

High Lane Village Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Regulation 14 Public Consultation

Wednesday 11th September 2019 until Friday 1st November 2019

Table 1 Consultation Bodies and MP's Responses

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
Natural England 1.	All			No comment	<p>High Lane Village Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Regulation 14</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 04 September 2019</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted</p>	Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p> <p>(See NDP website for attached annex)</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
Historic England 2.	All			No Comment	<p>High Lane Village Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) (Regulation 14 Town and Country Planning, England. Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012</p> <p>Historic England is the Government's statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment in England. We are a non-departmental public body established under the National Heritage Act 1983 and sponsored by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). We champion and protect England's historic places, providing expert advice to local planning authorities, developers, owners and communities to help ensure our historic environment is properly</p>	Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>understood, enjoyed and cared for.</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above document. At this stage we have no comments to make on its content.</p> <p>If you have any queries or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>		
Network Rail 3.	All			Comment	<p>Network Rail has the following comments to make.</p> <p>(1) Network Rail is a statutory consultee for any planning applications within 10 metres of relevant railway land (as the Rail Infrastructure Managers for the railway, set out in Article 16 of the Development Management Procedure Order) and for any development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Network Rail will be consulted by SMBC as and when planning applications are considered as part of the development management process.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order).</p> <p>Network Rail is also a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the railway infrastructure and associated estate. It owns, operates and develops the main rail network. Network Rail aims to protect and enhance the railway infrastructure, therefore any proposed development which is in close proximity to the railway line or could potentially affect Network Rail's specific land interests will need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>(2) The proposal area includes a section of railway line as well as Disley railway tunnel.</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Developments in the neighbourhood area should be notified to Network Rail to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Access points / rights of way belonging to Network Rail are not impacted by developments within the area. b. That any proposal does not impact upon the railway infrastructure / Network Rail land e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage works / water features • Encroachment of land or air-space • Excavation works • Siting of structures/buildings less than 2m from the Network Rail boundary / Party Wall Act issues 		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting impacting upon train drivers' ability to perceive signals • Landscaping that could impact upon overhead lines or Network Rail boundary treatments • Any piling works • Any scaffolding works • Any public open spaces and proposals where minors and young children may be likely to use a site which could result in trespass upon the railway (which we would remind the council is a criminal offence under s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949) • Any use of crane or plant • Any fencing works • Any demolition works • Any hard standing areas 		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>For any proposal adjacent to the railway, Network Rail would request that a developer constructs (at their own expense) a suitable steel palisade trespass proof fence of at least 1.8m in height.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework calls for local authorities to prevent unacceptable risks from land instability by ensuring decisions for proposed development are only approved when development is appropriate for its location. Applications for development</p> <p>All initial proposals and plans should be flagged up to the Network Rail Town Planning Team London North Western Route at the following address:</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>GUIDANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT ABOVE/ADJACENT TO RAILWAY TUNNELS</p> <p>1. The Developer should undertake a topographical survey of the site to determine the exact location and relationship of Network Rail's tunnels to the ground surface features. All levels to be related to Ordnance Datum. At this stage it would be beneficial for the applicant to also undertake a tunnel condition survey also.</p> <p>2. Network Rail's Engineer is to approve details of any development or works within 15 metres, measured horizontally, from the outside face of the tunnel extrados with special reference to:</p> <p>a. The type and method of construction of foundations</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>b. Any increase/decrease of loading on the tunnel both temporary and permanent. Certified proof that the proposals shall have no detrimental effect upon the tunnel will be necessary.</p> <p>3. Any proposal must not interfere with Network Rail's operational railway nor jeopardise the structural integrity of the tunnel.</p> <p>4. Network Rail will not accept any liability for any settlement, disturbance or damage caused to any development by failure of the tunnel structures nor for any noise or vibration arising from the normal use and/or maintenance of the tunnel. No right of support is given or can be claimed from Network rail's tunnels or railway land.</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>5. The developer is to reimburse Network rail the cost of any remedial works to damage or deterioration of the tunnel structures caused by any development and in this respect Network Rail reserves the right to carry out any necessary emergency work on the site at the Developer's expense should this become necessary to safeguard the integrity of the tunnel structure.</p> <p>6. If construction or other shafts associated with the tunnels are identified, Network Rail's Engineer must be advised immediately and work in the vicinity stopped. Network Rails' approval must then be obtained and working methods agreed before work is permitted to recommence. The Developer is to reimburse Network Rail the cost of any necessary physical work, protection and/or supervision.</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>7. Network Rail to retain unencumbered rights of access to any existing tunnel shafts .</p> <p>8. Where new roads, turning spaces or parking areas are to be situated adjacent to the tunnel shaft, suitable crash barriers or high kerbs should be provided to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling into or damaging the tunnel shaft.</p> <p>9. All drainage from any development must be taken away in an approved sealed pipe system. No soak ways are to be constructed within 50 metres of the tunnel. Details must be submitted for approval.</p> <p>10. No piling over the tunnel. Bored piles as part of an independently supported</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>structure clear from the tunnel may be acceptable, but the piles must not be closer than 5 metres from the outside face of the tunnel structure and have full bearing below invert levels, unless with prior approval of Network Rail.</p> <p>11. Consideration will also be given to the monitoring of the tunnel in the vicinity of any development at regular intervals before, during any works and at completion, the cost of which to be at the Developers expense.</p> <p>12. The developer should ensure that he has complied with all restrictive covenants, if any, contained in the title deeds to the property.</p> <p>13. It should be noted that Network Rail as part of its rolling maintenance programme</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>of tunnels will continue to seek access on an annual basis to carry out routine inspections of the land above such tunnels.</p> <p>The Developer shall ensure that these requirements are met and provide, for acceptance by Network Rail, sufficient evidence, supported by drawings, calculations and Design check certificates. Design check certificates will be subject to an independent check arranged by and at the expense of the applicant.</p>		
Disley Parish Council 4.	All		T1	Support	<p>Dear Neighbourhood Forum Re: High Lane Village Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan(NDP)</p> <p>On behalf of Disley Parish Council, I would like to apologise for the late response to the recent NDP consultation.</p>	Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>The Parish Council read your plan with interest and was particularly impressed with the Draft Policy T1Mitigating Local Traffic Impacts of Development and Improving Air Quality. Given the complexity of the document it is very well constructed.</p> <p>Given that many of the High Lane concerns reflect those of Disley and Newtown, Disley Parish Council would like to register its support for the Plan and to confirm that the Council will fully engage with any further consultation.</p> <p>We wish you every success in moving the Plan to the next stage.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
William Wragg MP MP for Hazel Grove Constituency 5.	All			Support / Comments	<p>High Lane Village Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan</p> <p>I am pleased to respond to this consultation in my capacity as Member of Parliament for Hazel Grove Constituency, which includes the village of High Lane. I welcome this consultation opportunity and the Neighbourhood Plan, as I have long believed that development should be done in a way which is sensitive to both the local environment and the wishes of local communities. Community planning must be central to that process and people must have a meaningful say on the areas in which they live, and the Neighbourhood Plan Provides this.</p> <p>I wish to formally offer my Support to the Draft Neighbourhood Development</p>	Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Plan (NDP) as a whole, and I make additional comments on specific sections and related issues below.</p> <p>Relation to Local and Regional Planning Processes</p> <p>The NDP covers the neighbourhood area of High Lane Village and surrounding Green Belt, but it is important to remember that this sits within several other local and regional developments planning processes, including the Stockport Local Plan, the SEMMMS Strategy, the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF), and the National Planning Policy Framework, each of which are referenced by the NDP. As the Member of Parliament for the local area, I have also given responses to the various consultations associated with those processes, which are a matter of public</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>record. In addition, I am regularly contacted by constituents regarding these various planning matters in both the consistency consultation exercises I have run, for example around the GMSF, and on an ongoing basis. My comments below are made in light of these representations.</p> <p>Transport – Roads</p> <p>I agree with the NDP that congestion is a real problem in High Lane and is of great concern to many residents, and that this is concentrated along the A6 corridor. On a daily basis there are high volumes of slow-moving traffic, with the A6 Northbound (High Lane to M60) seeing Morning Peak-Time Average Speeds of 13 mph – this makes it one of the most congested roads in the country with lower average speeds than</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>many in central London. Also, as the NDP highlights since the A6MARR opened which was intended to relieve congestion, traffic using the A6 increased as the A6MARR has only served to draw more traffic through the area, creating congestion which backs up onto the local roads.</p> <p>There is no apparent silver bullet to the local congestion issue in the near future. Therefore, it is right that NDP focusses on mitigation measures aimed at deterring more HGVs from using the A6 route, improved Air Quality monitoring and mitigating the impacts of future development. Essential to this is proper assessment of the impact that any housing developments, such as under the GMSF, would have on local traffic with the additional cars that new occupants would likely drive.</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Due consideration of this has been sorely lacking to date in the GMSF proposals, yet it was and remains one of the main subjects of comment from residents who contact me about the GMSF proposals affecting High Lane.</p> <p>Transport - Rail</p> <p>The village of High Lane needs to be provided with a viable form of local rail access. This can be either through the provision of a new station to serve High Lane specifically, or by providing improved access to nearby Middlewood Station. The more simple and expedient option is improvements to Middlewood. With Middlewood station a mere half a mile away, the provision of a proper road link and car-park would enable High Lane residents to make practical use of the existing station. The exact route of a</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>new road would need careful consideration. I also support the NDP call for parking and cycle storage facilities at the station and investment in passenger facilities.</p> <p>Housing and Green Belt</p> <p>By far the most contentious planning issue affecting High Lane in recent years was that initial proposal to expand the village by around 4,000 homes on Green Belt land contained in the first draft of the GMSF. This sparked understandable and justified outrage from local residents, not only for the large-scale destruction it would have meant for highly valued local Green Belt, but for the unsustainable pressure that the development would have placed on local roads, community infrastructure and amenities by more than doubling the size of the village.</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>I joined local campaigners against the proposals, and I have raised the issue repeatedly in Parliament including organising a petition of over 4,000 local signatories. Instead a policy of smaller scale local developments and urging the Council and the GMSF as a whole that a Brownfield First strategy should be pursued.</p> <p>I and the thousands who signed local petitions are not against house building. We need to provide new homes in order to fill the housing shortage, but this should be done in a way which is sensitive to both the local environment and the wishes of local communities. I therefore welcomed the revised Draft GMSF which reduced High Lane's proposed new housing allocation from 4,000 to 500 and also the Council's formal</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>adoption of a Brownfield First strategy. This not only protects the countryside, but focuses development where regeneration is needed and where the necessary infrastructure already exists. I want to thank local residents in High Lane for their support in this campaign.</p> <p>There was widespread and sincere relief that the original proposals for 4,000 homes has been reduced to 500, but nevertheless significant opposition remains. The principle issue of concern was the impact on local traffic that even 500 homes, and potentially around 1,000 cars, is likely to bring. High Lane is already in a difficult situation in terms of its proximity to the heavily congested A6. The likely impact of these new homes, and consequently additional</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>cars on the road (and fairly assuming an extra two cars per household) is believed by residents to be extremely negative in terms of traffic, congestion and as a result impacts on air quality too.</p> <p>In terms of future housing developments, I support the NDPs plan to mitigate the environmental and disruptive impact of this. I especially want to emphasise the impact on air quality and traffic congestion which such developments, both large and small, will inevitably bring and it is right these are fully explored. The affordability of units in future housing developments is a point that was echoed by residents responding to my own local GMSF consultation. I am pleased to see this point is addressed in the NDP.</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>I do, however, remain concerned that even the revised draft of the GMSF lacks detail on the type and character of the new sites were proposed by the GMCA for GMSF without consultation with HLVNF. As I said above it is vital that development should be conducted with due regard for the wishes of local communities. I hope that in the further stages of GMSF the GMCA engage more proactively with local communities, neighbourhood plans and forums. I fully support the NDP and Neighbourhood Forum in its efforts to achieve this.</p> <p>Green Space As with Green Belt, Green Spaces within the built environment are hugely valued by local people as areas of both natural beauty and sites of recreation. Their value is</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>brought into even sharper focus as a means of providing a place of relief to the problems of Air Quality and traffic discussed above and as a means to improving people's physical and mental health. It is vital they are both protected and improved, and I support the NDPs objectives of protect existing recreational facilities and support investment in new and improved facilities for all ages and abilities.</p> <p>Heritage High Lane is a village with great natural and industrial heritage, notably the historic Coal Mining and Canal industries, and is home to many listed buildings. I support the objectives of the NDP to protect the character of the village and the natural landscape – which is why the proposal of 4,000 new homes was completely unjustifiable.</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>I addition I support investment in maintaining and improving the canal network, both the water and the tow paths. What was once a very important source of industry is now a very important source of recreation. Steps should be taken to encourage walking, cycling, and boating along this invaluable community asset.</p> <p>I also wish to underline the importance of providing Wildlife Corridors and protection for Mature Trees, which were repeatedly mentioned by residents to me during discussion of GMSF sites. I would urge the Neighbourhood Forum to work closely with wildlife and environmental organisations – including RSPB, The Wildlife Trusts, Woodland Trust, Canal and River Trust, CPRE, and</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	HLVNF Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>others - to ensure that any permitted development is done with sensitivity to the local environment and provides maximum protection for local wildlife and habitats.</p> <p>Finally, I wish to offer my thanks to all the members of the High Lane Village Neighbourhood Forum, and especially its NDP Steering Group and other Working Groups, for their time and effort in preparing the Plan to its current stage. I offer my best wishes for its future progress in the process to adoption.</p>		