not justify such provision.

HARGRAVE CHURCH HALL

Hargave Church Hall is better utilised as follows.

- For the annual fete and associated social events (1 weekend and maybe 3 evenings per year)
- For 6 evenings per year by the WI
- For 6 evenings per year by the historical bgroup
- For approximately 52 afternoons per year by the Bowling Club
- Church events such as funeral wakes (say 5 per year), after church

refreshments (say 20 per year), Sunday school (12 mornings per year)

Though the Hargrave Hall utilisation is better than that for Huxley Hall, it is still low compared with, say, the Jesse Hughes Hall in Eaton which is utilised most days and evenings. Hargrave Church hall is subsidised by the Church Council and would not otherwise be sustainable.

Both halls are in fact living on “borrowed time” as are the Church and most of the community organisations, due to the increasing age profile of the population. If this point had been recognised in preparation of the plan, more attention would have been attached to the reasons for this lack of support. The villages suffer from the unavailability of houses which are unaffordable to anyone who is on average incomes. The point seems to have been ignored in preparation of the questionnaire and therefore the conclusions drawn by the Plan are questionable.

This is an extremely important point. The analysis should have at least recognised this situation and tried to address it. It is this writer’s opinion that had this been addressed the wholesale rejection of any new houses other than allowed in Policy 1a, 1b and 1c of the Plan could and should have been different. The provision of a small but significant number of additional, more affordable houses would have increased the population with younger families who are likely to increase the support for community organisations, who in turn would increase the utilisation of the village facilities. Ongoing, and carefully managed, such developments could create a “virtuous circle” increasing sustainability and resulting in a much more vibrant community.

It is considered that, had these points been made constructively when the responses were solicited in the Growth Options Consultation (section 4.4 of the Supporting Document) the conclusions drawn would have been more in line with that outlined above

The apparent omission of consideration of this point negates the main policies regarding housing proposed in the Plan and therefore the Plan should be revised before submission for approval.

Cheshire West and Chester comments on Central Gowy (South)
Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation -

Meeting with CWaC, Graham Bench, on 17/12/15.

Summary of responses to his comments in bold italics, 19/1/16.

3.3 – Facilities and Sustainability

- The Council is currently, in line with the Local Plan (Part One), identifying Local Service Centres across the borough. These LSC will be considered the lowest level of identified settlements, suitable settlements for a small level of development in the countryside, depending on an assessment of the available services, and some access to public transport. Both Hargrave and Huxley are on the list of settlements to be assessed.

Can only work with the situation as it exists now. There are no LSCs in our Area. The Plan is written on this basis.

- All modifications to the Local Plan (Part One) have since been made. As such, reference here can be replaced with reference to Paragraph 5.69 of the Local Plan (Part One).

Amend reference.

3.6 – Landscape, Local Character and Environment

- The Council is currently updating the Landscape Character document to standardise character areas across the borough. This update may result in some alterations to terminology.

Useful to know for the future. As above, can only work with the document as it exists now.

Table p13 – from a cursory look, the graph would appear to require all bars to total 100%. As such, given that no bar is at 100% importance, It is unclear how any bar can have no responses in the ‘none’ category. Similarly, It is unclear how Biodiversity at 88% net importance, can have a smaller ‘none’ bar than farming or village hall, both on 89% net importance.

Ensure all notes visible with the graph.

Vision

By including the reference to ‘largely free from further development’, the view could be taken by an examiner that the plan does not meet the basic conditions. Neighbourhood plans should ‘plan positively to support local development, sharing and directing development in their area...’. Although it is acknowledged that the local plan for this area is fairly restrictive, STRAT9 does allow for new development which is appropriate for a rural area. Furthermore, the vision as written is not consistent with the aims of the plan or the growth strategy, although further comments on that are made below. I would recommend ending the vision after ‘farming’.

AG agreed to amend Vision at meeting on 9/12/15

5.1 Policy 1 – Housing

The Council is currently, in line with the Local Plan (Part One), identifying Local Service Centres across the borough. These LSC will be considered the lowest level of identified settlements, and will be suitable settlements for a small level of development in the countryside, depending on an assessment of the available

services, and some access to public transport. Both Hargrave and Huxley are on the list of settlements to be assessed. Until identified as a LSC, development in the Neighbourhood Plan area will be considered to be Countryside, and will be expected to be in line with STRAT 9. If Hargrave or Huxley are identified as LSC, then STRAT 8 would apply to those settlements identified only.

STRAT 9 of the Local Plan (Part One) sets out that development in the countryside will only be considered appropriate if it requires a countryside location and cannot be accommodated within identified settlements. This is intended to focus the majority of development into the more sustainable and more accessible settlements across the Borough.

As the Neighbourhood Plan is within the Countryside, the identification of a target for housing development is not in conformity with the Local Plan (Part One).

Noted by some in earlier AG meetings that an NDP was not required because growth would be in conflict with the very low numbers in the Local Plan. CWaC comment is simply re-stating this; there is an inherent conflict in doing an NDP at all.

Further, the Growth Strategy in the evidence base shows local community support for no more than historic growth levels. This is not adequate to set a target for housing development, not least as there is no assessment of housing need within the Neighbourhood Plan area. In addition, it should be noted that more than sufficient planning permissions have already been granted for housing developments in the rural area to meet the Local Plan (Part One) requirements.

Reference to STRAT8 (unless either Huxley or Hargrave are identified as a Local Service Centre), and SOC2 should be removed.

As above, STRAT 9 applies because there are no LSCs. Remove references to STRAT8 and SOC2.

- 1a – This policy is not in general conformity with STRAT 9 of the Local Plan (Part One). STRAT 9 sets out that development in the countryside will be considered appropriate if it requires a countryside location and cannot be accommodated within identified settlements. This is the minimum level of development acceptable. The Neighbourhood Plan can identify the need for more, but not less. ***Agreed, we should not exclude that development permitted by STRAT 9 and our policy is too comprehensive. Amend.***
- Further, the Open Countryside designation has been replaced by 'Countryside'. ***Change wording here.***
- It is recommended that 1a is removed. ***Agree or re-word adding 'except that which is permitted by STRAT 9 of the Local Plan.'***
- 1b – This policy is partly in general conformity with STRAT 9 of the Local Plan (Part One). As set out previously, unless identified as a Local Service Centre, acceptable development will need to be in line with STRAT 9. This sets out a list of types of development to be permitted, but does not include infill and redevelopment of brownfield sites. It is recommended that 1b is removed as part replication of the Local Plan (Part One), and part not in conformity with the Local Plan (Part One).

The NDP should be in conformity with the Local Plan. In addition the Parish Councils workshop on 8/3/15 identified that there was likely to be sufficient housing supply through change of use of existing buildings only. Infill and redevelopment of brownfield sites were not necessary to fulfil the 'historic growth' rate. Also if the Local Plan does not allow the redevelopment of brownfield sites then they must be returned to greenfield e.g. as at Hoofield and Higher Huxley Hall barn conversions. Agreed, amend.

5.2 Policy 2 – Community Facilities

- 2a – I would recommend including a requirement that clear evidence is provided that the business is not viable, with evidence of marketing over a period of at least 12 months.

Agreed. Clarify that community facilities are not operated on a commercial basis, except for the pub, when it re-opens. The above should apply to commercial premises. Amend.

- 2b – I would recommend rephrasing to read 'Opportunities will be sought to extend or enhance the PROW network wherever possible.'

Amend.

Tattenhall PC Comments



Tattenhall & District Parish Council

Clerk: Mrs J Dutton Hill Farm Burwardsley Nr Tattenhall Cheshire CH3 9PF
Tel: 01829 770379 Email: dutton@tdpc.wanadoo.co.uk



5th December 2015

Comments from Tattenhall & District Parish Council on the Central Gowx (South) Hargrave and Huxley Neighbourhood Plan

1. Following a Governance Review by Cheshire West and Chester Council (CW&C) the boundaries of many parishes were changed. As a result the boundaries of Tattenhall Parish and Huxley Parish no longer correspond with the boundaries designated by their respective Neighbourhood Plans (NP). Indeed there are now areas in both parishes which are covered by the other parishes NP Policies.

Tattenhall Parish is discussing with Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) methods of re-designating its boundary, now that it has a made NP, in order to resolve this conflict. But we consider that during the six week publicity period (Regulation 16) would be an ideal time for Central Gowx (South) to realign its NP designated area to correspond with its new Parish boundary and to assist with this process.

2. Tattenhall Parish Council considers that this plan has been written to accommodate minimal growth in order to maintain the "status quo". Whilst we accept that Central Gowx (South) is not, nor does it contain, a Key Service Centre (KSC) we would expect a Neighbourhood Plan to plan positively and to be aware that to maintain facilities and services some growth above that designated in the Local Plan (LP) will be required.

3. It is also disappointing that the Central Gowx (South) policies have not made any provision for affordable housing that would allow older people to downsize and young people to get a foot on the housing ladder enabling both groups to remain in the community.

4. Although Policy 1 refers to re-using "brownfield" sites there is nowhere in the document that details whether there is any available.

5. Whilst the document highlights the lack of broadband there is no commitment in the policies to work with any agencies to improve this

Jean Dutton
Clerk – Tattenhall & District Parish Council

Appendix 3

Second Regulation 14 Consultation April - June 2017– Schedule of Comments and Actions Taken

ID	Comment	Source	Name	Response / Action Taken
NDPCons38	<p>The Environment Agency is pleased and encouraged to see that rivers are considered by the community of Central Gowy to be “extremely important,” rated 4th out of 35 in the table on page 14.</p> <p>However, even though the river flows through the neighbourhood area, there is no specific reference to the River Gowy in the development plan. The river is an incredibly important wildlife corridor, but it’s currently failing to meet “good ecological status” under the European Water Framework Directive due to poor water quality. The River Gowy’s importance to the local community and for wildlife should be reflected in the plan policies, to ensure that all developments conserve and enhance this river and help it meet “good ecological status” by 2027.</p>	Statutory	Environment Agency	<p>Mention of the river added to the section on Landscape, Local Character and Environment (section 3.6 of the Plan).</p> <p>Additional information added to supporting document section 5.</p> <p>Policy extended to include 3g which reference the river drainage.</p>
NDPCons39	<p>The Shropshire Union Canal passes through and along the southern boundary of the neighbourhood area before crossing in a north-westerly direction through the designated area. The Shropshire Union canal contributes to the rural character of the area and as such the Canal and River Trust would welcome the canal being acknowledged with ‘the area’ description found on pages 6 and 7.</p> <p>The Trust would also welcome the use of the canal and towpath for recreation and leisure purposes to</p>	Statutory	Canal & River trust	<p>Mention of the canal added to leisure facilities in section 3.5 of the Plan.</p> <p>Additional information added to supporting document section 5.</p>

ID	Comment	Source	Name	Response / Action Taken
	be acknowledged at section 3.5 Infrastructure, specifically under the heading 'leisure' on page 11 of the document.			
NDPCons40	Thank you for informing the HCA that the Central Gowy (South) neighbourhood plan has been published for pre-submission consultation. The HCA does not own any land within the Plan area but the Housing Policies contained are noted	Statutory	Homes & Communities Agency	Comments in support of the plan – no action necessary