

EiP Statement

Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan Part 2

Our ref 40812/23/MW/NMi
Date August 2018
To Programme Officer
From Lichfields

Subject **Matter 8: Chester**

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Lichfields is instructed by Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Redrow Homes Limited and Lingley Estates Limited (the Companies) [Representor IDs: 1150612 and 778027] to make representations on the Cheshire West and Chester Submission Local Plan Part 2 (March 2018) [SLP2]
- 1.2 This statement sets out the written representations concerning Matter 8: Chester.
- 1.3 These representations are made in the context of the Companies interests in Cheshire West and Chester, namely land at Wrexham Road, which is identified under Policy STRAT 3 of the CWaC Local Plan Part One [LPPO] as a Strategic Allocation for the provision of around 1,300 dwellings together with essential community infrastructure and a new primary school.
- 1.4 The representations in this statement are additional to and should be read in conjunction with the Companies previous submissions on the Local Plan Part 2 as well as those representations made on other matters.
- 1.5 This statement responds in the light of the Inspector's Matters Issues and Questions. Where relevant, the comments made are assessed against the tests of soundness established by the National Planning Policy Framework [the Framework] and the National Planning Practice Guidance [the Practice Guidance].

2.0 Issue 1: Settlement area policy CH1

Q1. How has the settlement area been defined? Is it justified, effective and correctly defined?

- 2.1 The Companies support the inclusion of the Wrexham Road site within the settlement boundary. The line of the settlement boundary around the allocation as defined on Map Change 117 is considered to be justified, effective and correctly defined.

Q2. Policy CH1, sets out the settlement area and principles for development within it to meet the aims of Local Plan Part One policy STRAT3. Are these clear, justified and effective?

- 2.2 In previous representations, the Companies noted that the development principles for Wrexham Road have been deleted from Policy CH 1 in the Local Plan Part Two; Land Allocations and Detailed Policies Publication Draft [PTPD]. Policy CH1 was supported on this basis.

2.3 As no change to Policy CH1 is proposed in the SLP2, the Companies continue to support the principles of development set out within Policy CH1.

Q3. Criterion 4 refers to ‘strategic open space corridors’, criterion 5 to ‘canal corridors’? How have these been defined? Are they justified, effective?

2.4 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q4. Criterion 6 refers to ‘principal gateways and routeways’. How are these defined? Are they justified and effective?

2.5 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q4. The policy also refers to four ‘strategic open spaces’ that contribute to the setting and character of Chester? How have these been defined? Are they justified and effective?

2.6 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q5. Is a specific approach to the provision of student accommodation in Chester justified?

2.7 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

3.0 Issue 2: Regeneration areas policy CH2; CH2.A; CH2.B; CH2.C; CH2.D

3.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

4.0 Issue 3: Employment land provision policy CH3

4.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

5.0 Issue 4: University of Chester policy CH4

5.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

6.0 Issue 5: Chester conservation areas policy CH5

6.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

7.0 Issue 6: Key views, landmarks and gateways and historic skyline policy CH6

7.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

EiP Statement

Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan Part 2

Our ref 40812/23/MW/NMi
Date August 2018
To Programme Officer
From Lichfields

Subject **Matter 8: Chester**

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Lichfields is instructed by Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Redrow Homes Limited and Lingley Estates Limited (the Companies) [Representor IDs: 1150612 and 778027] to make representations on the Cheshire West and Chester Submission Local Plan Part 2 (March 2018) [SLP2]
- 1.2 This statement sets out the written representations concerning Matter 8: Chester.
- 1.3 These representations are made in the context of the Companies interests in Cheshire West and Chester, namely land at Wrexham Road, which is identified under Policy STRAT 3 of the CWaC Local Plan Part One [LPPO] as a Strategic Allocation for the provision of around 1,300 dwellings together with essential community infrastructure and a new primary school.
- 1.4 The representations in this statement are additional to and should be read in conjunction with the Companies previous submissions on the Local Plan Part 2 as well as those representations made on other matters.
- 1.5 This statement responds in the light of the Inspector's Matters Issues and Questions. Where relevant, the comments made are assessed against the tests of soundness established by the National Planning Policy Framework [the Framework] and the National Planning Practice Guidance [the Practice Guidance].

2.0 Issue 1: Settlement area policy CH1

Q1. How has the settlement area been defined? Is it justified, effective and correctly defined?

- 2.1 The Companies support the inclusion of the Wrexham Road site within the settlement boundary. The line of the settlement boundary around the allocation as defined on Map Change 117 is considered to be justified, effective and correctly defined.

Q2. Policy CH1, sets out the settlement area and principles for development within it to meet the aims of Local Plan Part One policy STRAT3. Are these clear, justified and effective?

- 2.2 In previous representations, the Companies noted that the development principles for Wrexham Road have been deleted from Policy CH 1 in the Local Plan Part Two; Land Allocations and Detailed Policies Publication Draft [PTPD]. Policy CH1 was supported on this basis.

2.3 As no change to Policy CH1 is proposed in the SLP2, the Companies continue to support the principles of development set out within Policy CH1.

Q3. Criterion 4 refers to ‘strategic open space corridors’, criterion 5 to ‘canal corridors’? How have these been defined? Are they justified, effective?

2.4 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q4. Criterion 6 refers to ‘principal gateways and routeways’. How are these defined? Are they justified and effective?

2.5 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q4. The policy also refers to four ‘strategic open spaces’ that contribute to the setting and character of Chester? How have these been defined? Are they justified and effective?

2.6 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q5. Is a specific approach to the provision of student accommodation in Chester justified?

2.7 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

3.0 Issue 2: Regeneration areas policy CH2; CH2.A; CH2.B; CH2.C; CH2.D

3.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

4.0 Issue 3: Employment land provision policy CH3

4.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

5.0 Issue 4: University of Chester policy CH4

5.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

6.0 Issue 5: Chester conservation areas policy CH5

6.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

7.0 Issue 6: Key views, landmarks and gateways and historic skyline policy CH6

7.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

EiP Statement

Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan Part 2

Our ref 40812/23/MW/NMi
Date August 2018
To Programme Officer
From Lichfields

Subject **Matter 8: Chester**

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Lichfields is instructed by Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Redrow Homes Limited and Lingley Estates Limited (the Companies) [Representor IDs: 1150612 and 778027] to make representations on the Cheshire West and Chester Submission Local Plan Part 2 (March 2018) [SLP2]
- 1.2 This statement sets out the written representations concerning Matter 8: Chester.
- 1.3 These representations are made in the context of the Companies interests in Cheshire West and Chester, namely land at Wrexham Road, which is identified under Policy STRAT 3 of the CWaC Local Plan Part One [LPPO] as a Strategic Allocation for the provision of around 1,300 dwellings together with essential community infrastructure and a new primary school.
- 1.4 The representations in this statement are additional to and should be read in conjunction with the Companies previous submissions on the Local Plan Part 2 as well as those representations made on other matters.
- 1.5 This statement responds in the light of the Inspector's Matters Issues and Questions. Where relevant, the comments made are assessed against the tests of soundness established by the National Planning Policy Framework [the Framework] and the National Planning Practice Guidance [the Practice Guidance].

2.0 Issue 1: Settlement area policy CH1

Q1. How has the settlement area been defined? Is it justified, effective and correctly defined?

- 2.1 The Companies support the inclusion of the Wrexham Road site within the settlement boundary. The line of the settlement boundary around the allocation as defined on Map Change 117 is considered to be justified, effective and correctly defined.

Q2. Policy CH1, sets out the settlement area and principles for development within it to meet the aims of Local Plan Part One policy STRAT3. Are these clear, justified and effective?

- 2.2 In previous representations, the Companies noted that the development principles for Wrexham Road have been deleted from Policy CH 1 in the Local Plan Part Two; Land Allocations and Detailed Policies Publication Draft [PTPD]. Policy CH1 was supported on this basis.

2.3 As no change to Policy CH1 is proposed in the SLP2, the Companies continue to support the principles of development set out within Policy CH1.

Q3. Criterion 4 refers to ‘strategic open space corridors’, criterion 5 to ‘canal corridors’? How have these been defined? Are they justified, effective?

2.4 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q4. Criterion 6 refers to ‘principal gateways and routeways’. How are these defined? Are they justified and effective?

2.5 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q4. The policy also refers to four ‘strategic open spaces’ that contribute to the setting and character of Chester? How have these been defined? Are they justified and effective?

2.6 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q5. Is a specific approach to the provision of student accommodation in Chester justified?

2.7 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

3.0 Issue 2: Regeneration areas policy CH2; CH2.A; CH2.B; CH2.C; CH2.D

3.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

4.0 Issue 3: Employment land provision policy CH3

4.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

5.0 Issue 4: University of Chester policy CH4

5.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

6.0 Issue 5: Chester conservation areas policy CH5

6.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

7.0 Issue 6: Key views, landmarks and gateways and historic skyline policy CH6

7.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

EiP Statement

Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan Part 2

Our ref 40812/23/MW/NMi
Date August 2018
To Programme Officer
From Lichfields

Subject **Matter 8: Chester**

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Lichfields is instructed by Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Redrow Homes Limited and Lingley Estates Limited (the Companies) [Representor IDs: 1150612 and 778027] to make representations on the Cheshire West and Chester Submission Local Plan Part 2 (March 2018) [SLP2]
- 1.2 This statement sets out the written representations concerning Matter 8: Chester.
- 1.3 These representations are made in the context of the Companies interests in Cheshire West and Chester, namely land at Wrexham Road, which is identified under Policy STRAT 3 of the CWaC Local Plan Part One [LPPO] as a Strategic Allocation for the provision of around 1,300 dwellings together with essential community infrastructure and a new primary school.
- 1.4 The representations in this statement are additional to and should be read in conjunction with the Companies previous submissions on the Local Plan Part 2 as well as those representations made on other matters.
- 1.5 This statement responds in the light of the Inspector's Matters Issues and Questions. Where relevant, the comments made are assessed against the tests of soundness established by the National Planning Policy Framework [the Framework] and the National Planning Practice Guidance [the Practice Guidance].

2.0 Issue 1: Settlement area policy CH1

Q1. How has the settlement area been defined? Is it justified, effective and correctly defined?

- 2.1 The Companies support the inclusion of the Wrexham Road site within the settlement boundary. The line of the settlement boundary around the allocation as defined on Map Change 117 is considered to be justified, effective and correctly defined.

Q2. Policy CH1, sets out the settlement area and principles for development within it to meet the aims of Local Plan Part One policy STRAT3. Are these clear, justified and effective?

- 2.2 In previous representations, the Companies noted that the development principles for Wrexham Road have been deleted from Policy CH 1 in the Local Plan Part Two; Land Allocations and Detailed Policies Publication Draft [PTPD]. Policy CH1 was supported on this basis.

2.3 As no change to Policy CH1 is proposed in the SLP2, the Companies continue to support the principles of development set out within Policy CH1.

Q3. Criterion 4 refers to ‘strategic open space corridors’, criterion 5 to ‘canal corridors’? How have these been defined? Are they justified, effective?

2.4 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q4. Criterion 6 refers to ‘principal gateways and routeways’. How are these defined? Are they justified and effective?

2.5 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q4. The policy also refers to four ‘strategic open spaces’ that contribute to the setting and character of Chester? How have these been defined? Are they justified and effective?

2.6 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

Q5. Is a specific approach to the provision of student accommodation in Chester justified?

2.7 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

3.0 Issue 2: Regeneration areas policy CH2; CH2.A; CH2.B; CH2.C; CH2.D

3.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

4.0 Issue 3: Employment land provision policy CH3

4.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

5.0 Issue 4: University of Chester policy CH4

5.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

6.0 Issue 5: Chester conservation areas policy CH5

6.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.

7.0 Issue 6: Key views, landmarks and gateways and historic skyline policy CH6

7.1 The Companies have no comments to make on this issue.