

UPDATED MARTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2020 CONSULTATION STATEMENT

NOVEMBER 2020

1.1 This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan. The legal basis of the Statement is provided by Section 15 (2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:

- Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020;
- Explain how they were consulted;
- Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020.

1.2 Marton is a very small village in Cheshire, consisting of just over 100 dwellings, with approximately 245 residents. This has meant that consultation with all members of the community has been a real possibility at a manageable scale, which has helped to allow the whole community to become aware of the Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan, and to contribute to its development. Additionally, the Parish Council has a website, where Neighbourhood Plan documents and background evidence have been published and available to view.

1.3 The decision to update the original Marton Neighbourhood Plan, which was 'made' on 29th November 2016, was first muted in September 2018. The original Neighbourhood Plan had been overwhelmingly supported at referendum, with over 44% of eligible residents voting, and an almost 93% 'yes' vote. However, the original Neighbourhood Plan had been made before the official adoption of the Cheshire East Local Plan (2017) and before the National Planning Policy Framework update of 2019. Whilst recognising that the Neighbourhood Plan was a very successful planning document being used to help consider planning applications and appeals, it was considered that to ensure its continued effectiveness, the Neighbourhood Plan should be reviewed and updated to ensure that its policies remained consistent with local and national guidance.

1.4 This consultation statement has been prepared to detail the consultation which has been undertaken for the updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020. The consultation statement for the original Marton Neighbourhood Plan can be viewed at <http://www.martonparishcouncil.org.uk/martons-neighbourhood-plan/>

1.5 The consultation for the Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 has followed the same principles that were at the heart of the consultation for the original Neighbourhood Plan. The Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 is a community plan, and the Parish Council has been determined that residents should be kept informed of progress and given the opportunity to inform the Steering Group of their views. Cheshire East Council Planning department has also been consulted throughout the process and has provided invaluable information and advice. The consultation timeline for the Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 can be viewed in Appendix 1.

1.6 The original Neighbourhood Plan has been updated in order to recognise the changes that have occurred in local and national planning policy since the Neighbourhood Plan was made in 2016

(the adoption of the Cheshire East Local Plan Part One in 2017, the emerging Part Two Strategic Allocation and Development Policies Document, and the revised National Planning Policy Framework in 2019). It was not considered necessary to go right back to square one and undertake questionnaires and surveys, as the vision and objectives of the plan were not greatly changing. Rather, the existing policies were being reviewed and updated to reflect the more up to date local and national planning framework. It was therefore considered appropriate to carry out the pre-submission six week Regulation 14 consultation on the draft updated Neighbourhood Plan, prior to its submission to Cheshire East Council.

1.7 Work on the Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 began in earnest in 2019 and early 2020. A village meeting and an open day session at the school had been planned for March 2020. However, this was unfortunately cancelled due to the COVID 19 pandemic. Due to the national lockdown from March – July 2020 as a result of COVID 19, it was decided that in order that people could fully view, discuss and comment on the proposed Updated Plan, the Regulation 14 consultation should not occur until the lockdown was over. Even after the original lockdown had ended, it was recognised that people may not be comfortable in group settings, and also that some residents may still have been shielding, and so consultation would not be as straight forward as it had been previously.

1.8 Information was placed online and when email addresses weren't available, information was hand delivered. Residents who were not able to review the draft Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 and accompanying documents online were able to phone a member of the steering group who would then drop paper copies round for viewing.

1.9 As required under Part 5, Section 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, the Parish Council therefore undertook a six week pre-submission consultation on the draft Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 between 7th September 2020 and 19th October 2020. Within this period the following was undertaken -

- Consultation with statutory consultation bodies
- Notification as to where and how the pre-submission Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 could be inspected
- Information on how to make representations, and the date by which these should be received
- A copy of the pre-submission Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 was sent to the Cheshire East Spatial Planning department

1.10 Cheshire East Council supplied approximately 100 e-mail addresses of interested parties which were all sent the Regulation 14 information letter and links to the Neighbourhood Plan website where they could view the draft Updated Neighbourhood Plan and accompanying documents. This was supplemented with contacts for local organisations and individuals which it was considered might have opinions on the Plan. All households in the Parish were notified of the consultation process. An online version could be viewed on the village website at <https://www.martonparishcouncil.org.uk/martons-neighbourhood-plan/marton-neighbourhood-plan-update/>

1.11 Comments on the Plan could be sent by post to the Parish Clerk, or by emailing members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering group.

1.12 Along with local residents, the following people and groups were consulted as part of the Regulation 14 consultation:-

Halton Council	Neighbourhood Planning – Cheshire East Council
Lancashire County Council	Greater Manchester Councils
Manchester City Council	Cheshire West and Chester Council
Newcastle - Staffs Council	Derbyshire Dales Council
Shropshire Council	Derbyshire County Council
Staffordshire Moorlands Council	Peak District National Park
Stockport Council	Chapel and Hill Chorlton Parish Council
Stoke Council	Audley Parish Council
Trafford Council	Keele Parish Council
Transport for Greater Manchester	Kisgrove Town Council
Natural Resources Wales	Loggerheads parish Council
South Derbyshire Council	Madeley Parish Council
Warrington Council	Biddulph Parish Council
Malpas Parish Council	Whaley Bridge Parish Council
Tarporley parish Council	New Mills Town Council
Beeston parish Council	Woodford Parish Council
Tiverton Parish Council	High Peak Council
Natural England	Lymm Parish Council
The Environment Agency	Appleton Parish Council
Historic England	Grappenhall and Thellwall Parish Council
English Heritage	Stretton Parish Council
Network Rail	The Coal Authority
The Highways Agency	The Homes and Communities Agency
The Marine Management Organisation	United Utilities
National Trust	Welsh Water
Highways England	Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership
Amec	Stoke/Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership
National Grid	Cheshire and Warrington Growth Hub
O2	East Cheshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Scottish Power	North Cheshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry
NHS – Lancashire and Greater Manchester	South Cheshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry
NHS- Eastern Cheshire	West Cheshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry
NHS – Cheshire and Merseyside	Campey Turf Care
Marion and District Primary School	Regenda
Marion Meadows Golf Club	Barlows Agri Ltd
David Warburton French Polishers	JW Rigby
Stables at Marion Gate Farm	
Eddisbury Construction	
Capesthorpe Fisher German	
Chapeau Catering (cafe and games shop)	
Gus and Bear	
La Popote	
Escape Beauty Parlour	
Peaks and Plain	

1.13 A total of 34 comments were received at the Regulation 14 stage, from 14 consultees. These were from 9 residents, United Utilities, Hollins Strategic Land, Emery Planning, Fisher German LLP on behalf of the Capesthorpe Estate, and Cheshire East Council. The issues raised included

comments about wording to strengthen and give clarity to policies and ensure conformity; housing; the desire to allocate housing sites; comments regarding heritage; maps; Jodrell Bank; and design.

1.14 The issues and concerns have been given full consideration, and changes have been made to the Updated Neighbourhood Plan accordingly, in preparation for formal submission. Various wording in the text and policies have been amended, as per suggestions, to add clarity to the Updated Neighbourhood Plan. Changes were made to policies HD1 –Housing; HD2 – Design; PE1 – Landscape Character; PCA1 – Heritage; and PCA2 – Village Centre. Additionally, the Village Centre map was amended, and further photographs, a map and a paragraph highlighting the views of Jodrell Bank from Marton were included. A total of 14 changes were made to the draft plan following Regulation 14.

1.15 A summary of the representations made, along with the Steering Groups response and recommended amendments to the Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 is detailed in Appendix 2.

1.16 The consultation completed throughout the production of the Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 has been open and transparent, with opportunities provided for both statutory consultees and those that live and work within the Neighbourhood Area to make comment, and to raise issues for consideration. Whilst as much face to face consultation as had been planned was not possible, due to the restrictions brought on by the COVID 19 pandemic, every effort has been made to ensure that residents and consultees were able to view the draft plan and accompanying documents, and to raise any questions and make comments.

1.17 All statutory requirements have been met and consultation, engagement and research has been completed. This Consultation Statement has been produced to document the consultation and engagement process and is considered to comply with Part 5, Section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

APPENDIX 1: CONSULTATION TIMELINE

2018

- 10 September: Parish Council Meeting- Decision taken to update the Marton Neighbourhood Plan
- 15 October: Steering Group (SG) meeting to agree action plan
- 26 October: SG progress meeting
- 6 November: SG meeting with Lucy Hughes Cheshire Community Action
- 9 December: Parish Council meeting - Neighbourhood Plan discussed
- 16 December: SG meeting with Roger Lomas eSCAPE Urbanists
- 20 December: SG meeting with Tom Evans Cheshire East Neighbourhood Plan Manager

2019

- 13 May: Parish Council meeting - Neighbourhood Plan discussed
- 5 June: SG progress meeting
- 11 July: SG meeting with CE Planning SADPD implication for Marton
- 29 July: Parish Council meeting - Neighbourhood Plan discussed
- 19 November: SG progress meeting
- 9 December: Parish Council meeting - Neighbourhood Plan discussed
- 10 December: SG progress Meeting

2020

- 12 February: SG meeting to review draft Plan
- 4 March: SG meeting to review updates to draft Plan
- 23 March: Village meeting - Progress report on Plan update cancelled due to Covid 19
- 22 June: SG - Review draft Communication document and methods of distribution
- 27 July: Parish Council meeting-neighbourhood Plan discussed
- 14 August SG progress meeting
- 24 August: Consultation document circulated to Residents. Other stake holders, Local businesses, Statutory consultees

APPENDIX 2: REPRESENTATIONS FROM REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION
CONSULTATION

Ref	Name	Summary of Comments	Updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 Steering Group Response
1	Cheshire East Council	As a general point it would be helpful to have as an appendix, a schedule of changes to the original Marton Neighbourhood Plan document. This will significantly help an examiner to review the plan once the final version is submitted.	Thank you for this suggestion. A schedule of changes has been prepared.
2	Cheshire East Council	<p>HD1 - Given the first paragraph almost directly repeats the matters covered by adopted policy PG6 (and defers to that policy), it is probably not necessary to retain the statement in the final version of the plan.</p> <p>In the second paragraph it is advised to alter the reference to 'openness' of the landscape. Openness is a term commonly associated with assessment of development in the Green Belt, one of the fundamental purposes of which is to retain openness. The Green Belt is not applied in this location and therefore is not an appropriate test for new development proposals. However, harm to the landscape, one of the characteristics of which is often its open and undeveloped nature, is a relevant planning consideration and therefore it is suggested that the phrase is replaced with the following:</p> <p>'...not have a harmful effect on the landscape and the features that characterise the landscape'.</p> <p>Whilst the last sentence of the policy in regard to Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope is in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy (policy SE14), the matter is covered by policy in the existing development plan and therefore it is not necessary to repeat the policy in the neighbourhood plan too.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend the first two paragraphs of Policy HD1 to read 'The whole Parish is designated as open countryside and new housing development may be permitted in line with local and national policies.</p> <p>Proposals for agricultural workers, or residential properties which support a rural business, must be well related to existing buildings and not have a harmful effect on the landscape and the features that characterise the landscape.'</p> <p>Remove the last paragraph of Policy HD1, as suggested.</p>
3	Cheshire East Council	HD2 - The 'setting' of Marton is made up of the local landscape and whilst the phrase has a specific meaning in relation to heritage assets, it is not often used in a specific way in regard to a settlement. It could be appropriate to use the term if the 'setting' of the village is clearly defined by analysis of the landscape features and characteristics adjoining the built form, and its extent is defined on a map. For clarity it is advised that reference to the 'setting' is replaced by reference to the local landscape.	Agree – amend policy HD2c to read 'Development must not have a negative impact on the local landscape of Marton, and must not negatively impact the natural and historic environment of Marton.'

4	Cheshire East Council	PE1 - It is suggested that the phrase 'Key views to the World Heritage site at Jodrell Bank should be protected' is replaced with: 'New development should not harm the views to the World Heritage site at Jodrell Bank'.	Agree. Amend the last sentence of PE1 to read 'New development should not harm the views to the World Heritage site at Jodrell Bank.'
5	Cheshire East Council	PCA2 - Whilst retention of a mix of uses in the village is desirable, a marketing exercise for a period of two years may be an onerous obligation which would prevent positive development in the village. The Local Plan Strategy requires the provision of a marketing exercise where a change of use or new development is being proposed for an employment use (B1,B2 or B8 uses) but does not extend this restriction to other land uses. The uses listed in policy PCA2 are not limited to employment and it is advised that the reference to a marketing exercise is removed.	Agree. Amend policy PCA2 to read 'The village centre is shown on Map 8. A mix of commercial, community and residential use should be retained in the village centre. Commercial proposals in the village centre will be supported where they support the vitality of the village centre and are in keeping with the character of the village.'
6	Resident 1	A summary would be useful. We should highlight how Jodrell Bank can be seen from Marton (a picture from near my house (and possibly other locations) would show how there is a clear view with no buildings etc in the way). Also a satellite map with 2 lines from Jodrell Bank to the 2 widest edges of Marton would also highlight how it is predominantly open fields in between. The importance of this being that anything we do in Marton would affect Jodrell Bank greatly as there are no structures to block any disturbance.	A schedule of changes has been prepared. Agree – a further map and photographs highlighting the sight lines to the telescope, and views to Jodrell Bank from Marton have been included in the Neighbourhood Plan.
7	Resident 2	We fully support the objectives and policies of the updated Marton Draft Neighbourhood Plan. The expansion of the Plan Design Guidance is a big improvement and paints a clear picture of the character of the village and provides sound guidance on its future development. The section on the importance of Jodrell Bank is a welcomed addition.	Noted, with thanks.
8	Resident 3	Is there a summary of changes that have been made to the plan?	A schedule of changes has been prepared. The resident was directly contacted to discuss the changes.
9	Resident 4	We are happy to give our support to the updated Marton Neighbourhood Plan. This now reflects the Cheshire East Council Local Plan and recognizes the importance of the JBO Consultation Zones as well as expanding the design guidance. The updated plan will form the basis for the future development of the village.	Noted, with thanks.
10	Resident 5	Please could I ask you to note our support for the changes to the Neighbourhood Plan. Our thanks go to the team who have updated the Plan to bring it into line with the Cheshire East Plan and enable	Noted, with thanks.

		Marton's Plan to act as a framework for future planning.	
11	Resident 6	The Marton Neighbourhood Plan has been updated to align more closely to the Cheshire East Local Plan (issued since the Marton Neighbourhood Plan was made), and to reflect the importance of Jodrell Bank in local planning decisions. I support the objectives and policies of this updated version and am confident that it will continue to provide sound guidance for the development of the village.	Noted, with thanks.
12	Resident 7	We support the updated NP, as it is a relevant and useful update to its predecessor, and will provide strong guidance in the future for any planning discussions. We are particularly pleased that it recognises the importance of the Jodrell Bank consultation zone. Thanks to all for the extra work involved in this update.	Noted, with thanks.
13	Resident 8	We have read the revised plan and can see that it has been substantially rewritten, incorporating developments since the plan was originally implemented. All the previous policies appear to have been carried forward. We wonder if it would be possible to strengthen the Dark Skies/Lighting policy HD2i? We suggest the following wording: "Residents and local businesses should respect the dark skies policy and are urged to restrict outdoor lighting to the minimum required for safety and security purposes". We don't know if this falls within the remit of the Parish Council, but in the light of recent planning applications would it be possible to recommend that the number of licensed premises within the parish does not increase, in order to minimise disturbance to local residents and to avoid adversely affecting existing businesses within the area?	Partly agree. Amend the fourth sentence of HD2i to read 'In all cases, outdoor lighting sources should be kept to the minimum required for safety and security, and should have a minimum impact on the environment, should minimise light pollution and should minimise adverse effects on wildlife.' It is not thought appropriate to attempt to limit the number of licensed premises within the Parish, as it is considered important to retain a thriving village centre, as long as proposals are in keeping with the character of the village.
14	Resident 9	Thank you for all the hard work that has gone into the Neighbourhood Plan. I hope that everyone in the village will appreciate it.	Noted, with thanks.
15	United Utilities	HD2 – Design Policy We recommend the following is added as a separate point to policy HD2 – Design Policy: Any new development should take the following into account, where appropriate:	Agree. Add j) to policy HD2 as suggested.

		<p>j) Incorporate SUDS which minimises surface water run-off. These may include features such as ponds, swales and permeable paving designed as part of the development and to reflect the rural character of the area. Every option should be investigated before discharging surface water into a public sewerage network, in line with the surface water hierarchy.</p> <p>We suggest the following text is also added to the plan as a separate policy: “Surface water should be discharged in the following order of priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · An adequate soakaway or some other form of infiltration system. · An attenuated discharge to surface water body. · An attenuated discharge to public surface water sewer, highway drain or another drainage system. · An attenuated discharge to public combined sewer. <p>No surface water will be expected to discharge to the public sewerage system. Applicants wishing to discharge to public sewer will need to submit clear evidence demonstrating why alternative options are not available as part of the determination of their application.</p>	
16	Hollins Strategic Land	The updated neighbourhood plan must take a more holistic approach to updating the original neighbourhood plan. It should plan positively for the future by ensuring an up to date evidenced base and responding to matters such as the ageing population, affordability, lack of school parking and the absence of a village hall or play area.	It is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan has been updated appropriately, in order for the policies from the original Neighbourhood Plan to remain in keeping with local and national policies. There is no explicit requirement of what an updated Neighbourhood Plan must include.
17	Hollins Strategic Land	Local views are not supported by a robust evidence base.	Disagree. The Landscape Settlement and Character Assessment drawing 015-019-P008 details 16 viewpoints in Marton, with photographic evidence of the views, along with descriptions.
18	Hollins Strategic Land	There is no evidence that development in Marton has the potential to impact on the visual setting and key views of Jodrell Bank – there are not key views of Jodrell Bank from Marton, and Marton does not form part of the visual setting of Jodrell Bank.	Further photographs have been included in the Neighbourhood Plan highlighting the views of Jodrell Bank from Marton. Views of Jodrell Bank across open countryside and farmland

			<p>can be seen from many of the Parish's lanes, such as School Lane, Bunce Lane, Davenport Lane and Marton Hall Lane. The Landscape Settlement and Character Assessment viewpoints 12-14 states that 'Jodrell Bank can be seen when looking north'. To further demonstrate that development in Marton has the potential to impact on the visual setting of Jodrell Bank a further map has been included to indicate lines of sight to the telescope from Marton, along with photographs showing views to the Observatory, along with a further paragraph in section 4F to read 'The lines of sight to Jodrell Bank from Marton across open fields and countryside is shown on Map 10. Photographs from various points in Marton, along Davenport Lane (numbered 1 and 2) Bunce Lane (number 3) and School Lane (number 4) highlight the views of the observatory which can be seen from the parish. These photographs not only demonstrate the proximity of Marton to Jodrell Bank, but also the prominence of the observatory in the skyline, highlighting its significance as a distinctive local landmark on Marton's landscape.'</p>
19	Hollins Strategic Land	HD1 - The Neighbourhood Plan does not identify potential infill sites. It is essential that it undertakes an exercise to identify sites. There is no evidence to show that rural buildings that could be reused. It is imperative that the Neighbourhood Plan allocates land for housing.	The updated Neighbourhood Plan does not need to allocate housing sites. Infill sites and sites capable of conversion will be permitted, if appropriate, as detailed in the Local Plan Policy PG6. There is no requirement to allocate or identify such sites. Marton is classed as open countryside in the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan, and in the emerging SADPD it is also

			<p>classed as being in open countryside, and is not classed as an infill village. Strategic Policy PG6 – Open Countryside therefore applies. The protection of the open countryside from urbanising development is a principal objective of the Local Plan Strategy. It is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate housing sites.</p>
20	Hollins Strategic Land	<p>HD1 - While the SADPD evidence base states that the vast majority of housing in the rural area has come forward, there is no evidence that this has resulted in housing coming forward in the right areas. There is a need for affordable housing to come forward in the Macclesfield Rural Area. A robust evidence base is required and sites for residential development capable of providing affordable housing must be allocated.</p>	<p>The updated Neighbourhood Plan does not need to allocate housing sites. Marton is classed as open countryside in the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan, and in the emerging SADPD it is also classed as being in open countryside, and is not classed as an infill village. Policy PG6 – Open Countryside therefore applies. It is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate housing sites.</p>
21	Hollins Strategic Land	<p>PE1 – This policy states that development should not have a significant and harmful visual impact on the countryside surrounding the settlement of Marton. This is different to HD2. PE1 is more aligned with the NPPF. There is no evidence to demonstrate the extent of the setting of Jodrell Bank, and the views are not supported by a robust evidence base.</p>	<p>HD2c has been amended (see response to comment 3)</p> <p>Please see response to comment 18 regarding Jodrell Bank.</p>
22	Hollins Strategic Land	<p>PE3 – The updated Neighbourhood Plan states that ‘the central recommendation of the Landscape and Character Assessment was that the paddock in the heart of the village should be retained as green space’. This is incorrect. This site off School Lane would provide a deliverable housing site. PE3 should be removed.</p>	<p>Amend the paragraph which precedes Policy PE3 to begin ‘The Landscape Settlement and Character Assessment highlights that the small central paddock in the heart of the village is an integral element of Marton’s dispersed radial settlement character, and no development should change the existing character through the infilling of key open spaces and paddocks.’</p>
23	Hollins Strategic Land	<p>T1 – new family housing would provide more pupils for the school, potentially reducing perceived traffic issues. Land off School Lane could provide additional parking facilities.</p>	<p>As above, the updated Neighbourhood Plan does not need to allocate housing sites. Marton is classed as open countryside in the adopted</p>

			Cheshire East Local Plan, and in the emerging SADPD it is also classed as being in open countryside, and is not classed as an infill village. Policy PG6 – Open Countryside therefore applies. It is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate housing sites.
24	Hollins Strategic Land	PCA1 – A heritage impact assessment is not necessary for applications that would cause harm to the significance of Jodrell Bank. The impact on the efficiency of Jodrell Bank is not a direct heritage matter. There is no guidance available from Cheshire East Council or Jodrell Bank as to what forms of development may be acceptable in what areas of the consultation zone. Jodrell Bank must contribute to the evidence base.	In 2019 Jodrell Bank was awarded World Heritage Status by UNESCO in recognition of its internationally significant heritage, science and cultural impact. This was after the adoption of Local Plan Part One. The emerging SADPD recognises this World Heritage Status, and emerging policy states that development proposals within the world heritage site at Jodrell Bank (or within its buffer zone) that would cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset (including elements that contribute to its outstanding universal value) will not be supported unless there is a clear and convincing justification; and an appropriate heritage impact assessment has evaluated the likely impact of the proposals upon the significance of the asset and the attributes that contribute to its outstanding universal value.
25	Hollins Strategic Land	Appendices should be updated.	Appendices that are considered necessary to update the Neighbourhood Plan have been updated. It was not considered necessary to update the housing needs survey as the Local Plan has been adopted since the preparation of the original Neighbourhood Plan, which was prepared when there were no adopted housing figures. The adopted local plan has determined that Marton is classed as Open Countryside, where new development is

			<p>strictly controlled.</p> <p>Furthermore, the evidence base for the emerging SADPD recommended that no sites should be allocated in the SADPD for development in the 'other settlements and rural areas.' It was not therefore considered necessary to undertake another housing needs survey for Marton's updated Neighbourhood Plan. It was not intended to make substantial changes to the transport policies. The original transport statement had been prepared prior to the adoption of the local plan, and considered potential and committed development along with identified SHLAA sites. It was not considered necessary to have a further transport study undertaken at this stage, when no sites are currently being considered. The village plan and census information has not changed, and minutes from meetings held by the parish council are available to view on the Parish Council website. The details of planning applications will be updated, but all planning applications can in any case be viewed on Cheshire East Council's website.</p>
26	Hollins Strategic Land	Land off School Lane should be allocated for housing.	<p>The updated Neighbourhood Plan does not need to allocate housing sites. Marton is classed as open countryside in the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan, and in the emerging SADPD it is also classed as being in open countryside, and is not classed as an infill village. Policy PG6 – Open Countryside therefore applies. It is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate housing sites. This site has previously been refused for housing.</p>

27	Fisher German LLP on behalf of the Capesthorpe Estate	<p>HD1 - The policy is very rigid, and in alignment with the Cheshire East Local Plan (CELP), which is correct to acknowledge the local and national policy position. However, we feel this NP update should enable the local parish and community in Marton to have a local stance in how their policy towards housing is shaped and driven forward. The policy seeks to make it more challenging for development to take place in Marton and therefore conflicts with National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). Whilst Neighbourhood Plans have to be in 'general conformity' with the development plan, this enables some flexibility for the local community to implement their own strategy. CELP Part One has been adopted since 2017, and therefore is some-time off a LP review (2022). There is a golden opportunity for the updated NP to be 'ahead of the game' in creating policies which will shape the future of the village in line with the direction of travel for planning nationally. The proposed revisions will place greater constraints on new housing development, as well as leaving the community at risk should the 'tilted balance' come into play at a Borough-wide level.</p> <p>Affordability is a substantial issue in Cheshire East and the provision of much-needed affordable housing in high-value rural areas should be given opportunity. There is an identified housing need, and the CELP cannot be relied upon to provide, given the low status of Marton within their settlement hierarchy (not being considered a settlement). The SADPD is at a very early stage and therefore cannot either be relied upon. If the local need is to be met with windfall development, then this will be very limited and unlikely to be distributed within the rural area in a sustainable way. There is no sufficient guarantee that windfall housing will be delivered within Marton to meet local housing needs. There is recognition of a significant affordable housing requirement in the Macclesfield Rural Area and this must be considered. Marton is ideally positioned and a logical location to accept new development to meet established needs.</p>	<p>The updated Neighbourhood Plan does not need to allocate housing sites. Marton is classed as open countryside in the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan, and in the emerging SADPD it is also classed as being in open countryside, and is not classed as an infill village. Strategic Policy PG6 – Open Countryside therefore applies. It is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate housing sites.</p>
28	Fisher German LLP on behalf of the Capesthorpe Estate	<p>PE1 - The proposed new policy has increased the description and created a 'stricter' parameter to adhere to then the current adopted PE1. The policy states 'development must not have an adverse impact on the visual landscape setting of the World Heritage Site at Jodrell Bank'. Marton</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to comment 18 re Jodrell Bank.</p> <p>Disagree that 'Marton lies outside the zone of greatest impact on the telescope, which</p>

		<p>lies outside the zone of greatest impact on the telescope, which has been held at appeal to be to the opposite direction to Marton. The suggestion that development within Marton will impact on the visual setting of Jodrell Bank is not justified. No evidence has been provided to support this suggestion of potential impact on the visual setting or views of Jodrell Bank. This aspect of PE1 needs to be clarified, or ideally removed. Recognition is given to the importance of landscape; however, policy should allow flexibility where small amounts of development can be created in Marton whilst mitigating any impact on landscape.</p>	<p>has been held at appeal to be the opposite to the Marton site.’ The University of Manchester, regarding planning ref 15/5637M stated ‘It is shown that the region of strongest interference stretches across the area of sky where many of the most important pulsar observations are frequently made, relatively low in the SW in the direction of the proposed development. The appeal site lies in a similar direction to the sites which were the subject of recent Goostrey decisions. ..As demonstrated above the resulting interference from the proposed development will impair the efficiency of the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescopes contrary to policies GC14 and SE14’</p> <p>The policy allows for development if appropriate mitigation measures are put in place.</p>
29	Fisher German LLP on behalf of the Capesthorpe Estate	<p>Section 5 - Through carefully worded policies and standards, new development can be secured which retains the positive attributions listed in 5A, whilst seeking to resolve some of the listed issues noted in 5B. The NP has the ability to use a positive approach to development and to secure tangible benefits for the community, which in turn will ultimately make it more sustainable. New development can be used to lever in new and updated facilities, as well as additional local services due to the increase in resident numbers. Section 5 is based on evidence approximately five years old and consideration should be given to updating the evidence in order for a more accurate picture of the local community to be presented and for an appropriate weight to be given in the decision-making progress. It would be helpful to know whether community aspirations have changed in the past five years, and whether the shortfalls have become more severe. Demands of local shops and services have become an increasing concern over the last few years in many</p>	<p>Marton is classed as open countryside in the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan, and in the emerging SADPD it is also classed as being in open countryside, and is not classed as an infill village. Strategic Policy PG6 – Open Countryside therefore applies. New residential development of a scale to lever in new and updated services is therefore not considered appropriate.</p> <p>The main purpose of Updating Marton’s Neighbourhood Plan was to ensure conformity with local and national policies, as it had been prepared and made prior to the adoption of the Local Plan and updated NPPF. It was intended that the vision,</p>

		rural communities in general (since the evidence was gathered) therefore this requires a bold, innovative policy to help address issues.	objectives and policies would remain similar to the original Neighbourhood Plan, rather than a wholesale change. It was not thought necessary or cost effective therefore to go back to the very early stages and redo questionnaires etc. Residents have been able to give their views on the Updated Neighbourhood Plan and have been extremely supportive.
30	Fisher German LLP on behalf of the Capesthorpe Estate	It is no secret that development has been sought on part of the land and supported by the council in the recent past, although ultimately development has been prevented by factors influenced by politics rather than planning merit. There is excellent scope for sites to be allocated. The Estate owns significant areas around the village and is very keen to be an active participant in the local planning process. A number of sites are highlighted as being logical, sustainable locations for residential development. Although a site was refused for development and the Secretary of State determined that the appeal ran contrary to the NP, there were points made that the Parish Council should consider in order to create flexible policies to enable sustainable development. By taking a proactive and pragmatic approach now, the community will protect itself potentially against more harmful forms of development and would have the opportunity to negotiate with developers to provide much-needed community facilities, whilst protecting the essential characteristics of the village.	The updated Neighbourhood Plan does not need to allocate housing sites. Marton is classed as open countryside in the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan, and in the emerging SADPD it is also classed as being in open countryside, and is not classed as an infill village. Strategic Policy PG6 – Open Countryside therefore applies. It is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate housing sites.
31	Emery Planning	HD1 follows the policy for new housing development in Policy PG6 of the Cheshire East Local Plan which we support.	Noted, with thanks.
32	Emery Planning	Map 8 Village Spatial Policies illustrates a number of land-based designations. The “Village Character Area Boundary” encircles the village including and excluding land. This is the same boundary carried forward from the adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Nevertheless, it is the subject of consultation at present and we seek clarity in the next version of the plan and evidence base: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as to how it has been defined, i.e. the criteria used to assess whether or not to include land within the character area; and, • which policy, if any, it relates to. We have assumed Policy PE1, but 	Agree – Map 8 of the Plan and the same map used in the LSCA is confusing, Marton is in open countryside without a development boundary and will be revised in order to remove the boundary. It is considered appropriate to indicate the protected setting of the Grade 1 Listed Church. The SADPD stresses that ‘ Great weight must be given to the

		<p>a reference to Map 8 within the policy would assist.</p> <p>With regard to the “Protected setting of Church”, we note that Map 8 specifies the setting. Our point on this whether the setting should be defined so specifically in the context of the Glossary to the NPPF which states:</p> <p>“Setting of a heritage asset: The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.”</p> <p>Therefore, we propose that rather than defining a fixed setting on Map 8, that the Neighbourhood Plan refers to Policy HER1 (Heritage Assets) of the emerging Cheshire East Site Allocations DPD, which sets out how proposals affecting a heritage asset and its setting should be assessed.</p>	<p>conservation of historic assets. The more significant the asset, the greater the weight that must be given to its conservation. Crucial to the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets is an understanding of what makes them significant, and how the setting contributes to that significance.’</p> <p>The Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment details that the most important heritage asset is the 14th century timber framed church of St James and St Paul, founded in 1343. It is one of the ancient timber-framed churches of Cheshire, and considered one of the oldest longitudinal timber churches of Europe. The church marks the point of arrival into the village from the south, as well as creating a strong skyline and landmark from the surrounding lanes and fields on the southern side of the village. The setting of the church in the landscape is a key feature of Marton adding much to the character of the village. Detailing the protected setting will add clarity for any proposed developments.</p>
33	Emery Planning	<p>PCA1 – Heritage - We consider that Policy PCA1 is contrary to the NPPF with regard to heritage matters. The PPG1 states:</p> <p>“How can the possibility of harm to a heritage asset be assessed? What matters in assessing whether a proposal might cause harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. Proposed development affecting a heritage asset may have no impact on its significance or may enhance its significance and therefore cause no harm to the heritage asset. Where potential harm to designated heritage assets is identified, it needs</p>	<p>Whilst Historic England and English Heritage were both consulted and had no comments on the content of the Plan, it is agreed to amend the first two paragraphs of the policy for clarification to read:-</p> <p>‘Proposals which make a positive contribution to the Parish’s historic assets and their setting, including the Marton Oak and the Parish’s Listed Buildings (section 4c) will be supported. The Marton</p>

	<p>to be categorised as either less than substantial harm or substantial harm (which includes total loss) in order to identify which policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 194-196) apply.”</p> <p>The relevant paragraphs of the NPPF state: “193. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. 194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional. 196. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.” 200. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably”.</p> <p>Government guidance is clear that where there is harm to designated heritage assets that is but one aspect that must be considered when a proposal is being considered. The clear implication is that harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting can be acceptable. Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states that where the setting preserves those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset should be treated</p>	<p>Landscape and Character Assessment identifies locations where the setting of a heritage asset is particularly sensitive to development. Proposals for development must take into account the scale of any possible harm or loss and the significance of any heritage assets and will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that substantial benefits will be achieved when weighed against the harm or loss. Measures should be put in place to avoid or minimise impact or mitigate damage.</p> <p>When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of Marton’s heritage assets, great weight should be given to the assets conservation.’</p>
--	--	--

		<p>favourably. It does not require proposal to enhance the setting as PCA1 states.</p> <p>Therefore, to be consistent with national policy PCA1 should be amended to reflect paragraphs 194 and 196 of the NPPF which deal with how proposals are considered where there is either substantial harm or less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting.</p>	
34	Emery Planning	<p>Housing Need - The Plan relies on the 2015 Housing Needs Survey and there is no updated assessment.</p> <p>Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states: “14. In situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided all of the following apply: a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan two years or less before the date on which the decision is made; b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement; c) the local planning authority has at least a three year supply of deliverable housing sites (against its five year housing supply requirement, including the appropriate buffer as set out in paragraph 73); and d) the local planning authority’s housing delivery was at least 45% of that required over the previous three years.”</p> <p>The PPG states: “How should local planning authorities identify indicative housing requirement figures for designated neighbourhood areas, when these are needed? Where an indicative housing requirement figure is requested by a neighbourhood planning body, the local planning authority can follow a similar process to that for providing a housing requirement figure. They can use the authority’s local housing need as a starting point, taking into consideration relevant policies such as an existing or emerging spatial strategy, alongside the characteristics of the neighbourhood plan area. Proactive engagement with neighbourhood plan-making bodies is important as part of this process, in order for them to understand how the figures are reached. This is important to avoid disagreements at neighbourhood plan or local plan</p>	<p>It was not considered necessary to update the housing needs survey as the Local Plan has been adopted since the preparation of the original Neighbourhood Plan, which was prepared when there were no adopted housing figures. The adopted local plan has determined that Marton is classed as Open Countryside, where new development is strictly controlled.</p> <p>Furthermore, the evidence base for the emerging SADPD recommended that no sites should be allocated in the SADPD for development in the ‘other settlements and rural areas.’ It was not therefore considered necessary to undertake another housing needs survey for Marton’s updated Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

	<p>examinations, and minimise the risk of neighbourhood plan figures being superseded when new strategic policies are adopted.</p> <p>It then states:</p> <p>“What happens if the local planning authority does not provide a housing requirement figure for a designated neighbourhood area that wishes to plan for housing?</p> <p>Where strategic policies do not already set out a requirement figure, the National Planning Policy Framework expects an indicative figure to be provided to neighbourhood planning bodies on request. However, if a local planning authority is unable to do this, then the neighbourhood planning body may exceptionally need to determine a housing requirement figure themselves, taking account of relevant policies, the existing and emerging spatial strategy, and characteristics of the neighbourhood area. The neighbourhood planning toolkit on housing needs assessment may be used for this purpose.</p> <p>Neighbourhood planning bodies will need to work proactively with the local planning authority through this process, and the figure will need to be tested at examination of the neighbourhood plan, as neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with strategic policies of the development plan to meet the ‘basic conditions’.</p> <p>Therefore, we consider the update should include an updated needs assessment for the Parish or a requirement is requested from the LPA in light of the above guidance.</p>	
--	--	--