



Report on Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2030

An Examination undertaken for Cheshire East Council with the support of the Alderley Edge Parish Council on the September 2020 Regulation 15 submission version of the Plan.

Independent Examiner: Andrew Seaman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Date of Report: 18 January 2021

Contents	Page
Main Findings - Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction and Background	3
• Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Development Plan	3
• The Independent Examiner	4
• The Scope of the Examination	4
• The Basic Conditions	5
2. Approach to the Examination	6
• Planning Policy Context	6
• Submitted Documents	6
• Site Visit	7
• Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	7
• Modifications	7
3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights	7
• Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	7
• Plan Period	8
• Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	8
• Development and Use of Land	9
• Excluded Development	9
• Human Rights	9
4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions	10
• EU Obligations	10
• Main Issues	10
• Vision and Objectives	11
• Overarching Approach to Development (Policy AE1)	11
• Housing (Policies AE2-AE4)	14
• Local Economy and the Village Centre (Policies AE5-AE8)	19
• Character and Landscape (Policies AE9-AE13)	21
• Access and Infrastructure (Policies AE14-AE18)	26
• Community Facilities (Policies AE19, AE20)	28
5. Conclusions	28
• Summary	28
• The Referendum and its Area	28
• Overview	29
Appendix: Modifications	30

Main Findings - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Plan/NP) and its supporting documentation including the representations made, I have concluded that, subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- The Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Alderley Edge Parish Council;
- The Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – the Alderley Edge Parish Council area, as shown on Map 1 on Page 9 of the submitted Plan;
- The Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect: 2020 – 2030; and
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

1. Introduction and Background

Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Development Plan

- 1.1 The Alderley Edge Parish Council administers a Parish which, as noted within the Plan, is semi-rural in character and contains extensive designated Green Belt. The village of Alderley Edge is inset within the Green Belt and is relatively populous (4,780 residents¹). It contains a vibrant commercial core, a broad range of community facilities, a train station with good connectivity to Manchester and a range of verdant residential areas. It is separated from Wilmslow to the north and lies approximately 15 miles south of Manchester.
- 1.2 The NP has been approximately four years in preparation. As set out in the Consultation Statement and elsewhere, the Plan's development was instigated by the Parish Council and led by a steering committee who have consistently sought to gain the views of the Parish residents in

¹ 2011 Census data.

shaping its objectives and content, through the use of public meetings, questionnaires and engagement events.

- 1.3 The NP contains² a 'Vision' and a set of 'Objectives' for the area. These recognise the need for growth within the Parish whilst preserving the unique village culture, identity and character and maintaining the quality of life for all residents and stakeholders. The subsequent suite of NP policies is tailored to ensure appropriate forms of sustainable development are secured which will contribute towards the delivery of the Vision.

The Independent Examiner

- 1.4 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Development Plan by Cheshire East Council (CEC), with the agreement of Alderley Edge Parish Council.
- 1.5 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector, with experience of development plan examinations. I am an independent examiner, and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

- 1.6 As the independent examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
 - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
 - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.7 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ('the 1990 Act'). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the plan meets the Basic Conditions;
 - Whether the plan complies with provisions under s.38A and s.38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ('the 2004 Act'). These are:

² Chapter 4 of the Plan.

- it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
 - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
 - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
 - it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development';
 - it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area;
 - whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the plan proceed to referendum; and
- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)('the 2012 Regulations').

1.8 I have considered only the matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan be compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

1.9 The 'Basic Conditions' are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:

- Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
- Be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations; and
- Meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.

1.10 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of

2. Approach to the Examination

Planning Policy Context

- 2.1 Planning policy for England is set out principally, although not exclusively, in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF⁴). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. All references in this report are to the February 2019 NPPF and its accompanying PPG.
- 2.2 The Development Plan for this part of Cheshire East Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, is the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (CELPS⁵) and relevant saved policies from the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan 2004.
- 2.3 CEC has consulted on its initial Publication Draft Site Allocations and Development Plan Policies Document (SADPD) which will support the CELPS. Having considered the outcome of the consultation, a revised Publication Draft SADPD has been produced and consulted upon (26 October 2020 – 23 December 2020). The Council will consider the outcome of this consultation prior to submitting the SADPD for examination. This will form the second part of the Local Plan. It will set non-strategic and detailed planning policies to guide planning decisions and allocate additional sites for development to assist in meeting the overall development requirements set out in the CELPS. For the purposes of this examination, although I do not test the NP against the policies in the emerging SADPD, the reasoning and evidence informing the SADPD process is likely to be relevant to the consideration of the Basic Conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested. It is on that basis that I consider the emerging SADPD⁶.

Submitted Documents

- 2.4 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:
 - the Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Development Plan (September 2020);

³ This revised Basic Condition came into effect by virtue of the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

⁴ View at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework>

⁵ View at: <https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/pdf/planning/local-plan/local-plan-strategy-web-version-1.pdf>

⁶ PPG Reference ID: 41-009-20190509.

- Map 1 of the Plan, which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan relates;
- the Consultation Statement, July 2020;
- the Basic Conditions Statement, July 2020;
- all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation⁷;
- the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion prepared by CEC (December 2019); and
- the clarifications received (2 December 2020) to my correspondence (dated 23 November 2020)⁸.

Site Visit

2.5 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 30 November to familiarise myself with it, and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidence documents. These include Alderley Edge village, the Conservation Areas, the Local Green Spaces, Alderley Edge and the area separating the village from Wilmslow.

Written Representations with or without Public Hearing

2.6 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan and presented adequate arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum. No requests for a hearing session were received.

Modifications

2.7 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area

3.1 The Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Development Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by Alderley Edge Parish Council, which is a qualifying body for an area that was designated by CEC on 24 June

⁷ Including that from Sport England sent to the Parish Council on 12 November 2020.

⁸ View at: <https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-plans/neighbourhood-plans-a-f/alderley-edge-neighbourhood-plan.aspx> Response 2 December 2020 needs adding to website

2016⁹. The designated area is shown at NP Map 1 and constitutes the Parish of Alderley Edge, which is a logical proposition. The NP defers housing site allocations to the SADPD so there is no substantive justification, for example to accommodate housing land, for extending the designated area beyond the Parish boundary.

- 3.2 It is the only Neighbourhood Plan for Alderley Edge and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Plan Period

- 3.3 The Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2020 to 2030. This aligns appropriately to the CELPS.

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

- 3.4 As referenced in the Plan, the supporting Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement, the Parish Council resolved to produce a Neighbourhood Plan in 2016 and commenced work in earnest on the Plan following the formal designation of the Neighbourhood Plan Area in June 2016. The Parish Council wished to influence the future growth of the village, which was perceived to be an attractive location for development. It is clear from the consultation statement that the Parish Council prioritised the need to keep residents informed and to provide suitable opportunities to influence the process of plan production. A public meeting was held in July 2016 which attracted an attendance of 73 people.
- 3.5 A second public meeting was convened in September 2016 which focussed on issues arising from the July feedback, namely: green spaces, infrastructure, heritage and community/well-being. Thereafter, a Steering Group was established to guide the process of NP production consisting of Parish councillors, residents and local stakeholders.
- 3.6 A questionnaire was circulated to residents in March 2017 which received 375 responses which were used to inform the next steps of the NP formulation. Following a third public meeting, an Emerging Policies Document was produced by the Steering Group identifying key issues, a vision, objectives and policies for the area. This was subject to 4 weeks of informal consultation.
- 3.7 Additional surveys and work were commissioned by the Steering Group (e.g. business and car park survey). The evidence collectively informed the First Draft Plan, that was subject to informal consultation in August/September 2019. The responses were collated and, whilst the majority were supportive, informed further changes to the draft NP.

⁹ View at: <https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/pdf/planning/neighbourhood-plan/alderley-edge-neighbourhood-area-decision-notice.pdf>

3.8 Following completion of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Opinion (including the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Screening Opinion), the Regulation 14 public consultation was undertaken from 27 January to 9 March 2020 producing 72 responses¹⁰. The consultation included:

- consultation with statutory bodies;
- notification on where, when and how to view and comment on the Plan;
- email notification to interested parties;
- attendance at publicised 'drop in' events was encouraged; and
- consultation with other Parish councils and bodies.

Following further amendment, the NP was submitted to CEC and subject to Regulation 16 consultation from 2 October to 13 November 2020 and 13 consultee responses were received.

3.9 I am satisfied that a transparent, proportionate, fair and inclusive consultation process has been followed for the Plan that has had regard to the advice in the PPG on plan preparation and is procedurally compliant in accordance with the legal requirements.

Development and Use of Land

3.10 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with s.38A of the 2004 Act.

Excluded Development

3.11 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'.

Human Rights

3.12 The Basic Conditions Statement concludes that the Plan has had regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention of Human Rights Act 1998, and I note that CEC is satisfied that the Plan does not breach Human Rights (within the meaning of the Act). From my independent assessment, with particular focus on the policy content, I agree.

¹⁰ See Consultation Statement including Appendix 5.

4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

EU Obligations

- 4.1 The Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Development Plan was screened for SEA¹¹ (including HRA Screening) by CEC which found that it was unnecessary to undertake a full SEA. Neither Natural England (NE) nor the Environment Agency, when consulted, disagreed with that assessment. Historic England raised no concerns. Having read the SEA Screening Opinion, I conclude that SEA is not required.
- 4.2 The Plan was further screened for HRA which concluded that a HRA was not required. The Neighbourhood Plan Area is not in such close proximity to any European designated nature site that significant adverse effects to environmental interests would arise and, from my independent assessment of this matter and with regard to NE's comments, I agree with the content of the HRA Screening.

Main Issues

- 4.3 Following the consideration of whether the Plan complies with various procedural and legal requirements, it is now necessary to deal with whether it complies with the remaining Basic Conditions; particularly the regard it pays to national policy and guidance, the contribution it makes to the achievement of sustainable development and whether it is in general conformity with strategic development plan policies. I test the Plan against the Basic Conditions by considering specific issues of compliance with all the Plan's policies.
- 4.4 As part of that assessment, I consider whether the policies in the Plan are sufficiently clear and unambiguous, having regard to advice in the PPG. It is important to note that a policy should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence¹². I recommend some modifications to the Plan as a result.
- 4.5 Accordingly, having regard to the Plan, the consultation responses, the written evidence and my site visit, I consider that the main issues for this examination are whether the Plan policies:
- have regard to national policy and guidance, including their justification;
 - are in general conformity with the adopted strategic planning policies; and
 - would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

¹¹ Alderley Edge Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan SEA Screening Report, December 2019.

¹² PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

Following the sequence within the Plan, I shall assess these issues on the basis of the Plan's following chapters: Vision and Objectives, Approach to Development, Housing, Local Economy/Village Centre, Character/Landscape, Access/Infrastructure and finally, Community Facilities.

Vision and Objectives

- 4.6 The NP Vision has been refined following community engagement and appropriate consultation. It supports growth whilst seeking to maintain key village attributes and the quality of life experienced by residents and visitors. As such, it is a logical and clear statement of what Parish residents and stakeholders wish to achieve during the Plan period. It aligns with the principle of achieving sustainable forms of development and is supported by an overarching objectives and 6 key objectives derived from the community feedback. These relate to housing, the local economy, the natural and built environment, access/infrastructure and community/sports/recreation facilities. These collectively support and inform the suite of policies which follow. The Vision is clear and the objectives undisputed. I consider them reasonable and suitable for the NP.

Overarching Approach to Development (Policy AE1)

- 4.7 The NP and its evidence incorporate an assessment of the wider planning context within Cheshire East and the issues affecting development within the area. The NP recognises that Alderley Edge is a Local Service Centre as defined by the CELPS and that Policy PG2 envisages that small scale development to meet needs and priorities will be supported. The NP includes an analysis and understanding of the character of the Parish and the village in particular, demonstrating an awareness of community requirements and existing facilities.
- 4.8 The NP contains references to the emerging SADPD which are based on the July 2019 version and not, due to the timetable of the respective plans production, the current 2020 version which has now been consulted on. As a consequence, many of the NP references are out of date. The Parish council recognise¹³ that the NP will require revision in this respect if the NP is to proceed to referendum and be made. I consider that such revisions will be factual non-material changes that can be undertaken in cooperation with CEC prior to any referendum. The NP currently acknowledges that the emerging SADPD will have limited weight in decision making until it is adopted.
- 4.9 As a consequence for example, paragraphs 5.8, 5.9 and 6.13 et al, do not reflect accurately the current position of the SADPD. The SADPD no

¹³ Parish Council correspondence submitted to the Examination, dated 2 December 2020.

longer allocates specific housing sites within the Neighbourhood Plan Area and the Green Belt adjustment for Alderley Edge as originally proposed has altered. As a result NP Map 3 is inaccurate and requires factual amendment.

- 4.10 Nevertheless, the NP itself does not identify specific development sites for allocation. Instead, it relies on the SADPD process to determine sites and any changes to the Green Belt which are required. The NP correctly indicates that the policies of the NP and those of CEC will be used to guide development proposals which arise. Consequently, the altered content of the SADPD does not render the NP ineffective, unjustified or incapable of proceeding.
- 4.11 The development strategy of the NP is expressed by Policy AE1. The policy targets growth to the most appropriate locations within the Parish and provides criteria to be considered for proposals upon sites not allocated by the future SADPD. The thrust of the policy is consistent with the CELPS and has due regard to the objective of securing sustainable forms of development as required by national policy.
- 4.12 In its detail, the first paragraph of the policy requires new development to be targeted to the 'most appropriate locations' but there is no evidence to justify this form of sequential selection or to indicate why simply appropriate locations would not be acceptable. Similarly, the policy requires the highest levels of integration, sustainability, connectivity and design quality but there is insufficient justification for setting such a laudable but potentially onerous requirement when high levels of these factors would be consistent with both national policy and the Development Plan. I therefore recommend a modification to the policy in this regard (**PM1**).
- 4.13 The second paragraph of Policy AE1 applies to new development proposals which may arise in addition to any site allocations contained within the Development Plan. This is entirely reasonable although for clarity the NP should also include reference to CELPS Policy SC 6 for rural exceptions housing for local needs. I recommend a modification accordingly (PM1).
- 4.14 Policy AE1 includes 6 criteria for consideration when development proposals arise. Firstly, the NP proffers support for schemes which are located within the settlement boundary as defined by the Policies Map. The NP does not propose any changes to the boundary currently identified within the CELPS which is that effectively derived from the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan. It is intended that this will be updated by the SADPD. Given that the NP defers to the SADPD for development allocations such as new housing, this is an acceptable approach. It is consistent with the provisions of the CELPS (e.g. Policy PG 2, PG 6 et al) and the status of Alderley Edge as a Local Service Centre within the settlement hierarchy, which envisages small scale forms of development.

There is insufficient justification for requiring any amendment to this criterion to allow specifically for edge of settlement development. The safeguarded housing site proposed as part of the SADPD does not require specific reference within this policy, as it will be addressed by the SADPD as necessary in due course.

- 4.15 Criterion AE1 (2) provides support for the development of previously developed land/buildings wherever possible. I am satisfied that the wording of the policy, especially the reference to 'wherever possible', does not introduce a sequential preference test for new development to be situated on previously developed land ahead of green field sites, which would be contrary to national policy.
- 4.16 Criterion AE1 (3) would not support the delivery of major¹⁴ development. I am mindful that the NP recognises the need for modest growth in housing and employment and that small scale development will be needed to support the sustainability of the community. Nonetheless, major developments may, for example, consist simply of 11 housing units which could feasibly be considered 'small scale' in a wider context and not undermine the vision for the NP. Consequently, the reasoning for precluding support for all forms of major developments is not justified and would potentially run contrary to national policy for the effective use of land¹⁵, particularly where the remaining criteria of Policy AE1 and the Development Plan in general will remain to ensure that an appropriate form of development occurs. I therefore amend the policy accordingly (PM1).
- 4.17 Criteria AE1 (4) and (5) are consistent with the CELPS, have appropriate regard to national policy and are suitable responses to the specific context of Alderley Edge.
- 4.18 Criterion AE1 (6) affirms that the policy requirements of the NP and of CEC must be satisfied but this is unnecessary given that all relevant policies of the Development Plan would apply to proposals in any event. I therefore recommend deletion of this element to aid the simple application of Policy AE1 as a whole (PM1).
- 4.19 Therefore, on the evidence before me, and with the recommended modifications (PM1), I consider that the Plan's overarching approach to development is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted Development Plan, has regard to national policy, would

¹⁴ For housing, development where 10 or more homes will be provided, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more. For non-residential development it means additional floorspace of 1,000m² or more, or a site of 1 hectare or more, or as otherwise provided in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

¹⁵ NPPF: Chapter 11.

contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and so would meet the Basic Conditions.

Housing (Policies AE2-AE4)

- 4.20 Chapter 6 of the NP addresses housing issues within the Parish. The NP and its evidence combine to demonstrate an adequate understanding of the national and local housing context with a suitable analysis of the relevant planning policy considerations. As noted above and contained within the Plan, the NP does not make housing site allocations and seeks to utilise criteria based planning policies to secure suitable and sustainable forms of new development.
- 4.21 The NP requires revision, particularly paragraph 6.13 and Map 3, to ensure it is up to date with the emerging SADPD which has been altered to remove previously proposed housing allocations, albeit a safeguarded site (ALD 3) remains. Nevertheless, the narrative text of the NP (paragraphs 6.1 – 6.25) provides an adequately reasoned justification for the NP policies which follow and has been informed by commissioned evidence, such as the Housing Needs Assessment 2019 and Design Codes 2019¹⁶.
- 4.22 I note that the NP refers to development viability. The commentary provided by NP paragraphs 6.23 and 6.24 does not reference the additional national guidance¹⁷ that advises of the need for a proportionate assessment of viability that takes into account all relevant policies and local and national standards. There is no evidence of how viability has been considered in relation to the potential effects of NP policy requirements and consequently, to secure the effective implementation of policy and new development, some flexibility within the NP is required.
- 4.23 Policy AE2 relates to the design, scale and type of new housing. It is relatively lengthy and detailed. As such, Policy AE2 (1) refers to the Cheshire East Design Guide and the Village Wide Design Principles set out in the Alderley Edge Design Codes. The former is established guidance and contains useful design advice relevant to proposals within Cheshire East. The latter represents specific design advice pertinent to the Neighbourhood Plan Area and is reflective of local aspirations whilst being grounded in an understanding and evaluation of the area's defining qualities. Whilst there is inevitably some overlap between the two documents, they are not unduly repetitious. Both are informative and will be helpful in contributing towards the design of appropriate development within the Plan area. Nevertheless, the undue prescription and application of general design guidance as planning policy could potentially conflict with the delivery of high quality buildings and places as envisaged by national policy. Consequently, it is not justified for policy AE2 (1) to

¹⁶ View at: <https://www.alderleynp.com/inventory>

¹⁷ View at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/viability>

require proposals to 'adhere' to the available design guidance; alternatively however, it is entirely reasonable that proposals should have demonstrable regard to it. I recommend accordingly (**PM2**).

- 4.24 Policy AE2 (2) seeks to secure development schemes appropriate to their site in scale and character. The requirements of this policy are not unduly prescriptive albeit, in contrast, they may be considered general in their stipulations. Nonetheless, the policy requirements need to be considered in the context of the available design guidance and, on balance, are consequently acceptable.
- 4.25 Policy AE2 (3) reasonably seeks to secure an appropriate mix of house types and tenures which address local housing needs. This is consistent with the CELPS, including Policy SC 4. The actual mix proposed by Policy AE2 (3A) is supported by the commissioned Housing Needs Assessment. This latter evidence is not unduly weakened in its conclusions by the response rate to the surveys undertaken in its methodology which also includes the analysis of other data sets. The content of the NP does not conflict specifically with the emerging SADPD in this regard, including Policy HOU 1. Nonetheless, Policy AE2 (3A) requires modification to ensure its effective operation on small sites where the cited mix could not be secured. I recommend accordingly (PM2).
- 4.26 Not all sites will be suitable for, or capable of, delivering a housing mix which includes bungalows. The Housing Needs Assessment caveats its conclusions upon the need for bungalows by recognising that its recommendations are a broad guideline only and are untested for any viability implications on site delivery. Consequently, additional flexibility is required within Policy AE2 (3B) to ensure it is an effective means of delivering, and not stymying, needed housing. I recommend a modification to support the delivery of smaller homes, including bungalows where appropriate, in recognition of the Parish demographics which include an increasingly elderly population (PM2).
- 4.27 The reference within Policy AE2 (3B) to adaptable housing is unclear. Neighbourhood plans should not require different technical standards to the Building Regulations. Modification PM2 therefore includes a recommendation to support schemes that deliver suitable housing for those with disabilities or special needs where justified.
- 4.28 Policy AE2 (3C) addresses the issue of delivering affordable housing and, in large part, replicates the provisions of CELPS Policy SC 5, including site size thresholds of 11 or more dwellings and a minimum 30% provision of affordable homes which may be altered where evidence exists. Policy SC 5 requires the provision of affordable housing to be on-site unless exceptionally shown to be not possible, whereby off-site provision may be made or, thereafter, a financial sum provided in lieu of provision. The supporting text to the CELPS indicates that where affordable housing is to be provided off-site, then the details of that alternative provision are to

be agreed with the Council and will need to be in a suitable location relative to the need being met. This differs from the provisions of AE2 (3C) which requires the off-site provision to be within the settlement boundary of Alderley Edge. There is no substantive evidence to support this stance or to indicate that it is capable of delivery. Furthermore, the penultimate sentence of this part of the policy does not make grammatical sense. Collectively, I therefore consider the requirements of the NP not to be in general conformity with the strategic policy of the CELPS and, elsewhere, to be unnecessarily repetitive. I therefore recommend the deletion of Part 3C (PM2) notwithstanding, for completeness, a suitable cross reference to CELPS policies.

- 4.29 Finally, CELPS Policy SC 5(7) already indicates that the viability of schemes which result in variations to the normal provision of affordable housing may be subject to future review and, if warranted, the application of overage payments. NP Policy AE2 (4) provides additional detail on when such review points would occur. The policy is particularly prescriptive and provides no specific evidence in support of the review points identified albeit they are of some chronological sense. Regular review is a logical and reasonable requirement. In order to be responsive to site circumstances, which can be agreed on a bespoke basis, the policy requires modification so as to be effective in its implementation. Such modifications support the suggestions made by CEC. I recommend accordingly (PM2).
- 4.30 The NP seeks to take a positive approach towards the delivery of sustainable housing design. This is supported by the community and expressed through Policy AE3 which contains extensive and detailed criteria. I am mindful that the NPPF requires that policies within plans should serve a clear purpose and avoid unnecessary duplication of existing policies¹⁸. The PPG is clear that policies must not undermine the potential delivery of the Development Plan. Critically, policies in a neighbourhood plan should be clear, unambiguous, and capable of being applied consistently; they should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It is against this context that the NP falls to be considered.
- 4.31 Policy AE3 contains considerable detail. There are occasions where this repeats the provisions of the Development Plan (e.g. Local Plan Policy SD 2). In many instances, the detail is too prescriptive for a concise and effective planning policy albeit the information could reasonably form part of the supporting policy justification and provide an informative context for the consideration and determination of development proposals.
- 4.32 The objective of the policy is reasonable and has regard to national policy. However, as currently worded, it is uncertain if all of the criteria of the policy are expected to be satisfied in all development proposals.

¹⁸ NPPF: Paragraph 16 f).

Clarity is required to ensure that the criteria only apply where relevant and I recommend a modification accordingly (**PM3**).

- 4.33 The need for a suitable transition between new development and the surrounding countryside is reasonable and can be secured through a number of different techniques. I recommend that the reference to landscaping and densities is moved from the policy to the supporting justification, in order to ensure that the policy is clear; not unduly prescriptive and inflexible to any site specific circumstances that may arise; and thereby be capable of effective implementation (PM3). In addition, to be comprehensive, the policy requirements should apply to all green field development and not just allocated sites.
- 4.34 Similarly it is reasonable, and consistent with national policy and the Development Plan, for travel considerations for new housing schemes to be broader than the private car. The detail of how pedestrian and cycle routes could link to existing facilities can reasonably be included in the supporting text of the policy, whilst the reference to commuted sums is unnecessary and would be resolved on a case by case basis where circumstances justify such an approach. I recommend the deletion of these items from criterion 3 (PM3).
- 4.35 The objective of securing a high quality public realm is logical and has regard to national policy. The strict adherence to the Design Codes would potentially be unduly prescriptive and inflexible but it is entirely reasonable for proposals to be informed by this locally derived information. The Design Codes refer to shared spaces for social interaction and therefore repetitive inclusion in the planning policy is unnecessary. I recommend modification to criterion 4 accordingly (PM3).
- 4.36 The CELPS contains parking standards. Criterion 5 should be shortened to be precise and effective with a cross reference to the applicable CEC parking standards (PM3).
- 4.37 There is no specific evidence to indicate why every new house should be provided with external charging points as required by criterion 7. There is also no evidence on whether the effect that requirement may have on development costs would be acceptable and how that would relate to schemes with elements of communal parking. Consequently it is unjustified as worded. Nonetheless, the principle of including electric charging points is reasonable, is referenced in the CELPS and can reasonably be a consideration for the design of new housing. I therefore recommend a modification to this effect (PM3), which includes additional supporting text.
- 4.38 Criterion 8 should be simplified in order to be effective in its implementation (PM3).

- 4.39 Criterion 9 provides some factors for consideration that can contribute positively to successful sustainable design. The requirements would benefit from simplification to ensure flexibility in their implementation. The statement that support for schemes will not be forthcoming when the cited policy requirements are not considered by proposals requires some degree of discretion in its application but is, alongside the requirements, reasonable and has due regard to national policy. I recommend accordingly (PM3).
- 4.40 Criterion 10 seeks to enhance the energy performance of new housing in construction and operation over and above current requirements of Building Regulations. The objective of the policy is understandable in the context of broader sustainability considerations. However, the justification for the specific policy in Alderley Edge is not supported by any clear evidence, for example why it should apply in the manner drafted, why it should only apply to developments upon Green Belt land and why it should only apply to major schemes. Furthermore, there is no indication that its potential effect upon development viability has been assessed. Consequently, its requirements are not justified and has not had due regard to the plan making requirements of national policy. I recommend its deletion accordingly (PM3).
- 4.41 Passivhaus is a voluntary building standard not sought by national policy. However, the aspiration to support 'eco-housing' in principle is reasonable and would be consistent with national policy objectives. Criterion 11 requires modification to recognise that appropriate 'eco housing' will be supported which may, but not solely, include Passivhaus certification, albeit there is no reason that such housing should be exempt from the need to provide appropriate communications infrastructure as stated in the NP. I recommend accordingly (PM3).
- 4.42 Criterion 12 requires modification to ensure it is precise and capable of effective and flexible implementation. Thereafter it can be reasonably considered to have due regard to national policy, such as NPPF Chapter 15, which provides for biodiversity net gains and enhancement where feasible (PM3)
- 4.43 Criterion 13 refers to the priority habitats defined by the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (as amended) (NERC). CELPS Policy SE 3 already provides a measure of planning protection to such areas which are not defined or mapped within the NP albeit, on balance, the reference within NP Policy AE3 is justified. It is unclear what is meant by 'naturalisation' within the policy and this is not explained by the supporting text. This could lead to difficulties in implementation and therefore, to ensure an effective policy, I recommend a modification to delete this phrase (PM3) which also includes deletion of the unnecessary descriptors of potential NERC habitats.

- 4.44 The objectives of criteria 14 and 16 are reasonable but the policy factors are unnecessarily detailed and unduly prescriptive. I recommend a modification to ensure the policy is more precise and the relocation of some of the policy detail to the supporting text to ensure it is capable of effective implementation (PM3).
- 4.45 CELPS Policy SE 13 provides some detail of sustainable urban drainage requirements which obviates the need for their inclusion within Policy AE3 (17). I therefore recommend modification to avoid unnecessary repetition (PM3).
- 4.46 National policy enables the provision of planning policies which resist inappropriate development of residential gardens where harm to the local area may arise. NP Policy AE4 addresses this issue. Nonetheless, suitable development of garden or backland sites can provide a useful supply of necessary housing land, as recognised by the partial reliance on windfall housing provision within the current Development Plan and the emerging SADPD.
- 4.47 As drafted, NP Policy AE4 seeks to avoid development that would harm unacceptably the character of the area by reason of loss of openness, mature trees, hedges and shrubbery and a substantial increase in the density of built form. Given the evidence supporting the character of the village, this can be considered reasonable. The policy would require all proposals to provide justification to support higher density development but the reasoning for this is not clear. If harmful effects from development are avoided then the justification for development would become largely moot. I therefore consider this requirement unwarranted and I modify the policy accordingly. The third paragraph contains a requirement for the protection of trees and hedgerows which repeats the provisions of Policy AE3 (14) and I recommend its deletion as a result (PM4).
- 4.48 Overall and with the recommended modifications, I consider that the Plan's housing policies are in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted Development Plan, have regard to national guidance, would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and so would meet the Basic Conditions.

Local Economy and the Village Centre (Policies AE5-AE8)

- 4.49 The NP contains an analysis of the immediate Alderley Edge economy which is supported by specific evidence such as the Cheshire Retail Study Update, the Business Survey Report, two car parking surveys and business audit. This chapter of the NP indicates an awareness of the strategic policy context, including the designation of the village as a Local Service Centre, and has due regard to national policy.

- 4.50 Policy AE5 encourages entrepreneurship by seeking to support proposals that use business accommodation within or adjacent to the village centre and deliver one or more of three criteria. This spatial approach is consistent with the CELPS. The criteria have been derived from the information gleaned from the community and whilst I recommend some refinement to ensure the effective implementation of the policy as a whole (**PM5**), I am satisfied that it is suitably justified and reasonable in its approach.
- 4.51 Policy AE6 aims to support existing businesses within Alderley Edge, subject to 5 criteria. The policy is positive in its intent. Criterion 2 seeks to prioritise a village centre location for businesses occupying dedicated premises to help ensure long term sustainability. However, the rationale for this approach is not explicitly provided or supported by evidence or the text of the NP. Indeed, it is uncertain if the long term sustainability of the business or the village centre is intended, or both. I note that the survey data and NP paragraph 7.14 acknowledge the variety of businesses in the area, not all of whom are currently based in the village centre or who would necessarily be suited to being so. Consequently, some flexibility is required within the policy to ensure that village centre locations are utilised where appropriate, without disadvantaging other established business activities elsewhere. I recommend accordingly in the interests of ensuring an effective and justified policy (**PM6**).
- 4.52 New development proposals should ensure access and servicing issues are addressed adequately albeit they could not legitimately be required to resolve access issues which are unconnected to the scheme proposed. Criterion 4 needs clarification in this respect to ensure its effective implementation (PM6). Criterion 5 unnecessarily refers to other access and infrastructure policies which would apply, where relevant, in any case. I recommend this is deleted (PM6).
- 4.53 The NP and its evidence confirm that Alderley Edge experiences the effects of tourism. Policy AE7 provides criteria to be assessed when considering new tourism/visitor proposals which are consistent with the Development Plan.
- 4.54 The NP notes, which I observed, the relative vibrancy of Alderley Edge's commercial centre in addition to challenges that it faces, for example those perceived by the condition of the public realm and parking inadequacies. Consequently, Policy AE8 supports proposals which improve the public realm via one or more of 5 criteria. These are logical and consistent with the Development Plan.
- 4.55 Policy AE8 also addresses the issue of shop fronts and security with 3 criteria which are reasonable and relate to the character and aspirations of the village. Overall, with modification (**PM7**) to explain that not all of the criteria apply to the consideration of all schemes and to acknowledge

that the Use Classes Order has been amended¹⁹, Policy AE8 is suitably justified and will be effective in implementation.

- 4.56 Therefore, with modification, the Plan's approach to the local economy and the village centre will be consistent with the strategic intentions of the Development Plan, has due regard to national policy and meets the Basic Conditions.

Character and Landscape (Policies AE9-AE13)

- 4.57 As noted within the NP, the village lies in close proximity to the nearby sandstone escarpment of Alderley Edge which, whilst predominantly outside of the Neighbourhood Plan Area, has a strong defining influence on the character of the locality. The Cheshire East Local Landscape Designation Review (2018) provides useful descriptors of the special qualities of the area and these inform the content of the NP, including paragraphs 8.12 to 8.14. As noted previously, the village is inset within the designated Green Belt and I am particularly mindful that the purposes of designation²⁰ are intended to, amongst other matters, check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas, prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
- 4.58 Policy AE9 seeks to ensure new development proposals are sited and designed in a manner sensitive to the landscape character of the Parish. However, the first paragraph of the policy requires that development proposals sited in the green gap between Alderley Edge and Wilmslow, and with reference to NP Map 6, should not contribute towards the erosion of the gap.
- 4.59 Map 6 does not define the specific extent of the 'green gap'. Instead the two settlements are shown in the context of the designated green belt. This consequently gives imprecision to the application of the policy as it is unclear if the gap referred to is the entire area of the Parish beyond the northern and western settlement limits of Alderley Edge or a more limited area to the north. Indeed, not all of the land separating the settlements lies within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Policy AE9 is imprecise in this regard.
- 4.60 An interpretation of this policy could be such that any form of built development within the Wilmslow side of the Parish would contribute towards the erosion of the gap and thereby would be contrary to the policy. Consequently, any new build development would be restricted to an extent which is considerably in excess of that controlled by its existing designation as Green Belt. This policy interpretation would potentially

¹⁹ View at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2020/757/contents/made>

²⁰ NPPF: Chapter 13.

prevent forms of development that may be justified in very special circumstances, or which are not inappropriate with regard to national policy.

- 4.61 Whilst the gap between the two settlements is clearly of importance to the residents of the Parish, the effect of prohibiting all new built development to such an extent, over and above the Green Belt controls, is not adequately justified. Consequently I recommend a modification to ensure that flexibility is retained in a policy that has suitable regard to national policy (**PM8**).
- 4.62 Policy AE9 also seeks to avoid significant harm to characteristic features such as views towards historic and traditional agricultural buildings. Whilst the objective of the policy, to avoid significant harm to characteristic features (estate landscapes, historic and traditional agricultural buildings), is justified, there is no evidence explaining how views would be assessed and, for example, from where. Consequently the policy is imprecise and not capable of effective, consistent application. I therefore recommend a modification to amend criterion AE9 (2B) (PM8) to ensure it is capable of effective implementation.
- 4.63 The final paragraph of Policy AE9 repeats the provisions of Policy AE14 and therefore is unnecessary. I recommend its deletion (PM8).
- 4.64 National planning policy enables the designation of Local Green Space (LGS) via neighbourhood plans where certain criteria are satisfied²¹. NP Policy AE10 identifies 4 areas of LGS (Map 7). The primary evidence for these designations is provided within the table at Figure 3, whilst the NP refers to a 95% level of support from survey respondents on an earlier draft of the NP which at that time contained 5 specific LGS sites. I have also noted the subsequent correspondence from the Parish Council.
- 4.65 The NPPF is clear that the designation of LGS should only be used where the green space is:
- a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
 - b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
 - c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.
- 4.66 With these criteria in mind, all of the identified sites are within the village and thereby close to the community. Similarly, all are local in character and are not extensive tracts of land.
- 4.67 LGS Site 1 is a triangle of grassed land set in a highway junction. It is situated to the north of the village centre and framed by the B5359 and

²¹ NPPF: Paragraphs 99-101.

Riley's Lane. It lies opposite the church. The land area is small in its extent, contains some established trees, a bench, a litter bin and various items of street furniture such as road signs and a streetlight, with a metalled footway to its northern edge. It provides a degree of pleasant visual relief on an entranceway into the village and it is a location for one of the village's public Christmas trees. On balance the area can be considered demonstrably special to the local community such that its designation as LGS is justified in terms of national policy.

- 4.68 LGS Site 2 is located in a housing development to the north of the village. It is an area roughly square in proportion, mainly laid to grass with some specimen hedges and trees. Its scale and location are suggestive that it can provide a useful function for recreation and could, as indicated by its adoption by the local community as part of the Alderley Edge in Bloom initiative, provide an enhanced area both beautiful and tranquil in the housing estate. On balance, its designation as LGS is justified.
- 4.69 LGS Site 3 is, like Site 1, a small triangle of mainly grassed land forming a highway junction upon which there are some specimen trees, a bench and highway furniture. The land has a footway around most of its edges. The site is a pleasant feature of the area; it is visually agreeable. The area can be considered demonstrably special to the local community such that its designation as LGS is justified, with due regard to national policy.
- 4.70 LGS Site 4 is another area of land adjacent to two highways and a residential area to the south-west edge of the village. It is a more substantial area of land than Sites 1 and 3 and is laid to grass with maturing specimen trees. Based on the evidence available, it is pleasant with some limited recreational value. The area can, on balance, be considered demonstrably special to the local community such that its designation as LGS is justified in terms of national policy.
- 4.71 To have due regard to national policy, Policy AE10 should confirm that development proposals will be considered in a manner similar to those upon Green Belt and I amend the policy accordingly (**PM9**).
- 4.72 Alderley Edge has three conservation areas and numerous heritage assets which are described in the NP (see Map 8). National policy in relation to heritage assets is contained largely within Chapter 16 of the NPPF, whilst the CELPS provides numerous policy references²² in support of its Policy SE 7 regarding the need to respect and enhance the significance of heritage assets within the area. Within this context, I am mindful of the informative, albeit somewhat dated, Alderley Edge Conservation Area Appraisal which was undertaken by Macclesfield Borough Council in 2004.
- 4.73 Policy AE11 seeks to protect and enhance the conservation area. Whilst this is a reasonable policy requirement, it only refers to the Alderley Edge

²² E.g. Policy SD 2, SE 1 et al.

Conservation Area. The Neighbourhood Plan Area also contains other designated conservation areas and there is no reason provided as to why the broad principles of AE11 should not apply to all conservation areas in the Parish. I therefore recommend a modification to secure this end and to ensure a consistent and effective policy approach (**PM10**).

- 4.74 Policy AE11 also seeks to bring the guidance of the Alderley Edge Conservation Area Appraisal into planning policy. It is consequently detailed and prescriptive in the list of criteria that should be considered and addressed by new development proposals. The Appraisal dates from 2004, draws in part upon superseded policies of the Macclesfield Local Plan and, whilst it states that it is Supplementary Planning Guidance, inevitably its content does not reflect current national or local policy. For example, it makes no reference to heritage significance or the concept of designated assets. It is also clear that one of its purpose is to provide guidance²³ and design guidelines²⁴ intended to inform the planning process as a material consideration. As a consequence, the replication of the Appraisal guidance as planning policy within the NP is insufficiently justified and would have insufficient regard to national policy.
- 4.75 Whilst I recognise that the significance of the Conservation Area is at risk from inappropriate forms of new development, Policy AE11 is prescriptively detailed to the extent that it would unreasonably limit potentially appropriate forms of development, for example those that employ innovative and contemporary forms of architecture. I note from the Appraisal that the existing eclectic mixture of architectural styles and the use of modern materials, forms and details is not deemed as harmful as in other areas and that 'Cerin Amroth' is cited as a clearly modern design with a neutral impact. Successful design can be secured without unduly prescriptive policy requirements. I find that the details of Policy AE11 which govern building materials, building heights, architectural detailing, general finishes, density and extensions are not justified as planning policy.
- 4.76 Nevertheless, despite its age, the Appraisal is a useful source of information and aspects of the guidance it offers will remain of value in formulating and determining development proposals. I therefore recommend a modification to Policy AE11 (PM10), which makes specific reference to the need to have regard to the Appraisal albeit with the deletion of the policy criteria. This will align appropriately with NP Policy AE12 (2C). Consequently, Policy AE11 will successfully operate in harmony with the applicable statutory framework²⁵, the strategic policies of the Development Plan and have due regard to national policy.

²³ Conservation Area Appraisal, paragraph 1.9.

²⁴ Paragraphs 7.4 on.

²⁵ E.g. Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 – note Section 72.

- 4.77 Policy AE12 draws on the informative work commissioned to support the Design Codes. This identifies distinct 'focus areas' within the Parish with their own identified characteristics which, following my visit to the Parish, I accept. Overall, Policy AE12 is a reasonable and justified policy which will support suitably designed and located new forms of development. This will align with the CELPS.
- 4.78 Policy AE12 (1B) refers to the 'seamless integration' of new development and also the introduction of 'variety and visual interest' which may be mutually inconsistent. I recommend a modification to ensure clarity in the interests of an effective policy. Criterion 1D suggests that support will only be given for contemporary designs where they are of exceptional design quality. However, this requirement does not accurately reflect the provisions of national policy, which seeks good design and enables innovative designs which may promote high levels of sustainability or raise the general standard of design in an area; such designs may not need to be exceptional. I therefore recommend a modification to the policy to enable suitable contemporary designs (**PM11**).
- 4.79 For completeness and to ensure an effective policy, criterion 2C should refer to the significance of the conservation areas. Criterion 2D refers to important views but these are not identified thus rendering the policy imprecise and incapable of effective implementation; I recommend deletion of this phrase recognising that the details of any scheme will need to consider its general context and its effect on any heritage assets. Criterion 2E refers to the highest level of design quality in keeping with the traditional character of the village yet the definition of 'highest level of design quality' is not provided and is not justified by any specific evidence; alternatively the policy can reasonably require good design which is in keeping with the character of the village and I recommend a modification accordingly (PM11).
- 4.80 The NP contains a summary of the local townscape and key views (Map 10). This content is drawn from the Alderley Edge Design Code. However, the methodology and detailed evidence for the assessed viewpoints is not provided and not all appear to reside within the Neighbourhood Plan Area (e.g. View 4). The specific vantage points for the views on Map 10 are, with the possible exception of No 13, less than clear. In addition, the geographic scope and characteristic features which constitute the key views from each vantage point are also not specifically identified in any substantive detail. As noted by CEC in its consultation response to the submitted NP, national policy makes no specific allowance to protect 'views' and I agree with the CEC assessment that, with regard to Policy AE13, the broad concept of 'views' is too imprecise to be effective and that a policy which seeks to avoid harm to local landscape characteristics is more appropriate, clearer, has due regard to the PPG and will be effective. I recommend accordingly, which includes a cross reference to Policy AE9 (**PM12**).

4.81 Overall, and with the modifications noted above, I consider that the Plan's approach to 'landscape and character' is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Development Plan, has due regard to national policy and guidance, will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and so meet the Basic Conditions.

Access and Infrastructure (Policies AE14-AE18)

- 4.82 The NP is usefully informed by a range of data relating to transport, access and general infrastructure. These logically support the objective for the Parish to have a safe, pedestrian and cycle friendly environment with easy access throughout whilst encouraging sustainable transport modes, improving public transport and recognising parking constraints (NP page 80).
- 4.83 Policy AE14 consequently seeks to ensure that, where feasible, development proposals include linkages to existing footpaths and cycle routes and consider broader connectivity. Such an approach has due regard to national policy and the CELPS. To be effective, the policy should be more directive in its final three paragraphs, ensuring that development proposals address public rights of way and the appropriate design of cycling/pedestrian routes where applicable. I therefore recommend a modification to clarify the policy requirements (**PM13**)²⁶.
- 4.84 Policy AE15 aims to ensure development is located sustainably with good access to public transport. This principle is aligned satisfactorily with the NPPF. The policy identifies that a distance of 800m (10-15 minutes walk) to key services, shops and public transport should be secured where possible for major new development. The figure of 800m is drawn from the Manual for Streets although I am conscious that this advice also states "... this is not an upper limit and PPS13 states that walking offers the greatest potential to replace short car trips, particularly those under 2 km²⁷". My attention has also been drawn to alternative distance figures such as 1600m²⁸.
- 4.85 Invariably, the use of sustainable transport modes, such as cycling and walking, to access services is influenced by distance but also matters such as safety, traffic conflicts and route condition. The principle of the policy is reasonable but the figure of 800m is not justified. I recommend a modification to indicate that such development should be within reasonable walking distance to key services whereby, at the point of submission, the relevant range of determining accessibility factors can be considered (**PM14**).

²⁶ Non-material amendments to the NP are required to ensure correct paragraph numbering after paragraph 9.16, which should also refer to Map 11 (not 10).

²⁷ Manual for Streets Volume 1, paragraph 4.4.1.

²⁸ Institution of Highways and Transport (IHT) guidance document 'Planning for Walking' (April 2015).

- 4.86 The final sentence of Policy AE15 is not clear and I recommend a modification to ensure it is capable of being consistently understood and effectively implemented (PM14).
- 4.87 The NP identifies, with the support of empirical survey data, that there are issues with parking provision within the village. This is not disputed. Policy AE16 supports the provision of additional parking at Ryley's Lane car park (Map 13) but this is contingent upon the provision of replacement public open space on an, as yet unidentified, housing site. Given that the NP makes no housing land allocations and that the emerging SADPD contains no allocations for new housing, it is uncertain whether the identified land, and consequently the policy, is capable of being delivered. Planning policies must be capable of being effectively delivered and therefore to ensure that there is some possibility of additional parking being provided, feasibly regardless of any housing proposal, it is necessary to provide flexibility in how any alternative open space is provided. I recommend accordingly (**PM15**).
- 4.88 NP Policy AE17 relates to car parking and reflects community feedback from earlier rounds of NP consultation. I am mindful that any planning policy must relate specifically to land use considerations. Against this context, Policy AE17 needs to be clearer and will be precise and capable of effective implementation if modified to specifically relate to development proposals that may arise in the village. The reference to the provision of short stay/long stay on-street parking is not a specific land use planning policy but more of a highway management matter and should be relocated to the supporting text of the NP. I recommend a modification to the first part of Policy AE17 accordingly (**PM16**).
- 4.89 The second part of Policy AE17 relates to commercial developments. NP paragraph 9.35 identifies that new business related development should not contribute to existing car parking pressures in and around the village through effective car parking provision. This is clear. However, the wording of the second part of Policy AE17 appears to offer encouragement to new commercial development proposals which support measures to minimise parking pressures in Alderley Edge. This is different to paragraph 9.35 and is less clear, undermining the effective implementation of the policy. To provide clarity and thereby secure an effective policy, I recommend a modification to Policy AE17 to ensure its purpose is transparent and that it clearly relates to factors that new development proposals should address in order to ensure that adequate parking arrangements result (PM16).
- 4.90 Alderley Edge has a railway station which is identified within the NP as a key gateway site. Policy AE18 is designed to enable and encourage improvements to the site. To be effective, the policy should clearly establish that development proposals which deliver justified benefits to the Station Gateway will be supported rather than merely encouraged. I

recommend accordingly (**PM17**). As a note, the purpose of Maps 14 and 15 are not explained in the NP and could be deleted.

Community Facilities (Policies AE19, AE20)

- 4.91 Alderley Edge has a varied provision of community facilities as illustrated by NP Map 16 and as broadly defined in the NP glossary. Policy AE19 provides the basis for protecting and enhancing community facilities. To recognise a distinction between the types of community facilities shown on Map 16 and to ensure the effective implementation of the NP, a policy modification is required, as recommended by Sport England, which ensures the NP approach towards sports and recreational facilities has regard to national policy. I recommend accordingly (**PM18**).
- 4.92 Policy AE20 is not, as worded, a clear land use policy but an aspiration for improvements to the Chorley Hall Playing Fields. I recommend a modification to ensure that the policy is clear in its relevance to land use considerations and thereby ensure it is capable of effective implementation (**PM19**).
- 4.93 Paragraphs 10.14 – 10.22 refer to the Festival Hall, the Medical Centre and the need for additional parking, potentially upon the Heyes Lane allotments. The NP provides no policy position on this ongoing issue for the Parish and the absence of planning policy does not affect the compliance of the overall Plan with the Basic Conditions. The matter requires no further commentary in relation to my examination.

5. Conclusions

Summary

- 5.1 The Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Development Plan has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has assessed whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard to all the responses made following consultation on the NP, and the evidence documents submitted with it.
- 5.2 I have made recommendations to modify the suite of policies to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. As a consequence, the Executive Summary of the NP will require amendment to reflect the necessary changes. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

The Referendum and its Area

- 5.3 I have considered whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The Alderley Edge

Neighbourhood Development Plan as modified has no policies or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the Plan boundary. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Overview

- 5.4 In conducting the examination, I enjoyed reading the Plan, familiarising myself with the issues affecting the Parish and visiting Alderley Edge and its surrounds. The Plan follows a clear structure. The Consultation Statement and the Basic Conditions Statement were helpful. The Parish Council, the Steering Group and other volunteers are to be commended for their efforts in producing the document which, incorporating the modifications I have recommended, will make a positive contribution to the Development Plan for Cheshire East and will assist in creating sustainable development as envisaged by national policy.

Andrew Seaman

Examiner

Appendix: Modifications

Note: deletions shown with ~~strike through~~ and additions shown in *italics*.

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
PM1	22	<p>Policy AE1: Alderley Edge Development Strategy</p> <p>Growth should be targeted to the most appropriate locations, where the highest levels of integration, sustainability, connectivity and design quality can be achieved.</p> <p>In addition to any <i>justified rural exceptions housing or site allocations identified within the development plan, for example in the Cheshire East Council Site Allocations and Development Policies Document</i>, new residential and employment development will be supported within Alderley Edge village where proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are located within the settlement boundary of Alderley Edge (as shown on the most up to date adopted Local Plan Policies Map); 2. Are on brownfield (previously developed) sites or re-use existing buildings wherever possible; 3. Are for small to medium sized developments, except where an appropriate element of affordable housing is provided as an integrated element of a major residential development scheme;* 4.3. Are in areas with safe and accessible pedestrian and cycling linkages to existing village amenities and facilities to promote sustainable transport alternatives especially for short journeys, and to minimise adverse impacts of additional vehicles on the existing highway network; 5.4. Demonstrate that they are of a high quality design that considers local context and character; and.

	26/27	<p>6. Meet the requirements of the relevant detailed planning policies in the Alderley Edge NDP and other Cheshire East planning policies where relevant.</p> <p>Additional text to the end of paragraph 5.13 as follows:</p> <p><i>Rural exceptions housing will be considered in line with CELPS Policy SC 6.</i></p> <p>Amend Map 3 and paragraph 6.13 to reflect the current status of the emerging SADPD.</p> <p>(Other updates to the NP concerning the SADPD should be undertaken prior to any referendum and as non-material updates to the Plan).</p>
PM2	32	<p>Policy AE2: Design, Scale and Type of New Housing</p> <p>Proposals for new housing development within the built up area of Alderley Edge will be supported where:</p> <p>1. Design</p> <p>Developments adhere <i>have demonstrable regard to the Cheshire East Borough Design Guide and the Village Wide Design Principles as set out in the Alderley Edge Design Codes*</i>. In particular schemes should:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. Type</p> <p>A. Development must contribute towards a mix of house types, sizes and tenures and meet local housing needs as identified in the most up to date local housing needs assessment.</p> <p><i>Proposals must demonstrate how they have sought to deliver the necessary housing mix which, for sites of sufficient size, should include the provision of:</i></p> <p>Schemes should make provision for the recommended split of dwellings by bedrooms number as follows:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35% 1-2 bedrooms • 60% 3 bedrooms • 5% 4 + bedrooms <p>B. The mix of housing should include a range of accommodation suitable for the increasing 65+ age range. including This should include bungalows where feasible. Schemes which should also provide adaptable housing suitable for people with disabilities or special needs <i>will be supported in principle</i> where there is evidence of need.</p> <p><i>C. Affordable housing will be required in line with the applicable policies of the CELPS.</i></p> <p>Schemes of 11 or more dwellings or more will be required to provide a suitable proportion of affordable housing in line with Local Plan Strategy Policy SC5 Affordable Homes which requires a minimum of 30% of all units to be affordable in Local Service Centres such as Alderley Edge, or, where the most up to date local housing needs assessment identifies a need for a higher level of provision then development will be expected to address this additional requirement. This affordable housing provision of a minimum of 30% of all units should be provided on site or, as a first alternative where exceptional circumstances are demonstrated, built within the settlement boundary of the village in order to maintain a balanced community within the area. If it can be demonstrated that neither the policy requirement nor the first alternative are achievable due to exceptional circumstances, commuted sum payments by developers in lieu of provision of affordable housing on site or within the village, housing schemes within Alderley village as a first priority. Affordable Housing should be a mix of affordable to rent and affordable to buy (Shared Ownership being the preferred model).</p>
--	--	---

		<p>4. Viability and Review</p> <p>Where applicants demonstrate poor viability and secure reduced obligations for affordable housing on this basis, reviews of the scheme will be required at key points taking into consideration responses to initial marketing and promotional campaigns, take up and final house prices. In exceptional circumstances, where scheme viability may be affected, developers will be expected to provide viability assessments to demonstrate alternative affordable housing provision.</p> <p>Such reviews will be required at <i>points to be agreed but may be</i> the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 6 months from the completion of the first phase of the scheme; and - 12 months from the completion of the first phase of the scheme; and - On completion of the scheme. <p>Where viability improves, an 'overage' payment will be applied (as identified in any S106 agreement).</p> <p>*Refer to Appendix 5 Alderley Edge Design Codes.</p>
PM3	37	<p>Policy AE3: Sustainable Housing Design</p> <p>New housing development and conversions to residential use will be expected to demonstrate best practice in terms of sustainable design. Proposals should incorporate an integrated approach to ensure resource and energy efficiency have been considered throughout the design and construction phases and will be addressed in the eventual use and occupation of buildings.</p> <p>In particular schemes <i>Where relevant, proposals</i> should address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developments on any future allocated green field sites on the edge of the settlement should establish a sensitive transition with the wider rural landscape. Measures should include provision of 'soft

	<p>edges' with tree and hedge planting and development at lower densities.</p> <p>2. Developments should incorporate principles of Active Design to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity.</p> <p>3. Developments should promote travel by means other than the private car. Safe and accessible cycle and pedestrian routes should be provided where possible linking to existing networks and <i>facilities</i>. to local village shops, open spaces and recreational facilities as well as to public transport including Alderley Edge rail station and bus stops. If the creation of new links is not feasible, a committed sum towards the improvement and extension of the existing networks may be acceptable.</p> <p>4. Schemes should promote a high quality public realm in accordance with <i>informed</i> by the Design Codes*, with a road hierarchy that prioritises pedestrians, cyclists and those with mobility impairments ahead of vehicular traffic, and includes shared spaces which promote opportunities for social interaction, rest and enjoyment.</p> <p>5. The number of off-street car parking spaces should be sufficient to minimise on-street car parking and avoid environments dominated by the private car. As a minimum, schemes should not provide fewer spaces than the most up to date <i>Regard must be had to the adopted Cheshire East parking standards. (as set out in the Local Plan Strategy 2010 – 2030).</i></p> <p>6. Developments should ensure adequate safe and secure cycle storage within garden areas or the curtilages of houses.</p> <p>7. <i>Developments should include the provision of vehicle charging points.</i> External charging points should be provided at a rate of one charging point per house within the garage or on the</p>
--	---

		<p>driveway in order to support the use of electric vehicles.</p> <p>8. High quality communications technologies and infrastructure should be provided as part of any development in order to help support home working.</p> <p>9. The design of new housing should incorporate the efficient use of resources; subject to mitigation measures required to address any adverse impacts on local character and heritage. Applications should and proposals should demonstrate that in their design how the following factors have been considered and incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building orientation optimised for solar gain • Thermally efficient building shape (form factor) • Glazing levels optimised to avoid overheating • High levels of thermal insulation and airtightness • Appropriate use of heating, cooling and ventilation technology that includes acoustic mitigation measures where applicable to reduce the risk of noise pollution and disturbance to residents. <p>Applications that cannot demonstrate how these considerations have influenced design will may not be supported.</p> <p>10. Housing developments on land that was formerly Green Belt: all major schemes of 10 or more units should achieve a reduction in energy use compared to the minimum energy performance requirements for standard new build construction as defined in Building Regulations Approved Document Part L1A. (2013 edition incorporating 2016 amendments) This is expressed as a 19% reduction in target emissions rate (TER) as calculated using the methodology set out in the Building Regulations Approved Document Part L1A . At least 50% of this reduction must be achieved through</p>
--	--	---

	<p>building fabric efficiencies, with the remainder achieved from renewable energy technologies.</p> <p>1110. Passivhaus— 'eco-housing' developments that result in Passivhaus appropriate certification, such as Passivhaus, will be strongly supported and will not be subject to the requirements set out in paragraphs 8 and 9 above.</p> <p>1211. Developments should conserve, protect and, where possible, enhance wildlife, biodiversity, and other ecosystem services provided by the natural environment and where appropriate demonstrate how schemes contribute to biodiversity net gain. Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments are encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity. Where development sites include culverted water courses these should be naturalised wherever possible.</p> <p>1312. All areas of priority habitats (as defined by the NERC [Natural Environment and Rural Communities] Act 2006) as amended should be retained and naturalised to support local wildlife and enhance biodiversity. Such habitats may include existing water courses, field ponds and areas of wet marshy grasslands, as well as hedgerows and woodland.</p> <p>1413. Housing developments within the existing settlement boundary should retain and enhance the green character of residential areas by incorporating and protecting mature trees, hedgerows, gardens, grass verges, allotments and other existing green spaces. Schemes should conserve the heritage and ecological value of individual ancient trees and use characteristic native species in new planting. Where such features, or parts thereof cannot be retained, suitable mitigation planting will be expected.</p> <p>Appropriate buffers to retained trees and hedgerows should reflect a requirement to</p>
--	---

	35	<p>avoid damage to the feature itself and also any site specific constraints identified through relevant surveys.</p> <p>1514. Developments should incorporate suitable provision for private gardens as well as green frontages and communal areas as part of public open space provision.</p> <p>1615. All new residential developments must include locations for refuse and recycling containers within each dwelling curtilage, or communal areas for apartments, in line with the current local authority requirement for the number and sizes of bin in order to ensure that bins are kept away from dwelling/ street frontages and are suitably housed so as not to have an adverse visual impact.</p> <p>1716. New development should, where appropriate, incorporate SUDS which avoids all non-permeable surfaces, or delivers a water management system which minimises surface water run-off and ensures that all surface water is addressed within the site boundary. Every option should be investigated before discharging surface water into a public sewerage network, in line with the surface water hierarchy.</p> <p>*Refer to Appendix 5 Alderley Edge Design Codes.</p> <p>Add additional bullet points to the first paragraph at 6.29 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Development sites on the edge of the village should include provision of 'soft edges' with tree and hedge planting and development at lower densities.</i> • <i>Safe and accessible cycle and pedestrian routes should be provided where possible linking to existing networks and facilities to local village shops, open spaces and recreational facilities as well as to</i>
--	----	--

		<p><i>public transport including Alderley Edge rail station and bus stops.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Justified commuted payments towards the improvement and extension of the existing networks may be acceptable.</i> • <i>External vehicle charging points should be provided within new developments, feasibly at a rate of one charging point per house, in order to support the use of electric vehicles.</i> • <i>As required by national policy, high quality communications infrastructure should be provided as part of any development in order to help connectivity and support home working.</i> • <i>Schemes should conserve the heritage and ecological value of individual ancient trees and use characteristic native species in new planting. Where such features, or parts thereof cannot be retained, suitable mitigation planting will be expected.</i> • <i>Appropriate buffers to retained trees and hedgerows should reflect a requirement to avoid damage to the feature itself and also any site-specific constraints identified through relevant surveys.</i>
PM4	40	<p>Policy AE4: Rear Garden and Backland Development</p> <p>Residential development in rear gardens and backlands will be resisted where there would be an unacceptable impact on the character of the local area (including any conservation areas) in terms of loss of openness, mature trees, hedges and shrubbery, and a substantial increase in the density of built form.</p> <p>All such proposals will be required to provide clear justification to support the need for higher density development in that location, and should demonstrate how full and effective integration into the</p>

		<p>surrounding built form and townscape will be achieved.</p> <p>Where such development schemes are considered acceptable, buildings should be sited and designed to protect existing mature trees and hedgerows on the site and should provide adequate screening to protect the residential amenity and privacy of neighbouring occupiers <i>as necessary</i>.</p>
PM5	44	<p>Policy AE5: Encouraging Entrepreneurship</p> <p>Proposals for new or refurbished business accommodation within or adjacent to the village centre will be supported where they provide one or more of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A shared, co-working flexible workspace hub or affordable, serviced office space where home workers or start-up businesses can hire desks, meeting space and office equipment facilities and benefit from a knowledge exchange. 2. Business space suitable for small scale independent and specialist businesses. The subdivision of larger vacant units and bringing back into use of upper floors of retail and business units in the village centre will be supported as part of the measures to diversify the local economy, provided they comply with other NDP policies (particularly those related to Access and Infrastructure and Character and Landscape) and include screening of commercial waste storage areas. 3. Development of Enhanced digital and mobile data infrastructure where required. Up to date and high quality communications technologies and infrastructure should be provided wherever possible as part of new developments, including where structural alterations and changes of use are proposed.
PM6	45	<p>Policy AE6: Supporting Existing Businesses</p> <p>Proposals for the expansion of existing businesses to provide additional</p>

		<p>employment space within their existing site, on adjacent sites or on other suitable sites in Alderley Edge will be supported where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Designs are sensitive to local built character and form, the setting of any nearby heritage assets and existing patterns of development. 2. Proposals prioritise a village centre location <i>where appropriate</i> for those businesses occupying dedicated business premises, to help ensure long term sustainability. 3. Suitable measures are taken to protect the amenity of residents in surrounding areas. 4. Proposals deliver high quality design, resolve any access issues <i>secure adequate access arrangements</i> and provide suitable adequate service management plans (including screening of commercial waste contained within business curtilages, deliveries and parking). 5. Proposals adhere to NDP Access and Infrastructure policies relating to parking and access.
PM7	51	<p>Policy AE8: Supporting a Vibrant Village Centre</p> <p>Proposals which enhance the vitality and viability of the identified primary shopping area around London Road will be supported. Such proposals should include <i>one or more of</i> the following:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2B. Temporary use of vacant units for appropriate cultural or community use (under Use Class D1 or Meanwhile Use) will be supported.</p> <p>...</p>
PM8	59	<p>Policy AE9: Landscape Character and Access</p> <p>Development proposals <i>within the neighbourhood plan area</i> should ensure the</p>

		<p>adequate separation of not contribute towards the erosion of the green gap between the built up area of Alderley Edge and the neighbouring town of Wilmslow as shown on Map 6 is maintained.</p> <p>...</p> <p>B. Estate landscapes and views towards historic and traditional agricultural buildings;</p> <p>...</p> <p>Developments should also provide pedestrian and cycle linkages to existing public rights of way where feasible, to promote access to and enjoyment of the local countryside for all.</p>
PM9	64	<p>Amend Policy AE10. New final sentence to the policy as follows:</p> <p>Policy AE10: Local Green Spaces</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Proposals for inappropriate development will only be allowed in very special circumstances.</i></p>
PM10	67	<p>Policy AE11: Protecting and Enhancing the Conservation Area</p> <p>Development proposals in the Alderley Edge Conservation Areas should be carefully designed using good quality materials and detailing. Development proposals that harm the special character of the conservation area and its setting will be resisted.</p> <p>Designs <i>All development proposals should, where applicable, demonstrate how regard has been had to the Alderley Edge Conservation Area Appraisal. that the following criteria have been considered and addressed:</i></p> <p>1. New Development</p> <p>A. Buildings should be set back from the public highway, reflecting the local building line;</p> <p>B. New buildings should be two storeys high, with pitched roofs. However, three or</p>

		<p>single storey buildings may be appropriate in some locations depending on the existing local character and context;</p> <p>C. Wall materials should be confined to sandstone blocks, render or roughcast, or brick;</p> <p>D. Roof materials should be stone slate, natural Welsh (not imported slate such as Chinese or Iberian) slate, or clay tiles (machine or handmade);</p> <p>E. Chimneys should be provided;</p> <p>F. Doors and windows should be made from timber and painted;</p> <p>G. Existing boundaries should generally be retained and new boundaries should be built in stone (where they face the highway) or consist of hedging and trees;</p> <p>H. Entrance gates should be metal or timber and gate piers should be stone or brick, with simple details and a lack of ornamentation;</p> <p>I. Driveways should be paved using tarmacadam, preferably with a sandstone aggregate rolled into it;</p> <p>J. New developments will be required to provide a full landscaping scheme, including the provision of new trees and hedging where appropriate; and</p> <p>K. Lighting schemes should be designed sensitively to minimise light pollution and avoid unnecessary spillage.</p> <p>2. Density</p> <p>A. New development should reflect historic plot ratios (usually one detached dwelling within a large garden);</p> <p>B. Plot sizes for each individual dwelling should be no smaller than 0.3 hectare or 0.7 acre (this means that terraced or semi-detached buildings will not be acceptable); and</p> <p>C. New development should not impinge on the setting or mature landscaping of adjacent properties.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>3. Extensions</p> <p>Extensions to unlisted buildings in the Alderley Edge Conservation Area, particularly the substantial 19th and early 20th century houses of definite architectural and historic merit, should address the following criteria:</p> <p>A. The extension should not reduce the garden space to below 0.3 hectares or 0.7 acre;</p> <p>B. Extensions should respect the height, bulk and general form of the original building and be secondary in character to the original building; and</p> <p>C. Materials and external joinery detailing must match those used in the original building.</p>
PM11	72	<p>Policy AE12: Local and Historic Character</p> <p>1....</p> <p>B. Designs should include visual references or cues to local materials and detailing where possible and should demonstrate that they will make a positive contribution to local character, achieving <i>seamless appropriate</i> integration and introducing which may introduce variety and visual interest.</p> <p>...</p> <p>D. Contemporary designs will be supported where they are of exceptional <i>suitable</i> design quality and enhance the existing character of the area.</p> <p>2...</p> <p>C. New development should avoid harm to the <i>significance of the</i> Conservation Areas, and wherever possible, make a positive contribution to their character and setting.</p> <p>...</p> <p>D. Schemes will be required to protect important views and respect the village grain.</p>

		<p>E. Only the highest a good level of design quality, which is in keeping with the overall traditional character of the village will be acceptable.</p>
PM12	77	<p>Policy AE13: Key Views and Townscape</p> <p>The Key Views identified on Map 10 illustrates a range of indicative viewpoints valued by the community for their make an important contribution towards local visual amenity and Alderley Edge's townscape, setting and character.</p> <p><i>In accordance with Policy AE9, development proposals must not significantly harm, individually or cumulatively, characteristic features within the local landscape, including its openness.</i></p> <p>Schemes should demonstrate how designs have taken into consideration views from Castle Rock looking north and west across the village and views towards the sandstone escarpment at Alderley Edge. The scale, height and layout of any built form should be designed and sited sensitively to help ensure these important views are protected and any adverse impacts are minimised. Where development proposals would have a significant adverse impact on the view from Castle Rock due to their height, scale and introduction of major built form into the rural landscape setting they will be resisted.</p> <p>The impact on identified Key Views should be considered where relevant. Where a development proposal impacts on an identified Key View, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment or similar study should be carried out to ensure that the scheme is designed and sited sensitively and appropriately.</p> <p><i>Development proposals will be expected to consider and mitigate harmful impacts arising on the local landscape with due regard to Map 10 where applicable.</i></p>

PM13	82	<p>Amend Policy AE14 as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Where feasible, development proposals will be expected to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Retain and where necessary improve</i> aAll existing public rights of way should be retained and where necessary, improved within development schemes wherever possible. • Designs for new walking and cycling routes should to maximise safe accessibility for all non-vehicle users. Path widths should be suitable for safe use by users of mobility scooters, wheelchairs and pushchairs. • <i>Ensure</i> aAll new and existing pedestrian and cycle routes within the built-up area should be <i>are</i> well lit with carefully designed, directional lighting to encourage confident use and reduce anti-social behaviour. Routes should not be enclosed on both sides by high fences, walls or hedging which can lead to narrow, unattractive corridors with limited overlooking.
PM14	84	<p>Policy AE15: Promoting Accessibility to Public Transport</p> <p>Proposals for new residential and business-related development in Alderley Edge should demonstrate that they are sited in sustainable locations with good access to services and public transport facilities. Where possible Proposals for major development should be located within 800m (10-15 minutes' walk) <i>reasonable walking distance</i> of key services, shops, bus stops and the train station.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Travel plans should also demonstrate <i>the consideration and implementation</i> of schemes such as car share plans, investment and support in local public transport services and <i>the promotion of</i></p>

		awareness raising of and incentives for alternatives to private car use.
PM15	86	<p>Policy AE16: Supporting the provision of additional parking spaces at Ryley's Lane car park which is adjacent to the Park to improve car parking facilities in Alderley Edge</p> <p>A small part of the park at Ryley's Lane adjacent to the existing car park as shown on Map 13 is identified for the provision of a new extended public car park, subject to the <i>satisfactory</i> relocation of the existing small part of public open space to land within a proposed new housing site <i>an accessible location within or adjoining the built up area.</i></p> <p>...</p> <p>Amend paragraph 9.34 as follows:</p> <p>NDP Draft Policy AE16 supports the extension of the car park at Ryley's Lane, provided that equivalent park land area (approx. 1200m²) can be provided elsewhere in Alderley Edge as part of new housing development proposals. Policy AE16 received 92.54% support in the draft consultation held in February 2020.</p>
PM16	87/88	<p>Policy AE17: Car Parking</p> <p>1. <u>New and Improved Car Parks</u></p> <p>A. <i>Development p</i>Proposals for new or improved car parking in Alderley Edge should <i>which</i> balance the needs of residents, businesses, commuters, employees and visitors <i>will be supported in principle.</i></p> <p>B. The provision of short stay (2-3 hours) zoned on street parking nearer to the centre, and long stay zoned parking areas further from the centre will be encouraged where they are within a 10 minute walking distance from the village centre.</p> <p>2. <u>Commercial Development</u></p> <p>New commercial development proposals <i>should ensure the provision of adequate parking arrangements is will be</i></p>

		<p>encouraged to support measures to minimise parking pressures in Alderley Edge. In particular schemes should set out how they address the following:</p> <p>A. Provide sSustainable travel plans should be provided where appropriate;</p> <p>B. New development proposals will be required to pProvide car and cycle parking provision in line with Cheshire East Council's most up to date adopted cycle and car parking standards (set out in Appendix C of the Local Plan Strategy 2010 - 2030) and to provide electric vehicle charging points wherever possible;</p> <p>C. Proposals for new business-related development will be encouraged to aAllow for public parking use outside business hours through dual use car park policies <i>where feasible</i>;</p> <p>D. Developer contributions will be sought <i>Contribute</i> to provide electric vehicle charging points in the South Street Car Park <i>where justified</i>;</p> <p>E. Proposals should iInclude enhanced public transport links and service provision to the village for business visitors and employees. Park and ride schemes for larger employers will be encouraged (e.g. from the Alderley Park site)-;</p> <p>F. For visitor related development, the provision of <i>contribute towards or provide</i> a dedicated drop off and pick up point for coaches and taxis close to the village; and park and ride facilities will be supported provided that safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle links to key visitor attractions are provided and proposals comply with other NDP policies.</p> <p>Add the following to paragraph 9.35:</p> <p><i>The provision of short stay (2-3 hours) zoned on street parking nearer to the centre, and long stay zoned parking areas further from the centre will be encouraged where they are within a 10-minute walking distance from the village centre.</i></p>
--	--	---

PM17	90	<p>Policy AE18: The Station Gateway</p> <p><i>Proposals for improvements to the railway station as a main gateway site to the village for visitors and residents will be encouraged supported. Such improvements should include the following:</i></p> <p>...</p>
PM18	97	<p>Policy AE19: Protecting and Enhancing Local Community and Sports and Recreation Facilities</p> <p>1. <u>Protecting Existing Community Facilities</u> <i>Community facilities (excluding open space, sports, recreational buildings and land, see below) as shown on Map 16 are protected. There will be a presumption in favour of the re-use or redevelopment of these facilities for health, education or community type uses.</i></p> <p>The change of use of existing facilities to other uses will be resisted unless the following can be demonstrated:</p> <p>A. The proposal includes alternative provision, on a site within the locality, of equivalent or enhanced facilities. Such sites should be accessible by various means of transport including walking and cycling and have adequate car parking, or</p> <p>B. There is no longer a need for the facility, and this can be robustly demonstrated by the developer through public consultation.</p> <p>2. <u>Protecting Indoor and Outdoor Sports and Recreation Facilities</u></p> <p>Indoor and outdoor sports and recreation facilities as identified on Map 16 should not be built on unless:</p> <p>...</p>
PM19	98	<p>Policy AE20: Chorley Hall Playing Fields</p> <p><i>Investment in Development proposals resulting in improved facilities at Chorley Hall Lane Playing Fields will be supported to bring the site back into use, in line with the latest Playing Pitch Strategy and Action</i></p>

		Plan. Such improvements could include, but are not limited to, the following: ...
--	--	--