

## **Disley and Newtown NP Consultation (Reg. 14 Stage) – Developers / Landowners**

4 representatives (consultants) for landowners in Disley and Newtown submitted comprehensive and lengthy comments in response to the NP consultation in favour of future development. All four were in respect of sites being proposed for future housing development, each one putting forward a case for their particular proposed development. Two responses were repeated from the same consultant for two different landowners / clients.

### Repeated Comments

- Policy H1 (repeated comment). It was their view that the second approach, Local Plan Proportionate figure in paragraph 7.4 of the draft NP is the correct approach and it is suggested that an assessment of individual sites against clearly identified criteria be undertaken in order to allocate further sites for development and not necessarily restricted by Green Belt constraints.
- Policy H5 (repeated comment) It is considered that the evidence referred to does not support the restriction to one third detached properties. – Requested that the policy is revised to adequately reflect the latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need PPG2
- The repeated comments also stated that it would be beneficial for the NP to allocate sites that meet the needs of the area. (Both repeated comments then provided a long and detailed case for each of the particular proposed housing developments for the respective clients as “suitable sites” which are within the Green Belt or are referred to in CE’s Green Belt assessment update in 2015).
- Para 4.3 should be amended to reflect the fact that the number of people working from home is higher than the average. There should also be recognition that Disley is one of 13 Service Centres in the CE LPS. It was also suggested that the NP Steering Group should seek to engage with landowners and developers in developing the NP.
- In Visions and Objectives, the vision should be amended to remove reference to “The Green Belt will remain”. – reason being it is not yet known how many new dwellings and employment land Disley will be expected to accommodate. Land will need to be removed from the Green Belt through the SADPD process.
- The vision should also be amended – rather than stating “any” development, there should be an explicit commitment to achieving an appropriate level of housing and employment growth in line with CE Dev. Plan

- Under objectives the following taken from para 8.3 of the LPS should be added—" New dev. is required to meet local needs and help to retain services and facilities ..." etc

The third respondent commented:

- Figure B seeks to include land currently in the Green Belt --- questioning its inclusion and pointing out the NP cannot amend the Green Belt boundaries.
- The indication that housing numbers will be accommodated within the settlement boundary without any Green Belt release should be removed
- Policy H2 No objection
- Policy H4 No objection – NP should be amended to provide flexibility, ie. that further allocations will be required to meet housing need.
- Policy H5 There is no justification for the restriction of only one third of new dwellings to be detached.
- The NP should be amended to delete the settlement boundary - as a new one will be developed for Disley through the SADPD.
- Remove any ref. to only allowing dev. within the settlement boundary as land may need to be released from Green Belt.
- Provide sufficient flexibility to allow additional allocations for housing through the SADPD.

The fourth respondent's comments referred throughout to the Parish Council formulating the draft NP policies and not the NP Steering Group. These comments are summarised as follows:-

- Policy H1 Fails to meet the tests of lawfulness and robustness and is neither in accordance with the NPPF nor the adopted CE Local Plan for the following reasons.
  - Failure to adequately demonstrate that the Parish Council has properly sought to determine the full objectively assessed housing need for the NP.
  - In determining the housing requirement the status of the housing figure in the Housing Advice Note (August 2016) has been misinterpreted.
  - Failure to allocate sufficient land to satisfy even the minimum housing requirement.
  - The need for affordable housing has been ignored

- There has been a failure to demonstrate that the Green Belt constraints of Disley are such as to presume against allocation of any suitable available and deliverable allocations for modest housing development, nor has it been demonstrated that the Green Belt constraints are such as to presume against the allocation of any safeguarded land.
- Full submissions for suitable, available and deliverable sites have been submitted to the CE Borough Council as part of the Local Plan "Call for Sites" exercise.
- Policy H5 The objectives of achieving a mix of housing type are supported – however a prescriptive one-third limit on detached houses on developments of 10 or more requires clear justification which is lacking.

This respondent proposed that NP should be amended as follows:

- a. Increase the number of houses for the plan period to reflect a proper assessment of housing need.
- b. Allocate two parcels of land at Bentside Farm for housing development.
- c. Amend the Green Belt boundary and Settlement Boundary accordingly.

This respondent supported the Countryside and Green spaces policies and Built Environment policies although in the latter case, it is not clear whether the potential prescriptive proposals are based on an appropriate and robust analysis of the existing Conservation Area.

## **Response**

### **Comments relative to policy H1 have been accommodated with an amendment to the wording of the policy (see revised policy below)**

The NPSG is aware that the Settlement Boundary overlaps with land designated as Green Belt - i.e. the housing in Light Alders Lane/Lyme Road area. Even though this housing falls within the GB boundary, it has been included as 'settlement'. The NPSG has also consulted with CEC on this matter. There is no implication that the NPSG wishes to re-draw the GB boundary line.

#### **Policy H1 – New residential development**

A settlement boundary is defined and shown at Figure C. Within the settlement boundary of Disley and Newtown, new housing development consistent with housing numbers set by Cheshire East Council for Disley and Newtown as a Local Service Centre will be supported, except for any areas of Green Belt within the settlement boundary where further residential development will not be permitted. Outside the settlement boundary, residential development will not be permitted except where this accords with national Green Belt policy. In all cases any proposed residential development will be subject to the other policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.

**Comments relative to policy H5 have been accommodated with an addition to the second element of the policy (see revised policy below)**

**Policy H5 - Housing Mix and Type**

New residential developments of 10 or more units should include a range of property type, tenure and size to address any imbalance and needs in the local market.

Unless viability or other material considerations show a robust justification for a different mix, in order to redress the imbalance of the current housing stock and ensure an appropriate mix of housing in Disley and Newtown to meet local needs, new homes on developments of 10 or more should be limited to one-third detached properties. The remainder (both market and affordable) should reflect the most recent up to date housing needs survey, particularly favouring smaller homes, bungalows, apartments, terraced or semi-detached, and providing for the changing needs and life-styles of an ageing population - including where appropriate an element of fully compliant Lifetime Homes.

**In all other respects the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group considered that the comments from developers / landowners were all biased in favour of the landowner's respective proposed development, none of which reflected the views of the community collated throughout the NP consultation process and did not warrant any further changes to the NP draft policies.**