

Cheshire West & Chester Council

Local Plan

(Part Two) Land Allocations
and Detailed Policies



Statement of Consultation

March 2018

Visit: cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk



Cheshire West
and Chester

Purpose

1 Purpose of this statement	2
2 Statement of Community Involvement	3
3 Consultation bodies	4

Consultation

4 Introduction	5
5 Issues consultation and Call for Sites	7
6 Minerals methodology consultation and Call for Sites	9
7 Facilities and services consultation	11
8 Local Service Centre background paper consultation	12
9 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment consultation	14
10 Preferred Approach consultation	16
11 Publication Draft consultation	19

Appendices

A Specific and general consultation bodies	21
B Issues consultation and Call for Sites summary	23
C Local Service Centre background paper consultation summary	43
D Preferred Approach consultation summary	45
E Publication Draft consultation summary	75

1

Purpose of this statement

1 Purpose of this statement

1.1 This document is the consultation statement required to accompany the Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies - Submission Plan, under Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

1.2 As set out under Regulation 22 (1) (c), Local Planning Authorities are required to prepare a statement setting out details of consultation exercises undertaken in the preparation of their Local Plan, under Regulation 18 and Regulation 20. This consultation statement details how Cheshire West and Chester Council has engaged with key stakeholders and the public in the preparation of the Council's Submission Local Plan (Part Two); how those bodies and people were invited to make representations; a summary of the main issues raised by those representations; and how those issues have been addressed.

1.3 The Council has carried out consultation exercises in accordance with Regulations 35 and 36 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, which require local planning authorities to make the consultation documents available on their website, at their principal office and other appropriate places, and provide copies to individuals on request. Consultations have also been guided by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

1.4 Separate more detailed reports of consultation have been compiled at previous stages of preparation of the Local Plan (Part Two) and are referred to as relevant throughout this document.

2 Statement of Community Involvement

2.1 The Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) sets out who, on what and how we will consult key stakeholders and members of the public on the preparation of the Local Plan and planning proposals. The SCI was originally prepared and consulted upon in January 2009 prior to Local Government Reorganisation, and consolidated and updated the existing SCIs of the former county and district councils.

2.2 It was subsequently updated in April 2013 to take account of changes brought about by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and a further update was made in 2015 to take account of changes to the way that the Council carries out planning application consultations.

2.3 Most recently, the SCI was amended in 2017 to include details of advice and assistance which the Council will provide to communities preparing neighbourhood development orders and plans, as required by the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017. The Statement of Community Involvement (October 2017) can be viewed online via the following link:

http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/portal/cwc_ldf/sci/sci_2017

3 Consultation bodies

3.1 The Council's vision for community involvement, is to "work hard to improve engagement with customers, individuals, communities and partners and deliver the highest quality of services to all stakeholders". The Council has reflected this in its consultation at the 'Preparation (Regulation 18)' stage of the Local Plan (Part Two) preparation, which has included full public consultation on both the scope and issues; and the preferred approach, draft policies and allocations.

3.2 The Council has a comprehensive consultee database containing details of all those who have previously taken part in any earlier local plan and related planning policy consultation exercises and comprises nearly 6,000 consultees. The database includes consultees from each of the following categories:

- Specific consultation bodies⁽ⁱ⁾
- General consultation bodies⁽ⁱⁱ⁾
- Duty to co-operate bodies⁽ⁱⁱⁱ⁾
- Other consultation bodies, individuals and stakeholders

3.3 Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as inserted by section 110 of the Localism Act 2011, has introduced a duty to co-operate in relation to the planning of sustainable development. The Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with other local planning authorities and bodies, as prescribed in regulation 4(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, on strategic matters to maximise the effectiveness of the preparation of the Local Plan (Part Two) and supporting activities so far as it relates to a strategic matter.

3.4 A list of specific and general bodies from each of the above categories is included in Appendix A 'Specific and general consultation bodies'.

3.5 Given the significant nature of the Local Plan (Part Two), all key stakeholders and consultees registered on the database were formally consulted through direct notification at each consultation stage.

i Reg 2(1) Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012
 ii Reg 2(1) Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012
 iii Reg 4(1) Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012

4 Introduction

Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies

4.1 The Local Plan (Part One), which was adopted by the Council on 29 January 2015, provides the overall vision, strategic objectives, spatial strategy and strategic policies for the borough to 2030. This includes setting out the level and location of new housing and employment land, as well as the identification of a number of strategic sites.

Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies

4.2 The purpose of the Local Plan (Part Two) is to provide the detailed policies and non-strategic land allocations required to deliver the overall strategy for Cheshire West and Chester for the period to 2030. The amount of housing and employment land needed is clearly identified in Local Plan (Part One) and the Local Plan (Part Two) will not include any policies which alter or amend these requirements. When adopted, both documents will constitute the statutory development plan for Cheshire West and Chester and will replace all of the retained policies from the former district local plans^(iv).

4.3 A principal priority of the planning system is to engage local people in the development of Local Plans enabling authorities to better reflect the identified priorities of local communities. The Council has actively engaged with the borough's key stakeholders and local communities throughout the preparation of the Local Plan (Part Two).

4.4 This consultation statement provides details of consultation carried out in the preparation of the Local Plan (Part Two), as summarised in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Local Plan (Part Two) Timetable and Milestones

Timetable and milestones		Date
Preparation (Regulation 18)	Public consultation on the scope and issues and engagement of stakeholders	May 2014
	Call for sites to identify any additional development sites including residential, employment, Gypsy & Traveller and Travelling Showpersons, minerals and waste management	May 2014
	Minerals call for sites and methodology consultation of the mineral industry and known landowners	October 2014

iv Chester District Local Plan; Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Local Plan; Vale Royal Borough Local Plan; Cheshire Replacement Minerals Local Plan; and Cheshire Replacement Waste Local Plan

Timetable and milestones		Date
	Consultation on facilities and services with parish councils and the Council's regeneration teams	October 2014
	Public consultation on Local Service Centre Background Paper	March 2015
	Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment - Draft Methodology consultation	August 2015
	Public consultation on the Local Plan (Part Two) Preferred Approach, draft policies and allocations	August 2016
Publication (Regulation 19)	Statutory public consultation (6 weeks) prior to submission of the Local Plan for examination	December 2017
Submission (Regulation 22)	Submit document to Secretary of State for examination	March/ April 2018
Examination hearings (Regulation 24)	Independent examination in public, into the soundness of the document	July/ August 2018
Adoption (Regulation 26)	Document adopted and published	February 2019

4.5 Each of the above Preparation (Regulation 18) stages were subject to a period of public consultation in accordance with relevant planning regulations and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. All comments received during these stages were acknowledged, recorded and taken into account in the preparation and ongoing development of the Local Plan (Part Two).

4.6 A more detailed overview of the consultation carried out and the responses received is contained in the following sections.

5 Issues consultation and Call for Sites

5.1 The Local Plan (Part Two) Issues consultation was carried out in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, which require Local Planning Authorities to notify general and specific consultation bodies of the subject of the local plan, inviting them to make representations about what the local plan ought to contain.

5.2 At its meeting on the 24 March 2014 the Council's Local Development Framework Panel endorsed the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies Initial Consultation document. The consultation document sought, through a series of questions, views on the proposed form and content of the Local Plan (Part Two), including what policies should or should not be included and the potential to use Supplementary Planning Documents. As part of the consultation the Council also issued a call for additional development sites including residential, employment, Gypsy & Traveller and Travelling Showpersons, minerals and waste management, which had not already been submitted through the Employment Land Review or Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process.

5.3 This stage included consultation on the following documents:

- Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies – Issues Consultation and Call for Sites
- Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies - Call for Sites Form

Consultation process

5.4 Public consultation on the Local Plan (Part Two) Issues and associated documents ran for longer than the statutory period of six weeks from 1 May 2014 to 19 June 2014. All key stakeholders and those registered on the Council's consultation database were directly notified of the consultation via letter or email. Consultation documents were also issued to all town and parish councils within the borough.

Notification

5.5 Advanced notice of the Issues Consultation and Call for Sites was sent to everyone on the Council's consultation database. A letter providing details of the consultation dates for the consultation was sent prior to the commencement of the consultation. The letter included details of how to access the consultation documents – which were made available on the Council's website and in all of Council's offices, customer service centres and libraries during normal opening hours – and how to make comments.

Website

5.6 The consultation featured on the Council's website, providing links to a dedicated consultation web page provided on the Council's Local Plan consultation portal. The web page included all of the consultation documents which were available to view either online or downloaded as PDF documents.

Responses

5.7 The consultation document invited comment on 70 different questions broken down into the main policy areas identified in the Local Plan Part One as summarised below. Pursuant to Regulation 18, a total of 1,032 responses were received to the consultation from 135 contributing consultees.

5.8 A number of the representations received related to issues that were already being addressed through the Local Plan (Part One), such as the scale and distribution of housing, the approach to which was established upon receipt of the Local Plan Inspectors report. The Local Plan (Part Two) is not intended to revisit policy areas established in Part One, but rather to add detailed policy to assist with delivery of the overarching plan strategy set out in Part One

5.9 A summary of the main issues raised along with how they have been taken into account is provided in Appendix B 'Issues consultation and Call for Sites summary'. Detailed consideration has been given to all representations in the course of producing the Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies and any associated Supplementary Planning Documents. Full details of all representations received and the Council's response can be found on the Council's website:

http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/portal/cwc_ldf/cw_lp_part_two/issues/lpptwo

5.10 The information provided on the potential future development sites was fed into the preparation of the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA).

6 Minerals methodology consultation and Call for Sites

6.1 In response to the 'Issues and additional call for sites' consultation which was held from 1 May to 19 June 2014, two minerals site nominations were received. The Council needed to make a more detailed review of the type and number of minerals site allocations required and the type and availability of mineral resources in the borough, and so undertook a further minerals call for sites consultation from 8 October to 21 November 2014.

6.2 A draft site appraisal methodology was consulted upon at the same time as the minerals call for sites consultation. The methodology outlined and sought comments on the staged process of reviewing any submitted sites alongside the proposed exclusionary and discretionary criteria to be used in assessing the submissions.

Consultation process

6.3 Consultation on the minerals call for sites and draft site appraisal methodology ran for six weeks from 8 October 2014 to 21 November 2014.

6.4 45 stakeholders were consulted, including: Natural England; Historic England; Environment Agency; Natural Resources Wales and CADW; landowners; industry representatives and companies; mineral operators; utility providers; Cheshire East Council; British Geological Survey; and internal specialist teams in the Council including highways, public rights of way, landscape, ecology, historic environment and environmental protection.

6.5 Consultees were notified by email/letter and the consultation was hosted on the Council's Local Plan consultation portal which included an online survey form for the call for sites and the draft site appraisal methodology which was available to view either online or downloaded as a PDF document. The consultation invited representations to be made online via the consultation portal, by post or email.

Responses

6.6 A total of 11 comments were received from seven contributing consultees on the minerals call for sites consultation, and nine comments from eight contributing consultees were received on the draft minerals site appraisal methodology.

6.7 Key issues raised in relation to the draft minerals site appraisal related to the Council's policy approach to hydrocarbons; clarification of how sites are assessed against certain criteria and objection to the scoring of certain elements of specific sites; the lack of method of assessment in relation to impact on heritage assets; and the need to consider green infrastructure. In response, the Council amended the methodology accordingly. Additional changes were also made to the appraisal process due to the limited number of suitable sites submitted to the call for sites, including: removal of the 'site scoring and ranking' stage and expansion of the 'detailed site assessment' stage to include consultation with the Council's specialist teams.

6.8 The Council received a total of 13 minerals site nominations in response to the call for sites consultation. Including the two sites received through the Issues consultation and additional call for sites consultation in May 2014, sites received through the call for sites included: four sand and gravel sites; five salt and brine sites; and four oil and gas sites. These sites were carried forward for initial assessment against the site appraisal methodology.

6.9 Consultation on the Initial Assessment Outcomes report was undertaken from 26 February to 11 March 2016 with those who made a submission to the call for sites, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England. These consultees received the Initial Assessment Outcomes report via email and were invited to make any comments on the document or provide further information or evidence to support inclusion of a site. Two comments were received, mainly relating to the scoring of certain criteria at specific sites. These comments were incorporated into the 'Minerals call for sites – Assessment Outcomes report' which is available at:

http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/portal/cwc_ldf/cw_lp_part_two/ev_base/min_cfs_outcomes2016

6.10 The 'Minerals call for sites – Assessment Outcomes report' was subject to another stage of consultation from 22 April to 6 May 2016 with the same bodies plus additional interested individuals and groups who were sent the document by email and invited to make comments. This informed the site allocations and preferred areas included in the Preferred Approach stage of the Local Plan (Part Two). Responses were received from an operator regarding the Rudheath Lodge silica sand site and from Natural England regarding the potential impacts of minerals development on specific sites on protected species, sites and groundwater.

6.11 Between 12 April and 26 April 2017, 11 minerals operators plus other interested parties including the Crown Estate and Minerals Products Association were contacted via email seeking any additional, alternative sites that could be used to provide sand and gravel. This targeted consultation sought to inform and confirm the updating of relevant policies for the Publication Draft of the Local Plan (Part Two). Two operators responded with additional details regarding sites previously put forward through the minerals call for sites. These sites were taken forward and incorporated as allocations within the Local Plan (Part Two). Additional discussions were also undertaken with salt and brine operators regarding existing provision, reserves and future plans, to ensure that the relevant Local Plan (Part Two) policy helps to provide a steady and sustainable supply of salt and brine.

7 Facilities and services consultation

7.1 The Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies – Issues Consultation and Call for Sites included a draft methodology setting out the criteria for the selection of local service centres. Several representations were received relating to the need to involve Parish Councils in the assessment process to identify the local service centres and provide up-to-date local intelligence in respect of the services and facilities in their settlements.

7.2 In response to these representations, an additional, targeted consultation with Parish Councils, Ward Members and the Council's Localities and Regeneration Boards was undertaken over a six week period in October/ November 2014.

7.3 The consultation also included a 'call for sites' for the Parish Councils, Ward Members and the Regeneration Boards to identify potential future development sites that could be considered for allocation.

7.4 The consultation exercise involved sending a map of the local area to each Parish Council, Ward Member and the Council's Regeneration Boards together with a site details form (to identify any potential development sites) and a services and facilities questionnaire (to identify all service and facilities in the Parish).

Consultation

7.5 The consultation ran from 1 October 2014 to 1 November 2014. Letters enclosing all the consultation material were sent to each Parish Council, Ward Member and members of the Localities and Regeneration Boards. A Members Briefing was also issued to all councillors, in October 2014.

Responses

7.6 The responses received to the services and facilities questionnaire were used to prepare the Local Service Centre Background Paper 2015, which was subject to further consultation in March/April 2015.

7.7 The information provided on the potential future development sites was also fed into the preparation of the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA).

8 Local Service Centre background paper consultation

8.1 As a result of feedback from the Issues Consultation and Call for Sites, and the consultation on facilities and services with parish councils; further consultation was undertaken on a draft local service centres methodology and the initial identification of 29 local service centres, to support the preparation of the Local Plan (Part Two). This included consultation on the 'Local Service Centre Background Paper Consultation' (March 2015) document.

Consultation

8.2 Public consultation on ran for longer than the statutory period of six weeks from 9 March 2015 to 24 April 2015. All key stakeholders and those registered on the Council's consultation database were directly notified of the consultation via letter or email. Consultation documents were also issued to all town and parish councils within the borough.

8.3 In total 4,728 individuals, partners and stakeholders were consulted, including: Town and Parish Councils; the Council's Regeneration Boards; Natural England; the Environment Agency; English Heritage; Sport England; Highways England; neighbouring authorities; landowners; developers; utility providers; the HSE; environmental groups; education and healthcare bodies; amenity groups; housebuilders; and voluntary organisations.

8.4 Whilst the consultation officially closed on 24 April 2015, comments were accepted after the deadline. This enabled parish and town councils to participate where meetings were not scheduled during the consultation period.

Notification

8.5 Advanced notice of the consultation was sent to everyone on the Council's consultation database, either as a letter or an email, providing details of the consultation dates for the consultation was sent prior to the commencement of the consultation; and including details of how to access the consultation documents – which were made available on the Council's website and in all of Council's offices and customer service centres as well as the borough's libraries during normal opening hours – and how to make comments.

Website

8.6 The consultation featured on the Council's website, providing links to a dedicated consultation web page provided on the Council's Local Plan consultation portal. The web page included all of the consultation documents which were available to view either online or downloaded as PDF documents.

Local media

8.7 A press release was issued entitled 'Local Service Centres – Consultation – Have Your Say', outlining that the purpose of this consultation was to gather feedback on the proposed methodology and options for identifying local service centres, and featured on the home page of the Council's website

(March 2015). The consultation was also included in the 5 March 2015 Member Briefing, and the Bulletin for Local Councils (Town & Parish) March 2015.

Responses

8.8 The draft document sought, through a series of seven questions, views on the Council's approach to identifying local service centres including the factors, services and facilities that should be considered in defining a local service centre. Three options were presented for the definition of local service centres. A total of 296 responses were received to the consultation from 77 contributing consultees.

8.9 A summary of the main issues raised along with how they have been addressed is provided in Appendix C 'Local Service Centre background paper consultation summary' and a full list of all representations received and the Council's response can be found on the Council's website at: http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/portal/cwc_ldf/cw_lp_part_two/ev_base/lsc_2015

9 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment consultation

9.1 In response to the 'Issues and call for sites' consultation which was held 1 May to 19 June 2014, additional site information was recorded on the Council's databases. The information fed into the Council's Housing and Economic Availability Assessment (HELAA).

Consultation process

9.2 The HELAA is an evidence base document to inform the preparation of the Council's Local Plan and the identification of land allocations, particularly for housing and employment use. This updates the information in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2013 and part of the Employment Land Study Update (2013).

9.3 The preparation of the HELAA has been closely aligned with the process of Local Plan preparation. As an evidence base document there is no formal requirement for consultation on the HELAA, however it is important that the site assessments are robust and a partnership approach towards this study has been adopted. A stakeholder group was established (Housing and Economic Partnership Group) utilising existing networks and groups that worked with the Council to prepare earlier iterations of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the Employment Land Study. The partnership group (see Appendix A of the HELAA report for a detailed list of membership) is a representative cross-section of developers, agents, house-builders, businesses and landowners that provide advice and feedback at key stages in the assessment. A total of 75 organisations/ businesses make up the partnership group with an equal representation of businesses, house builders and planning consultants; developers and landowners.

9.4 The National Planning Practice Guidance sets out the methodology for preparing the HELAA, and the Council's methodology was developed to take account of the Local Plan being prepared in two parts. The Council consulted on a Draft HELAA methodology during August - September 2015. Following this consultation, a range of comments were received in relation to housing delivery assumptions. The Council undertook a further follow on survey in January 2016 to receive further input on the issues raised.

9.5 In addition to engagement with external bodies, the HELAA has been prepared in consultation with other Council service areas who have provided input in relation to specific areas of expertise including heritage, natural environment and transport.

9.6 Other technical evidence base studies that have been prepared by external consultants to inform the Local Plan (Part Two) have also been integral to the site assessment work, for example, the recommendations published in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the borough and the Stanlow Special Policy Area Review (2016).

9.7 The key stages of engagement and feedback on the HELAA, alongside the Local Plan process, have been;

- May 2014 - Local Plan (Part Two) call for sites exercise
- August - September 2015 - Draft HELAA methodology consultation

- December 2015-January 2016 - Housing assumptions workshop / survey
- August 2016 - Site assessments and draft HELAA report, alongside the Local Plan Preferred Approach consultation
- Final HELAA report (February 2017)

9.8 The HELAA (2017) report is available through the following link:
http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/portal/cwc_idf/land/helaa2017

Responses

9.9 The Council has produced a separate report to summarise the consultation undertaken during the preparation of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). This sets out the Council's response to the comments received on the draft HELAA Methodology (September 2015), actions taken and details of the Housing Assumptions Survey (January 2016). It also provides details of the consultation on the draft HELAA (August 2016) alongside the Local Plan (Part Two) Preferred Approach consultation.

9.10 The HELAA consultation statement (2017) can be viewed at:
http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/portal/cwc_idf/land/helaa2017

10 Preferred Approach consultation

10.1 As a result of feedback from the Issues Consultation and Call for Sites, consultation on facilities, services, the Local Service Centres background paper, and an updated supporting evidence base, further consultation was undertaken on a Preferred Approach that took into account responses received from consultation along with changes made to the Local Plan (Part One) through the examination process, which have implications for the scope of policies to be included in the Local Plan (Part Two).

10.2 At its meeting on the 20 July 2016 Cheshire West and Chester Council Cabinet approved the Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies Preferred Approach document for public consultation. The document set out the Council's preferred approach for the Local Plan (Part Two) and included draft policies and allocations. This was not a statutory stage, but was subject to public consultation to give residents and stakeholders the opportunity to comment on the preferred approach, before publication for formal consultation. The consultation was accompanied by a draft policies map which showed the geographical application of the proposed policies and changes to land use allocations, and a range of supporting evidence base documents.

10.3 Policies included alternative options where it had been possible to identify a reasonable alternative approach, or an explanation of why there was no alternative. These alternative options fed into the Sustainability Appraisal process, which was carried out to test the sustainability of the preferred approach. A draft Habitats Regulations Assessment was also prepared to evaluate whether any significant effects of the preferred approach are likely to arise on nearby internationally important wildlife sites.

10.4 This stage included consultation on the following documents:

- Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies – Preferred Approach – written policies
- Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies – Preferred Approach – policies map
- Interim Sustainability Appraisal
- Draft Habitat Regulations Assessment

Consultation process

10.5 Public consultation on the Local Plan (Part Two) Preferred Approach and associated documents ran for six weeks from 12 August 2016 to 23 September 2016. All key stakeholders and those registered on the Council's consultation database were directly notified of the consultation via letter or email. Consultation documents were also issued to all town and parish councils within the borough.

10.6 In total 4,713 individuals, partners and stakeholders were consulted, including: Town and Parish Councils; the Council's Regeneration Boards; Natural England; the Environment Agency; English Heritage; Sport England; Highways England; neighbouring authorities; landowners; developers; utility providers; the HSE; environmental groups; education and healthcare bodies; amenity groups; housebuilders; and voluntary organisations.

10.7 Whilst the consultation officially closed on 23 September 2016, comments were accepted after the deadline. This enabled parish and town councils to participate where meetings were not scheduled during the consultation period.

Notification

10.8 Advanced notice of the Preferred Approach consultation was sent to everyone on the Council's consultation database, either as a letter or an email, providing details of the consultation dates for the consultation was sent prior to the commencement of the consultation; and including details of how to access the consultation documents – which were made available on the Council's website and in all of Council's offices, customer service centres and the borough's libraries during normal opening hours – and how to make comments.

10.9 Officers also attended a meeting of the Cheshire Association of Local Councils (ChALC) on 3 August 2016 to make Local Town and Parish Councils aware of the consultation and provide information on how to make a response.

Website

10.10 The consultation featured on the Council's website, providing links to a dedicated consultation web page provided on the Council's Local Plan consultation portal. The web page included all of the consultation documents which were available to view either online or downloaded as PDF documents.

Local media

10.11 A press release was issued on 8 August 2016 entitled 'Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies'. The press release outlined the purpose of the consultation and the headline proposals for the preferred approach, and featured in the news section of the Place North West website on 8 August 2016; in the latest news section of the Planning Portal website on 11 August 2016; and on the 'your West Cheshire' news section of the Council's website (8 August 2016). The consultation was also included in the 11 August 2016 Member Briefing, which was also sent to local Parish and Town Councils.

Responses

10.12 The consultation document invited comments on 105 different questions, covering 100 policies, grouped into 25 policy areas, as summarised in the appendices. A total of 2,825 responses were received, from 1,266 contributing consultees.

10.13 A number of the representations received related to issues that have already been addressed through the Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies (adopted January 2015), such as the scale and distribution of housing, or the extent of the Green Belt. The Local Plan (Part Two) follows the overall strategy set out in the Part One plan and it is not appropriate or justified to seek changes to the strategy established and agreed in Part One. The Local Plan (Part Two) is there to add the detailed policy and land allocations required to deliver the strategy set out in Part One. In addition, numerous sites were put forward for development or designation, in response to several of the questions and policy areas.

10.14 A summary of the main issues raised along with how they have been addressed is provided in Appendix D 'Preferred Approach consultation summary'. Detailed consideration has been given to all representations in the course of producing the Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed

Policies and any associated Supplementary Planning Documents. A detailed summary of all of the representations received and the Council's response can be found on the Council's website:

<http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/file/4704470>

10.15 Full details of all representations received and the Council's response can be found on the Council's consultation portal:

http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/portal/cwc_ldf/cw_lp_part_two/pref_app?tab=list

11 Publication Draft consultation

11.1 The Local Plan (Part Two) Publication Draft consultation was carried out in accordance with Regulations 19, 20 and 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, which require Local Planning Authorities, before submitting a local plan to the Secretary of State, to make a copy of the proposed submission documents and a statement of representation procedure available in accordance with the Regulations.

11.2 This is a key stage in the development of the Council's Local Plan (Part Two), as the Publication Draft plan is essentially the final version of the Local Plan that the Council intends to submit to the Secretary of State for examination by an independent planning inspector.

11.3 At its meeting on the 29 November 2017 Cheshire West and Chester Council Cabinet approved the Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies Publication Draft Plan for public consultation. The document is the version of the plan that the Council considers would be found sound at examination and then be adopted.

11.4 The purpose of the consultation was to seek views on the legal and procedural compliance of the Local Plan, the soundness of the Local Plan and whether the Local Plan is in conformity with the Duty to Cooperate. The tests of 'soundness' as set nationally are whether the Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

11.5 The consultation was accompanied by a draft policies map which showed the geographical application of the proposed policies and changes to land use allocations, and a range of supporting evidence base documents, including a Sustainability Appraisal, which was carried out to test the sustainability of the Plan, and a Habitats Regulations Assessment which was prepared to evaluate whether any significant effects of the preferred approach are likely to arise on nearby internationally important wildlife sites.

11.6 This stage included consultation on the following documents:

- Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies – Publication Draft– written policies
- Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies – Publication Draft– policies map
- Sustainability Appraisal
- Habitat Regulations Assessment
- Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies Statement of Consultation
- Local Plan (Part Two) Publication Draft Statement of Representations Procedure

Consultation process

11.7 Public consultation on the Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies – Publication Draft Plan and associated documents ran for seven weeks from 11 December 2017 to 29 January 2018. All key stakeholders and those registered on the Council's consultation database were directly notified of the consultation via letter or email.

11.8 In total 6,377 individuals, partners and stakeholders were consulted, including: Town and Parish Councils; the Council's Regeneration Boards; Natural England; the Environment Agency; English Heritage; Sport England; Highways England; neighbouring authorities; landowners; developers; utility providers; the HSE; environmental groups; education and healthcare bodies; amenity groups; housebuilders; and voluntary organisations.

Notification

11.9 Notice of the Publication Draft consultation was sent to everyone on the Council's consultation database, either as a letter or an email, providing details of the consultation dates for the consultation, how to access the consultation documents – which were made available on the Council's website and in all of Council's offices, customer service centres and the borough's libraries during normal opening hours – and how to make comments.

11.10 Advance notice of the consultation was sent to local Parish and Town councils to enable them to participate where meetings were not scheduled during the consultation period.

Website

11.11 The consultation featured on the Council's website, providing links to a dedicated consultation web page provided on the Council's Local Plan consultation portal. The web page included all of the consultation documents which were available to view either online or downloaded as PDF documents.

Local media

11.12 A press release was issued on 8 December 2017 entitled 'Local Plan (Part Two) Consultation'. The press release outlined the purpose of the consultation and the headline policies contained in the plan; and was featured in the 'your West Cheshire' news section of the Council's website (8 December 2017), as well as appearing on the Chester Archaeological Society's Twitter feed. The consultation was included in the 7 December 2017 Member Briefing, which was also sent to local Parish and Town Councils.

Responses

11.13 The consultation document invited comments on 95 different policies and monitoring framework, grouped into 20 sections. Pursuant to Regulation 20, a total of 906 responses were received, from 218 contributing consultees.

11.14 A summary of the main issues raised is set out in Appendix E 'Publication Draft consultation summary'. Full details of all representations received can be found on the Council's consultation portal: http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/portal/cwc_ldf/cw_lp_part_two/lp_pd/pd

A Specific and general consultation bodies

A.1 The following list of consultees is based on the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

A.2 Under Regulation 2 of the 2012 Regulations, the requirement to consult the public includes specific and general bodies, as well as consulting those residents and/or businesses the Council considers appropriate.

Specific consultation bodies

- Coal Authority
- Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Marine Management Organisation
- Natural England
- Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
- Highways England
- Adjoining Local Planning Authorities
- Mobile Operators Association
- Mobile Phone Operators with apparatus situated in any part of the borough
- Health bodies (West Cheshire CCG, Vale Royal CCG, NHS England)
- Electricity licence holders
- Gas license holders
- Sewerage undertakers
- Water undertakers
- Homes and Communities Agency

General Consultation Bodies

- Voluntary bodies where some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the Local Planning Authority area
- Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the Local Planning Authority area
- Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the Local Planning Authority area
- Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the Local Planning Authority area
- Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the Local Planning Authority area

Duty to co-operate bodies

- Environment Agency
- Historic England

- Natural England
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Health bodies (West Cheshire CCG, Vale Royal CCG, NHS England)
- Office of Rail Regulation
- Integrated Transport Authority
- Highways England
- Marine Management Organisation
- Local Enterprise Partnership
- Local Nature Partnership

Other Consultees

A.3 Where appropriate the council will also consult a range of additional organisations in the preparation of local development documents. Examples of the types of organisations include:

- Controllers of waterways and navigation authorities
- Airport Operators
- Minerals and waste operators and trade associations
- Landowners
- Fire Authority
- House builders and developers

A.4 This list is not exhaustive, and consultees will be updated as successor bodies and reorganisations occur.

Scoping of the Sustainability Appraisal

A.5 There are three statutory bodies that must be consulted on the scope of the sustainability appraisal, in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plan and Programmes Regulation 2004. These bodies are:

- Historic England
- Natural England
- Environment Agency

A.6 Cheshire West and Chester authority is bordered by Wales to the west and therefore, Natural Resources Wales and Cadw must also be consulted as the statutory consultees for Strategic Environmental Assessment.

B Issues consultation and Call for Sites summary

Table B.1 Summary of main issues raised and how they were addressed in response to the Issues Consultation and Call for Sites (Regulation 18)

Form and Content 38 comments were received on the proposed form and content of the plan.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
General agreement with the broad form and content of plan proposed and a need for maps to define police areas.	The form and content of the Local Plan (Part Two) has been developed to follow the broad form of the Issues consultation document and the Local Plan (Part One). It is supported by a comprehensive policies map that shows the geographical application of the policies.
Concern about progressing Part Two before adoption of Part One.	Local Plan (Part One) was adopted in January 2015. The Local Plan (Part Two) has been developed in line with the strategic policies set out in the Local Plan (Part One).
Policies to be developed with site specific information.	A call for sites was undertaken alongside the Issues consultation (2014). Additional information on sites was considered alongside the Preferred Approach consultation. The Council has produced a Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (2017) and Land Allocations Background Paper together with other evidence reports. Where appropriate policies have been developed taking account of site specific information.
Requests from parish councils to be notified of sites being considered in their areas.	Parish Councils have been notified (in line with the Council's adopted SCI) at each stage of consultation on the Local Plan (Part Two) including on the Draft HELAA and Draft Land Allocations Background Paper alongside the Local Plan (Part Two) Preferred Approach consultation.

Call for a policy to demonstrate appropriate contingency measures (e.g. release of reserve sites) if plan fails to deliver.	Evidence submitted through the Local Plan (Part One) examination demonstrates that land will be available to meet housing requirements. The Council through the Housing Land Monitor and other evidence base documents including the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment will ensure the supply position is kept up to date.
Reference to information sources to be used e.g. from Health and Safety Executive, CWAC Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy.	The Local Plan (Part Two) references the supporting documents and evidence base used in the development and application of the policies.
Spatial Strategy Policy Areas A total of 467 responses were received in respect of the proposed spatial policy areas.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
Concern about deliverability of brown field sites and alternatively support for the use of brown field sites ahead of green field.	All of the proposed land allocations have been assessed against specific criteria (as set out in the Land Allocations Background Paper) in order to determine whether a site is both suitable and deliverable. The Plan has also been subject to a viability appraisal which has not identified any significant deliverability issues. The plan does not include a sequential test in relation to the use of brownfield land first; however policies throughout the Local Plan (Part Two) promote the sustainable use of brownfield land i.e. in sustainable locations in line with the NPPF and the Local Plan (Part One). Local Plan (Part Two) policy DM 1 sets out the locational strategy for new development, specifically promoting and supporting the uses of previously developed land.
Definition of sustainable development needed.	The Local Plan and specifically Local Plan (Part One) policy STRAT 1 has been developed in line with and reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. The policy seeks to enable development where proposals are in line with relevant policies within the Plan, incorporating elements of, and building upon, the model wording provided by The Planning Inspectorate (PINS). The policy sets out principles that reflect local

	circumstances which include supporting mixed-use developments, prioritising the reuse of brownfield land and minimising the loss of greenfield and high grade agricultural land. As this is a framework policy it is not considered that further detailed policies are required within the Local Plan (Part Two) or that further definition of Sustainable development is required.
Greater reference needed to health and wellbeing.	Health and wellbeing is a core theme that runs through the Local Plan (Part One) and the Local Plan (Part Two) has a dedicated chapter. The health and wellbeing chapter considers how development can impact on health and wellbeing of residents, including how the built environment can contribute to health to how air quality, noise, land instability and contamination should be considered. Policies also consider hazardous installations and appropriate locations for such a use along with the appropriate development in a hazard zone to ensure the best use of available land.
For Chester comments referred to: • Increasing the housing number. • Protecting the Green Belt and objections to Wrexham Road allocation. • Reinforcing the regional role of Chester. • The need for arts provision and protection of the city centre.	These issues (including the housing requirement and the Green Belt, which are strategic issues) were addressed through the preparation of Local Plan (Part One). Arts and culture are now referenced in Local Plan (Part Two) policy DM 39.
For Ellesmere Port comments included: • Need for a district wide review of Green Belt including safeguarded sites. • Support for increased housing numbers at Ledsham Road and objections to Ledsham Road allocation. • Need for a review of employment land • Policy requirement for ongoing and expanded port facilities.	The issues on Green Belt review and housing numbers were addressed through the preparation of Local Plan (Part One). The Local Plan (Part Two) allocates employment land for a range of types and sizes of site, borough wide, for future employment use. Site representations have been considered through the preparation of the Draft HELAA (2016) and Draft Land Allocations Background Paper (2016) alongside the Local Plan (Part Two) Preferred Approach consultation. This

• Recognition of Mersey Estuary international conservation designations. • Town Centre concerns –including business rates, traffic management, lack of parking and cost deterring shoppers, sport and recreation needs. • Support for specific policy approach to Thornton Research Centre and links to Ince Park and development of a leading University Science campus.	information was reviewed and updated, taking account of representations, further evidence reports and additional information, through the HELAA (2017) and Land Allocations Background Paper (2017). The Local Plan (Part One) policy supports opportunities for freight transport, where feasible, on sites alongside the Manchester Ship Canal. Ellesmere Port is identified as a town centre in the Local Plan (Part One). The Local Plan (Part Two) promotes main town centre uses in the town centre, defining a primary shopping area and town centre boundary for Ellesmere Port. Main town centre uses will be directed to the town centres, allowing for flexibility whilst protecting the retail core. Parking is considered in policy T 5 and the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document. The support for a policy on Thornton Research is noted in principle and has been included in the Local Plan (Part Two).
For Northwich the following issues were raised: • Support for the definition of a settlement boundary. • Need to consider the release of green field sites, objection to the release of green field sites and a number of site specific policy requirements. • Need for a reference to environmental context of development site in Wincham. • Information on proposed development in Knutsford.	A settlement boundary has been drawn for the Northwich settlement area. The housing requirement for Northwich has been assessed through the Housing and Employment Land Allocations – Background Paper as the Plan and the identification of the land allocations has progressed. The requirement in Northwich will be met and exceeded through the delivery of developable extant planning permissions; the strategic site at Wincham Urban Village; additional developable land allocations set out in the Local Plan (Part Two); and supply brought forward on sites identified on the Brownfield Register. The Wincham site has been assessed through the Housing and Employment Land Allocations – Background Paper. The paper recognises that development of this site will be subject

	to additional sufficient site specific assessments and mitigation measures to be provided as part of a comprehensive masterplan for the site through the planning application process. The supporting policy for Wincham in the Local Plan (Part Two) has been developed to include a number of environmental considerations including ensuring the design is sensitive to different land uses in the area and open space is managed and enhanced. Knutsford is located outside of Cheshire West and Chester.
For Winsford respondents highlighted: • No need for more social housing. • The need for community facilities. • Support for town centre improvement. • Concern about over-reliance on station quarter allocation – need for more allocations and higher housing requirement.	Policies in the local plan reflect the Winsford neighbourhood plan which has a strong emphasis on supporting town centre regeneration. As part of the work on implementing the neighbourhood plan, further detailed work has been undertaken on proposals to regenerate the town centre which would include provision of retail, leisure, residential and community facilities. The Local Plan policy supports and reflects this work. The neighbourhood plan allocates sufficient land for housing to meet the requirement for Winsford in policy STRAT 6 (including the Station Quarter) and so it is not necessary to allocate additional land in the local plan. The requirement for social housing in Winsford, as for the rest of the borough, is set out in policy SOC 1. This policy is based on evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment which identifies affordable housing need across the borough.
For the rural areas comments included: • Too much / too little development proposed. • Need to define local service centres – consult with parish councils and resident.	The need to identify local service centres and the policies relating to the rural area in the Local Plan (Part Two) stems from the requirement to implement the strategy of the Local Plan (Part One), which is based on focusing most new development in and adjacent to the four urban areas and

• Identification of settlement boundary lines not necessary – shouldn't prevent development in the countryside. • Need to allocate sites in local service centres - rural development should not be devolved to Neighbourhood Plans. • Rural areas should be consulted in depth on mineral extractions and alternative energy. • Need to consider rural infrastructure and transport • Employment in rural areas should meet local need only.	steering development in the rural area primarily to key service centres which represent the most sustainable locations in the rural area. The Council has consulted on the proposed methodology for the selection of the local service centres since 2014 which has included a discrete consultation with Parish Councils to establish the level of services and facilities in settlements. In response to concerns over the level of development in Local Service Centres it is recognised that these settlements have very limited locational sustainability. The approach in the Local Plan (Part One) is that the Council does not require new housing in these settlements to meet the borough's housing requirements. Indeed, should significant levels of new housing development come forward in these centres this would undermine the strategy of the Plan to focus development in Chester, Ellesmere Port, Northwich and Winsford, and a lower level of development in the ten rural key service centres. Proposals for new housing development outside but adjacent to Local Service Centre settlement boundaries as identified on the Policies Map will be permitted where it is for rural exception housing or a community land trust development where supported by the Parish Council, where it is brought forward through a Neighbourhood Development Order or a Community Right to Build Order or it is allocated in a made Neighbourhood Development Plan. Communities living in all areas have been consulted on the development of the Local Plan (Part Two) in line with the Council's adopted SCI. The Local Plan (Part Two) identifies employment land allocations in the rural area, to meet the strategic development requirements of the Local Plan (Part One). These sites are allocated to provide for at least 10ha employment land, to allow the small scale expansion of existing employment sites, and new sites within or on the edge of key service centres outside the green belt. Through Neighbourhood Plans, local communities can also include policies to support economic
---	---

	development in their area and consultation will take place with local residents through the neighbourhood plan process.
Specific Green Belt comments were divided between calls for and against Green Belt Review, releasing sites for Gypsy and Travellers and a specific policy on renewable energy within the Green Belt.	Local Plan (Part One) was adopted in January 2015 and established the extent of the North Cheshire Green Belt boundaries. The Council commissioned consultants WYG to look at potential gypsy and traveller site options, in accordance with the strategic approach set out in Policy SOC 4 of Local Plan (Part One). The findings were reported to Local Plan Working Group 24 July 2017 and all responses regarding sites for Gypsy and Travellers have been recorded and will be considered in the course of producing a separate Development Plan Document for Gypsies and Travellers. Policy ENV 7 in the Local Plan (Part One) is supportive of renewable energy, and additional policies have been added to the Local Plan (Part Two) in relation to wind and solar energy. Where renewable energy schemes are proposed in the green belt, proposals will be considered in accordance with national planning guidance as well as local and neighbourhood plan policies. Where proposals constitute inappropriate development in the green belt they would need to demonstrate very special circumstances if they are to be acceptable. These would be considered on a case by case basis. It is not considered necessary to include a specific policy on renewable energy schemes in the green belt in the local plan.
Other Spatial Strategy comments related to: • Transport – including potholes, park and ride, access to rural services, cycle and pedestrian facilities, the need to establish maximum capacity of Grosvenor Bridge and clarity on a new Dee crossing, support for	The Local Plan (Part Two) includes transport policy for a new park and ride site, and pedestrian and cycle access to new developments, which builds on Local Plan (Part One) policy STRAT 10 – ‘Transport and accessibility’.

waterway corridors and proposals for the Manchester Ship Canal. Support for a policy relating to sustainable travel (such as the PROW network and cycleways) that sets out where improvements are planned, cross-referencing to the ROWIP. • Infrastructure – support and objection to any proposed introduction of CIL, the need for a detailed plan of required infrastructure, the need for a SPD on developer contributions, greater reference to Green Infrastructure and requirements for sport and recreation to be addressed.	The Local Plan (Part One) policy supports opportunities for freight transport, where feasible, on sites alongside the Manchester Ship Canal. The Local Plan (Part Two) includes a policy on waterways and mooring facilities. A further policy has been included in the Local Plan (Part Two) which seeks to protect and enhance recreational routeways, including the Public Rights of Way network, footpaths and cycle routes, and sets out that investment in the network of recreational routeways should be informed by the latest evidence base, including the Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan. The requirements for sport and recreation have been set out in the Local Plan Part Two, informed by the updated Open Space Study, Playing Pitch Strategy and emerging Sports Facilities Strategy. The Local Plan Part Two contains further guidance relating to green infrastructure, including through identification of the borough's ecological network and more detailed policies relating to trees, woodland and hedgerows, open space and waterways. Consideration of green Infrastructure is also included in detailed policies relating to some specific site allocations to ensure that green infrastructure is incorporated and planned into development. Infrastructure – Support for introduction of CIL noted. Comments on the introduction of CIL on grounds of the need to ensure that CIL does not make development unviable taken into account as an Economic Viability Study was prepared to inform preparation of the CIL charging schedule. The need for infrastructure to support delivery of development set out in the Local Plan (Part One) was assessed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Additional work on infrastructure requirements has also been undertaken as part of the work on the Community Infrastructure Levy. A SPD on developer contributions will be prepared to provide additional information
---	---

	and guidance to support the relevant Local Plan (Part One and Part Two) policies.
Economic Policy Areas 89 responses were received in respect of economic growth, employment and enterprise, town centres and the visitor economy.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The need for the Plan to support sustainable economic growth, including consideration of opportunities for rural infrastructure and employment, the need to address the Manchester Ship Canal and its potential for sustainable economic growth within the port and logistics sectors, a proposed policy approach to existing Chester University sites, the provision of convenience retail uses within employment areas, links between town centres, housing, regeneration and employment areas and the need to prioritise providing employment and opportunity to those furthest from the labour market.	The Local Plan (Part Two) includes policies to support sustainable economic growth, rural infrastructure and employment, the University of Chester site at Thornton Science Park, retail, housing, regeneration and employment policies. The Local Plan (Part One) policy supports opportunities for freight transport, where feasible, on sites alongside the Manchester Ship Canal. The Council notes the importance of good links between the town centre and areas of housing growth, regeneration and the waterfront in Ellesmere Port. The Council recognises there are sites alongside the Manchester Ship canal and has reviewed the policy framework affecting these sites in the Local Plan (Part Two). The Council notes the extant planning permissions for port related activity, including Port Bridgewater. The Council has considered the need for site specific policies and in relation to port related activity alongside the transport policies in the Local Plan (Part Two).
The need for the Plan to support town centres by considering the evening economy, adequate free/cheap parking, not being over prescriptive in terms of floorspace thresholds for retail impact assessments, defining primary	The Local Plan (Part Two) actively promotes the evening economy, including cultural, civic and family activities to create strong and diverse town centres that are inclusive, accommodating all ages. The Local Plan (Part One) considers

shopping areas, considering new sports facilities within town centres, and input from the Member’s working group tasked to look at the future of Town and City Centres. Specific comments were raised in respect of future policies relating to Winsford Town Centre, Chester Greyhound Retail Park and Barons Quay.	out of centre retail development, including use of the sequential test and locally set thresholds for an impact assessment. The Local Plan (Part Two) establishes primary shopping frontages for Chester and Northwich, due to the position in the retail hierarchy. All town centres have a primary shopping area and town centre boundary based on the recommendations in the Cheshire Retail Study 2016. The Local Plan (Part One) promotes the town centre first approach, with main town centre uses directed to the town centre. Members have been involved in developing retail policies, with the findings of the Cheshire Retail Study 2016 reported to Local Plan Working Group on 25 January 2016 and further development of the policies considered on 27 February 2017.
Other areas suggested for inclusion in the plan included: • Need to progress high speed broadband for home based businesses. • Inclusion of al fresco dining policy. • Recognition of tourism opportunities in Ellesmere Port. • Consider sporting events to attract visitors to area.	The Local Plan (Part Two) includes a policy relating to the provision of high speed broadband. The Local Plan (Part Two) supports alfresco dining in the town centre, provided there is no harm to the centre or the safety of road users. Outdoor seating in local retail centres will also need to consider the impact on residential amenity. The Council notes the importance of the visitor economy and specific tourism attractions in Ellesmere Port. The Local Plan (Part Two) includes a policy on the historic canal port, to support tourism at the National Waterways Museum. The Local Plan (Part Two) has considered the links with sporting events that attract visitors to the area and a specific policy is included for Oulton Park racecourse.
Social Policy Areas 20 responses were received in respect of social policy areas.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed

The proposed approach to Affordable Housing, with mixed comments that the policy must be flexible, realistic in terms of viability and that the rural threshold is too onerous and should be increased to 5 or more dwellings, with others commenting that policy compliance must be enforced.	Local Plan (Part One) policy SOC 1 sets out the thresholds for requiring affordable housing which is required to meet the need in the borough. Local Plan (Part Two) policy DM 23 supplements this policy and sets out the way in which affordable housing should be provided through the delivery of market led housing developments. The explanatory text to Local Plan (Part Two) policy sets out the reason for the approach to affordable housing delivery, and for the thresholds that were adopted in the Local Plan (Part One). The percentage requirement is flexible and is influenced by local circumstance and viability.
Addressing the housing needs of the elderly, downsizing and greater provision of bungalows.	The housing policies have been reconsidered and amended to reflect the wide range of housing needs in the borough and to ensure that the house types and sizes reflect, where possible, the needs of the demographic. Local Plan (Part Two) policy DM 26 encourages the delivery of a mix of accommodation to ensure that a wide range of homes are provided, this includes accessible and adaptable dwellings, specialist care accommodation, and adaptable homes.
Addressing the need for student accommodation and other types of defined housing requirements.	Local Plan (Part One) policy SOC 3 sets out the Council's approach to housing. Local Plan (Part Two) policy DM 27 has been amended in response to consultation to include the requirement for "a demonstrated quantitative and qualitative need." Local Plan (Part Two) policy DM 26 encourages the delivery of a mix of accommodation to ensure that a wide range of homes are provided, this includes accessible and adaptable dwellings, specialist care accommodation, and adaptable homes.
Community right to build not being a Green Belt exception.	The Local Plan is in line with the NPPF in relation to the Green Belt and Community Right to Build. i Paragraph 90 of the NPPF sets out the types of development that are not considered to be inappropriate in the Green Belt which includes "development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order".

Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpersons sites to be suitable for residential use, and tight parameters set to ensure sites are run well, maintained and made acceptable to local communities.	The Council commissioned consultants WYG to look at potential site options, in accordance with the strategic approach set out in Policy SOC 4 of Local Plan (Part One). The findings were reported to Local Plan Working Group 24 July 2017 and all responses regarding sites for Gypsy and Travellers have been recorded and will be considered in the course of producing a separate Development Plan Document for Gypsies and Travellers.
General support for SPD on air quality, noise and contaminated land with recommendations that is also include: light pollution, odour, access to and provision of new health facilities, wider social and cultural well-being.	The Local Plan (Part Two) contains a suite of comprehensive development management policies that deal with these topic areas relating to environmental protection, design and amenity issues. The policies have been worded so that future guidance in the form of Supplementary Planning Documents could be provided if necessary. Note that the Council is in the process of preparing a borough-wide Low Emissions Strategy to deal with issues of poor air quality.
The need to update Open Space Audit, Playing Pitch Strategy and to include indoor facilities with a possible SPD, a more proactive approach to green space with equal access to reduce health inequalities and funding to be allocated to bodies who manage areas such as Parish Councils, charitable trusts etc.	The Council has produced an updated Playing Pitch Strategy and Open Space Study and a Sports Facilities Strategy in preparation. This up to date evidence base has informed detailed policies in the Local Plan Part Two which set out the requirements for open space, sport and recreation facilities with new developments. The approach to determining open space requirements with new development includes assessment of access to existing provision, as informed by the updated Open Space Study. Such policies in Local Plan Part Two provide more detail to Local Plan (Part One) policy SOC 6 which applies equally to all facilities and provision, regardless of management structure. The Council may prepare an SPD on developer contributions which provides additional information and guidance to support these policies.
Environmental Policy Areas 283 responses were received in respect environmental policy areas.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed

Flood risk and Water management, with support for further sustainable urban drainage guidance, the need for hydrological surveys on land know to be impermeable clay, full surveys of all drains and sewers and a comprehensive plan established by Welsh Water for the Chester area, reference to Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, scenarios for breach conditions on river flooding, avoiding development on flood plains, policy suggestions around Surface Water, water efficiency and groundwater protection, calls for the Council to contribute to long term solutions around drainage systems as Environment Agency withdraw from maintenance of some drainage systems across the region leaving them to farmers and greater links to Green Infrastructure but not as a substitute for mitigation of habitat.	The Council is developing a SuDs Design and Technical Guidance document which should be used alongside the SuDs policy of the Local Plan (Part Two). The policies of the Plan have been developed in liaison with the relevant utility companies. The Local Flood Risk Management Strategy has been referenced in the policies of the Local Plan (Part Two) relating to flood risk. The SuDs policy also recognises that the implementation of SuDs provides opportunities to enhance biodiversity. The policies of the Plan and the land allocations have been developed alongside an update to the SFRA which has assessed the risk of flooding for each site (fluvial, surface and groundwater) and against the development vulnerability of the uses proposed at each site. The SFRA acknowledges the reduced management of Frodsham marshes. The SFRA recommends that development should not take place in this area due to the level of risk from a number of sources, the reduction in flood risk management actions and the natural tendency of the area to flood.
With regards to the identification of key gaps there was objection to this on the basis that they are not Green Belt so why offer them such protection, but others mentioned specific locations to consider, gaps within villages as well as between them, careful consultation with local communities, key gaps to be fully and appropriately justified.	The principle of identifying key settlement gaps is established in the Local Plan Part One. The evidence base for Local Plan Part Two contains a Local Landscape Policy Review which has reconfirmed that a network of areas on the edge of existing towns and villages help to define those settlements' separation and thus influence their character, individuality and distinctiveness. Based on the objective assessment in this evidence document, key settlement gaps have been identified where there is a threat of erosion to the valued separation and settlement identity roles provided by these areas, as a consequence of growth over the plan period.
In terms of Green Infrastructure there was support for a policy on waterways and for Hillforts and Sandstone Trail initiatives to be included, for reference to the multifunctional	The Local Plan Part Two contains further guidance relating to green infrastructure, including through identification of the borough's ecological network and more detailed policies

use of GI and for detailed policies on conserving, enhancing and managing existing trees and enforcement of TPOs.	relating to trees, woodland and hedgerows, open space and waterways. Consideration of green infrastructure is also included in detailed policies relating to some specific site allocations to ensure that green infrastructure is incorporated and planned into development. The Sandstone Trail has been identified as a strategic recreational routeway in the Local Plan Part Two which seeks to protect and where possible enhance its public access and recreational value.
Other comments referred to the need to positively identify new sites of Biodiversity and Geodiversity value, nature improvement areas and SBI's, the protection of marl pits, the need to support Local Wildlife Sites Survey and requirements of biodiversity surveys, dealing with biodiversity on application sites, liaison on Cross-authority linkages and a policy suggestion for European sites.	Local Plan Part Two contains a detailed policy relating to the consideration of biodiversity/geodiversity with development proposals and sets out information required alongside planning applications. As part of the evidence base for Part Two, an Ecological Network for CWAC has been produced which uses data collated and analysed by the Mersey Forest Team and incorporates views of Local Nature Partnership members. The Local Plan Part Two recognises that Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS) are subject to rolling reviews, and a note has been included with the policies mapping to state that the GIS data used is to correct as at the date produced. SBIs have been superseded by Local Wildlife Sites and Nature Improvement Areas are picked up by the ecological network which is mapped through the Local Plan Part Two. Natural England are trialling a strategic approach to Great Crested Newts; CWAC are engaging with Natural England on this matter and the Council's approach may be reviewed according with the resulting of the preliminary work.
Historic Environment comments related to policies for Chester and other areas of potential/importance, support for the idea of a Local List, calls for VDS to be given more weight, policies to reflect the importance of conservation areas and the need for a proper evaluation of the historic environment and sound evidence base.	The Local Plan (Part Two) recognises the importance of the historic environment and the unique nature and importance of Chester. Specific policies have been included to address the historic environment in Chester including Chester Conservation Areas and key views, landmark buildings and gateways. The Plan also includes a policy relating to non-designated assets which includes locally listed buildings. This policy recognises the importance of neighbourhood plans

	and village design statements in identifying local heritage assets and that the communities who prepare these documents are best placed to understand the local features of heritage value and the special character which makes their village or town distinctive. The evidence base for the historic environment includes the Council's Historic Environment Record and the Chester City Centre and Approaches Characterisation Study (2012). The Key Views diagram from the Chester Local Plan has also been updated and the Council is also preparing a Rows Conservation Area Management Plan.
Comments on design and sustainable construction were generally supportive of an SPD for Local Standards including distance between buildings standards, reference to BREEAM, Eco and Lifetime homes or better standards and new models to enable elderly people to stay independent in their own homes for as long as possible. Some questioned the enforceability of such standards and objections were made to any policies or SPD which seek to impose design standards relating to sustainable construction on developers which is unnecessary as done through building regulations.	Local Plan (Part Two) includes development management policies sustainable construction, which includes a requirement for new non-residential buildings to meet BREEAM standards, and design, which includes separation distances between buildings. National guidance now only allows Councils to seek building performance above current building regulations, in line with nationally prescribed housing standards; and as such, the Part Two plan includes requirements for better water efficiency and adaptability for disabled people, in new dwellings. Text within the relevant policies provided an indication of where the Council may prepare additional guidance in the form of SPDs, to inform the implementation of the policies, going forward.
Comments on Alternative Energy Supplies, included objections to Coal Bed Methane and Shale Gas Extraction as not alternative energy supplies but conventional hydrocarbon fuels, with all the issues associated with them including CO2 emissions, roads, landscape, environment, noise, light, human health which contribute to climate change, and require full public consultation. There was also support for the recognition of Coal Bed methane as a potential source of energy generation within the area and a comment that there needs to be a clear position in relation to Shale Gas and Coal Bed methane extraction. There was	Oil and gas extraction is now covered in the Minerals section of the Local Plan (Part Two). There is no policy basis for a presumption against coalbed methane or shale gas exploration and extraction. Local Planning Authorities are required to plan positively and to provide a criteria-based approach for hydrocarbon extraction. The potential issues relating to oil and gas extraction are either covered by specific criteria within the policy relating to proposals for exploration, appraisal or production of hydrocarbons or within specific policies within the plan relating to that issue (e.g. transport, noise or flood risk). The policy applies to conventional and unconventional

also reference to the need to acknowledge the national/international importance of Urenco's Capenhurst complex for uranium enrichment and contribution to low carbon energy production, protective polices needed for windfarms and the need more emphasis on renewable energy.	sources of oil and gas and explains the meaning of fracking and coal bed methane extraction. An SPD relating to Oil and Gas Exploration, Production and Distribution has been prepared and was adopted in May 2017. This provides additional guidance and information relating to oil and gas developments. Urenco is a large scale commercial site located within the Green Belt as defined under the Local Plan (Part One). The Local Plan (Part Two) includes a policy for the Urenco site to ensure that the development plan reflects current and future activities proposed within the site to 2030 in the context of Green Belt policy. Proposals for low carbon and renewable energy are supported in Local Plan (Part One) policy ENV 7. Policies have been included in the Local Plan (Part Two) providing detail on how proposals for wind and solar energy will be assessed, to ensure that their benefits can be realised without causing significant harm to the landscape.
Comments were also received on the need to retain household waste recycling centres and to stop or 'curtail landfill with appropriate mitigation polices. There was also reference to the need to recognise rock salt as strategic national resource for planning purposes and to refer to industrial silica sand, with further detail on waste and minerals needed in Part Two.	There are no proposals at the current time to close any of the household waste recycling centres. The plan recognises that two of the sites, at Frodsham and Tattenhall, do not meet best practice standards. A criteria based policy has been included to assess any future applications for replacement sites for these facilities. Policies in the plan reflect the waste hierarchy, which seeks to dispose of waste to landfill as a last resort and instead promote re-use, recycling and recovery. The Local Plan (Part Two) includes policies relating to the safeguarding of mineral resources, including sand and gravel and salt and brine. It also includes a policy relating to industrial sand proposals, which allocates a site for silica sand extraction.

Other Policy Areas 10 responses were received on other policy areas that respondents felt should be included in the Plan.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
Comments on policy areas that respondents felt should be included in the Plan, including: Green Infrastructure, biodiversity and ecological restoration, telecommunications, aerodrome safeguarding, reserve sites or safeguarded land, viability appraisals.	The Local Plan Part Two contains further guidance relating to green infrastructure, including through identification of the borough's ecological network and more detailed policies relating to trees, woodland and hedgerows, open space and waterways. Consideration of green infrastructure is also included in detailed policies relating to some specific site allocations to ensure that green infrastructure is incorporated and planned into development. The Local Plan Part Two contains a detailed policy relating to the consideration of biodiversity/geodiversity with development proposals and sets out information required alongside planning applications. It also identifies an ecological network for the borough (which includes restoration areas) and steers development considerations according with the components of the ecological network. The Local Plan (Part Two) includes a policy relating to ICT and telecommunications; and the Local Plan (Part Two) considers aerodrome safety in policy DM 11 and the policies map. Further discussions on development of the policy have been undertaken with relevant Aerodrome Operators. Evidence submitted through the Local Plan (Part One) examination demonstrates that land will be available to meet housing requirements. The Council through the Housing Land Monitor and other evidence base documents including the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment will ensure the supply position is kept up to date. The Local Plan (Part Two) is also supported by a viability assessment.
Audit of retained Policies	

8 responses were received in relation to the audit of retained policies.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
Comments were received highlighting the need to retain/ include a number of policy areas within the Plan, including: Village Design Statements, Biodiversity and Wildlife, Jodrell Bank Observatory, Weaver Valley Regional Park, Frodsham Town Design Statement and Student Accommodation.	The Local Plan Part Two contains a detailed policy relating to the consideration of biodiversity/geodiversity with development proposals and sets out information required alongside planning applications. It also identifies an ecological network for the borough (which includes restoration areas) and steers development considerations according with the priorities of each component of the ecological network. The Local Plan (Part Two) also includes a policy that restricts development that would impair the efficiency of the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope, within an area identified on the policies map; and policies relating to the development of student accommodation. Village Design Statements (including Frodsham Town) remain as material considerations in the determination of planning applications, although some are being superseded, or incorporated into Neighbourhood Development Plans, for those areas. The Council adopted a Supplementary Planning Document: Houses in Multiple Occupation and Student Accommodation in April 2016, which provides further guidance in line with Local Plan (Part One) policy SOC 3 and is cross referenced in the Local Plan (Part Two) policy DM 27.
Neighbourhood Development Plans Respondents were asked to identify any areas where NDPs may overlap with plans and policies from the emerging Local Plan.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
14 responses were received highlighting the potential for overlapping which will need to be considered in the course of producing the Local Plan Part Two.	During the course of preparing the Local Plan (Part Two), there has been significant work by neighbourhood plan groups with the result that we now have 14 made plans and many more at various stages of preparation. The aim, in preparing the Local Plan (Part Two) and when providing support to communities in drawing up their own plans, has been to ensure

	that plans are complementary as far as possible, and to avoid potential policy conflicts. For example, where neighbourhood plans have designated Local Green Spaces in their plans, these sites are not duplicated in the Local Plan. A number of policies in the Local Plan (Part Two) make reference to neighbourhood plan policies, emphasising the need to take those policies into full account in decision making and drawing up proposals.
Call for Sites A total of 190 responses were received to the Call for Sites from 107 respondents.	
Summary of main issues raised The majority of the sites put forward are already included on the Councils database of sites relating to either the Employment land Study or Strategic Housing land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), but a total of 82 additional new sites have been submitted with a variety of proposed uses. These include primarily residential or mixed uses, with a small number of sites proposed for retail, employment or mineral uses and other purposes. Two minerals site nominations were received, including Newplatt Rudheath Lodge for silica sand extraction and sites at Winsford Rock Salt Mine and the surrounding areas for the mining of rock salt.	How main issues were addressed All site representations have been added to the Councils existing databases. Where appropriate sites have been appraised in the preparation of the Local Plan (Part Two). Site representations for housing and employment have been considered through the preparation of the Draft HELAA (2016) and Draft Land Allocations Background Paper (2016) alongside the Local Plan (Part Two) Preferred Approach consultation. This information was reviewed and updated, taking account of representations, further evidence reports and additional information, through the HELAA (2017) and Land Allocations Background Paper (2017). The Council has produced a separate report to summarise the consultation undertaken during the preparation of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). This includes consultation on the draft methodology (September 2015), housing delivery assumptions (December 2015-January 2016) and site specific comments received through the preferred approach consultation. The HELAA consultation statement can be viewed at: http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/portal/owc_ldf/land/helaa2017

	The Council undertook a further minerals call for sites consultation from October to November 2014 in order to address the need for a more detailed review of the type and number of minerals site allocations required and the type and availability of minerals resources in the borough. The two sites submitted in the call for sites consultation between May and June 2014 were appraised with the additional sites received through the targeted minerals call for sites to inform site selection and allocation in Local Plan (Part Two).
Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment A total of 5 responses were received in relation to Sustainability Appraisal or Habitats Regulations Assessment.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
Gaps in the range of documents used to inform the health information within the Sustainability Appraisal draft scoping report and the need to demonstrate a clearer understanding of how coal bed methane and shale gas extraction fit into the Sustainability Appraisal objectives. The importance of protection of international nature conservation designations associated with the Mersey Estuary was raised, along with the need for developments that could impact on European sites to provide sufficient information to enable compliance with the Habitats Regulations. The need for Neighbourhood Plans to take the Habitat Regulations into account was also raised, although this is not an issue relevant to the Local Plan (Part Two).	The baseline information and list of relevant plans and programmes have been updated within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report and the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan (Part Two) Publication Draft and take account of relevant health information and documents. The policy relating to proposals for exploration, appraisal or production of hydrocarbons has been subject to sustainability appraisal and has been tested against the sustainability objectives. This information is included within the Sustainability Appraisal report. The Council has considered impacts on internationally important nature conservation designations as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment. The Habitats Regulations Assessment has identified potential impacts and mitigation measures and some Local Plan (Part Two) policies identify that there may be a need for site-specific Habitats Regulations Assessment on some sites.

C Local Service Centre background paper consultation summary

Table C.1 Summary of main issues raised and how they were addressed in response to the Local Service Centre Background Paper Consultation

Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
More specific definitions for some of the assessment criteria should be used e.g. the frequency and destination of the public transport service.	Accessibility to public transport has been reviewed in revising the methodology. Advice was provided by the Council's Transport Strategy team on the current position of rural services across the borough and nationally, and 'access to public transport' for the purposes of the revised methodology has been defined accordingly. This was presented to Local Plan Working Group in February 2016 where the revised methodology was agreed as part of the evidence base for the preparation of the Local Plan (Part Two).
Additional criteria for assessing the settlements should be used e.g. access to employment opportunities, access to health facilities and access to recreation and leisure facilities.	This issue was considered by the Local Plan Working Group in January 2016 and considered further at the meeting in February 2016. Alternative services and facilities raised through consultation were considered, and the inclusion of particular services and facilities in the revised methodology has been based on those which are commonly used on a regular basis, with emphasis placed on those identified within National Planning Policy Guidance and the Local Plan. The revised methodology ensures that settlements will only become a local service centre where there is access to public transport which in turn will give the community in local service centres some access to higher order services and facilities. 'Access to public transport' is defined in the revised methodology informed by further advice provided by the Council's Transport Strategy team.
The functional relationship between settlements should be assessed i.e. accessibility and proximity to other settlements in the vicinity or to key service centres.	The revised methodology ensures that settlements will only become a local service centre where there is access to public transport which in turn would allow some access to higher order settlements/towns. Accessibility to public transport has been reviewed in revising the methodology and a definition has been provided in line with further advice provided by the Council's Transport Strategy team. The revised methodology was presented to Local Plan Working Group in February 2016 where it was agreed as part of the evidence base for the preparation of the Local Plan (Part Two).

Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The capacity of existing infrastructure should be taken into account e.g. capacity of schools.	This was considered by the Local Plan Working Group at the meeting in February 2016. It was considered to be less directly related to the methodology but more a concern as to what designation may mean for a settlement in terms of levels of future development. The policy approach to local service centres takes this into account by only allowing for development of limited scale unless delivered through a planned approach by the local community; and STRAT 8 of the Local Plan (Part One) also states that development should not exceed the capacity of existing services and infrastructure unless appropriate improvements can be made. The future policy direction relating to local service centres was discussed and noted by Local Plan Working Group in February 2016.
The settlement assessments should be more in-depth to consider the age structure and socio-economic characteristics of the communities.	This is taken into account in the overall policy approach to local service centres. The Local Plan does not allocate land for development at local service centres and only expects development of limited scale in these locations, unless delivered through a planned approach by the local community. Local communities may wish to do so through Neighbourhood Plans which may include an assessment of socio-economic characteristics. This however does not affect the criteria for local service centre designation.

D Preferred Approach consultation summary

Table D.1 Summary of main issues raised and how they were addressed in response to the Preferred Approach, Draft Policies and Allocations Consultation

Chester – Policies CH1 to CH7 103 responses were received, of which 47 agreed and 12 disagreed with the preferred approach. 44 neither agreed nor disagreed.		
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed	
The main issues raised through consultation related to the need to review the Green Belt to meet housing needs; concerns over the impact of Wrexham Road; the importance of the natural and historic character of Chester including green spaces and strategic green corridors, including Chester Castle; sustainable construction of new housing; the need for mixed housing types and mixed/employment uses on sites. The comments identify the need for an assessment of all identified employment sites where they affect a heritage asset; and the need to protect and take account of the risks to the environment and prevent pollution; some identified employment sites should not be protected from alternative forms of development, specifically Black Diamond Street (CH2.C) which should be brought forward for student accommodation. Bumpers Lane (CH2.G) is not considered justified or effective and is dependent on the Chester Western Relief Road. The area around the railway station and the Northern Gateway as key priority regeneration areas; and the policy for key views, landmarks, gateways and the historic skyline	Policy CH1 has been amended to reference green spaces and to protect the nature, quality and scale of strategic open space corridors; provide clarity on the protection and reinstatement of historic routes and grain; provide reference to the canal corridors; set out additional details in respect of high quality development. Reference to the Wrexham Road strategic site has been deleted as this is a repetition of details set out in the Local Plan (Part One) policy. Any remaining issues such as the provision of open space would be addressed through other Part Two policies. Revised policy CH2 has been amended to ensure high quality development at 'Chester Gateway and include references to residential development. Site assessments have been updated through the HELAA (2017) and Land Allocations Background Paper (2017), considering representations received, updated information, the SA/HRA or other evidence reports including a Heritage Impact Assessment of the potential sites carried forward for assessment from the HELAA. The Local Plan (Part Two) includes policies to minimise the risk to the environment and potential pollution arising from new development. The Council will continue to monitor the take up and development of employment land to ensure the strategic development	

overlooks the topography and roofscape of the city and needs to include an updated key views diagram.

University/student growth must be viable and sustainable and should only be allowed if appropriate housing is provided for students. The University should be encouraged to develop its facilities and accommodation in the north of the borough and at Thornton Science Park. The canal should be integrated with the development of the Parkgate Road campus and student accommodation should not be excluded from the allocation of the Glenesk site.

The preferred approach and identified primary shopping frontages (including the Rows) are too restrictive and there should also be a more flexible approach to secondary shopping frontages. There is a lack of evidence of the impact of this policy. A percentage of A1 uses should be retained within the Primary Shopping Area but vacant units should be allowed to change to other A-class units if there is no demand for an A1 unit.

requirements of Local Plan (Part One) can be met. The Local Plan (Part Two) makes employment land allocations to meet the strategic development requirements of the Local Plan (Part One).

The University of Chester vision for the Thornton Science Park campus is considered in relation to draft policy EP5. It should also be noted that Thornton is in a major hazard zone within which residential development would not be appropriate. The use of the City's waterways, footpaths and towpaths is encouraged and supported through a number of other policies in the plan. The 'Glenesk' site at Parkgate Road has been assessed through the Council's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (2017) (HELAA). A significant proportion of the site is within Flood Zone 3a and 3b and in accordance with EA advice set out in the latest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) the draft proposed land allocation has been deleted from the policy.

A full assessment of the city centre has been undertaken by the Council's retail consultants in which identifies the core retail element of the city centre that should be protected to maintain vitality and viability. However, consideration has been given to including alternative options for Chester city centre and a more flexible approach will be taken for long term vacant shops with no demand or when the impacts of Chester Northgate take effect. Flexibility has also been given on secondary shopping frontages and on The Rows, while ensuring that active frontages on the Row level are promoted. Residential on upper levels could be encouraged to increase footfall.

The plan has been amended to include references to the Local Plan (Part One) Policy ENV 6 High Quality Design and Sustainable Construction (to promote respecting the local character and achieve a sense of place) and ENV 5 Historic Environment to ensure development within the city of Chester protects of enhances heritage. Local Plan (Part One) Policy

	ENV6 also acknowledges the manifesto for contemporary design. The Shropshire Union Canal and the Castle have been added to the list of historic assets and policy CH5 has been amended to clarify that this also refers to buildings and structures associated with the waterway and include a reference to the conservation management plan. Policy CH6 has been amended to include references to topography and roofscape and strengthen the consideration of impact on the skyline. The Key Views and gateways diagram from the Chester Local Plan has been updated and incorporated into the Local Plan (Part Two).
Ellesmere Port – Policies EP1 to EP7 50 responses were received, of which 18 agreed and 3 disagreed with the preferred approach. 29 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
Policies EP1 – Ellesmere Port settlement area; EP7 – Ellesmere Port historic canal port The main issues related to the defined settlement boundary for Ellesmere Port and specifically the Protos (Ince Park) site; request for a borough wide Green Belt review; to remove the Ledsham Road strategic allocation as the site is currently being developed; comments on transport infrastructure; request for sub-regional growth strategies to be referenced and general support for the policy. Boundary amendments were proposed for policy EP7 Historic Canal Port to exclude the operational port area and align with the conservation area. Employment land allocations and the Hooton Park policy were generally supported. Additional employment land should be identified (Booston Oil Depot), specific sites at New Bridge Rd (EP2.B) and Rossmore Road East (EP2.F)	In response Policy EP1 must be read alongside the Local Plan (Part One) which states that the general extent of the North Cheshire Green Belt will be maintained. Reference to Ledsham Road site has been removed as this is identified in Part One and is being developed. The policy explanation clarifies that settlement boundary has been drawn to meet the town's development needs, support urban regeneration and protect the Green Belt in line with Local Plan (Part One). The Protos site along with Quinn Glass, the allocation at Station Road, Ince and CF Fertilisers has now been included within the settlement boundary for Ellesmere Port. This is a change to the response set out to Working Group in July which did not include the Protos site in the Ellesmere Port boundary. However, upon reflection it is considered that including these major employment areas as being in the countryside could potentially restrict future development which could harm economic growth. . The boundary of the historic canal port has been amended to follow the conservation area.

D

Preferred Approach consultation summary

should include B2 uses. There should be an assessment sites where they affect a heritage asset. The allocation of remaining land at Cheshire Oaks Business Park (EP2.E) is too restrictive. There is a need for a wider strategic framework for Stanlow and Thornton areas. The setting of Thornton Science Park should be a clear consideration in development proposals. Hazardous development/unneighbourly uses should not constrain future development. The Ince Park (Protos) policy should include criteria on landscape character, public transport infrastructure, consultation; information transparency and community benefit funds. Policy reference to ecological mitigation and the use of the Manchester ship canal and rail network were questioned. Opposing views on the 'land to the east of Ince Park' were received relating to the wider Ince /Frodsham Marshes designation; development of greenfield site, brownfield land availability in Stanlow, flood risk and accessibility. There were significant concerns on policy wording and the terminology 'safeguarding' the site and it should be allocated for employment use.	Site assessments have been updated through the HELAA (2017) and Land Allocations Background Paper (2017), considering representations received, updated information, the SA/HRA or other evidence reports including a Heritage Impact Assessment of the potential sites carried forward for assessment from the HELAA. A Stanlow Special Policy Area Review (2016) was undertaken and informed the site assessments in the HELAA (2017) and the Local Plan (part Two) policies. The Local Plan (Part Two) makes employment land allocations to meet the strategic development requirements of the Local Plan (Part One). Specific sites at New Bridge Road and Rossmore Road include B2 use, former Booston Oil Depot is allocated under Policy EP2. The remaining land at Cheshire Oaks business park is retained as an employment allocation for B1 use. The Local Plan (Part Two) contains policies relating to new or extensions to hazardous installations and development within the vicinity of hazardous installations. The Stanlow Special Policy Area Review (August 2016) reviews potential development constraints in the area. There are a number of hazard zones and whilst the hazard zones do not preclude development, they influence the nature and extent of development that can take place. Advice will be sought from the HSE on specific planning applications and development proposals. Ince Park is a key site in the Local Plan (Part One), which supports opportunities for freight transport on the Manchester Ship Canal and rail network. The existing permissions for the site include extensive ecological mitigation areas and the policy and explanation have been updated in line with other policies of the plan. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) provides details on how the Council intends to feedback decisions and information to stakeholders. The community benefit fund is not covered by the planning
--	---

	permission on the site and is outside of the control of local plan policies. Land to the east of Ince Park has been reviewed through the HELAA (2017) and Land Allocations Background Paper (2017) considering NPPF, updated evidence reports, the consultation responses received and other relevant information. The Local Plan (Part Two) makes employment land allocations to meet the strategic development requirements of the Local Plan (Part One).
Northwich – Policies N1 to N5 83 responses were received, of which 23 agreed and 8 disagreed with the preferred approach. 52 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main issues for policy N1 relate to the defined settlement boundary for Northwich, site specific issues and the housing requirements for Northwich, and updates to the Wincham Urban Village site. Large scale redevelopment proposals (e.g. Winnington Works) should demonstrate that traffic impacts can be accommodated, particularly on Winnington Swing Bridge. Developers should provide any necessary infrastructure, such as roads, bridges, amenities (schools, shops, surgeries). Developments should take account of the river frontages and recognise the importance of waterways for ecology and biodiversity. There is a need to take account of the Neighbourhood plans in the area. The approach in policy N2 Northwich Regeneration Areas is broadly supported, including the redevelopment of Weaver Square. Comments on N5 support the protection of biodiversity on the waterways and the reference to rivers and canals as environmental assets.	Site specific issues on housing and employment, including land at Wincham, were considered at Local Plan Working Group 24th July 2017. Transport issues will be considered through the work on the Northwich Transport Strategy and through the planning application process where development comes forward. Revised policy T1 has been amended to prioritise highway improvements, as they are identified through the Transport Strategy. The Northwich policies have been amended to protect the biodiversity value of the waterways, to encourage links with the waterways and to reference policy DM37 recreational routeways and DM38 waterways and mooring facilities where appropriate. Neighbourhood Plans are supported in line with NPPF and it is not necessary to reference this within the policy. Site assessments have been updated through the HELAA (2017) and Land Allocations Background Paper (2017), considering representations received, updated information, the SA/HRA or other evidence reports including a Heritage Impact

D

Preferred Approach consultation summary

Various comments were made on the draft employment allocations for Northwich, in particular objections to the identification of land to the west of King Street, Northwich. Landowner/developer representations were put forward for alternative sites including land at Chapel Street Wincham for economic development, land to the south A556/south west Gadbrook Park, Lostock Longwood and land to the east of King Street. The need for an assessment of all identified employment sites where they affect a heritage asset is identified. Development should be compatible with nearby hazardous development. New employment allocations should provide improved transport infrastructure and consider the potential for a new train station to serve Gadbrook Park. The town centre boundary and primary shopping area should be expanded to include Old Warrington Road. A clearer definition to ensure secondary frontages have viable shops and pedestrian links to Barons Quay should be considered.	Assessment of the potential sites carried forward for assessment from the HELAA. The Local Plan (Part Two) makes employment land allocations to meet the strategic development requirements of the Local Plan (Part One), including at least 30ha additional employment land for Northwich. The Local Plan (Part Two) contains policies relating to new or extensions to hazardous installations and development within the vicinity of hazardous installations. The Local Plan (Part Two) allocates employment land for the potential expansion of Gadbrook Park and includes a site specific policy to ensure a comprehensive approach is taken and incorporates transport infrastructure improvements. A full assessment of the town centre has been undertaken by the Council's retail consultants in which identifies the core retail element of the town centre that should be protected to maintain vitality and viability. However, consideration has been given to including alternative options for Northwich town centre and a more flexible approach will be taken for long term vacant shops with no demand and on secondary shopping frontages. Residential on upper levels could be encouraged to increase footfall.
Winsford – Policies W1 to W2 13 responses were received, of which 4 agreed and 2 disagreed with the preferred approach. 7 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised The main issues raised concerned the allocation of additional land for housing development and amendments to the settlement boundary; inclusion of details on transport initiatives, including a bypass of Middlewich and improved links to the M6; and support for town centre regeneration initiatives and public transport improvements. Employment land allocations in Winsford should be accompanied by	How main issues were addressed In response, the need for additional housing land and allocations was assessed (as reported to Local Plan Working Group 24 July 2017) concluding that no additional allocations were required for Winsford. Revised policy T1 has been amended to strengthen the Council's commitment to a new link between Winsford/Middlewich and the M6 and to safeguard land to provide for the necessary junction improvements.

improved highway and transport access to the M6 and Middlewich at junction 18 and take account of opportunities from the Northern Gateway Development Zone around Crewe.	
Rural area – Policies R1 to R4 161 responses were received, of which 29 agreed and 21 disagreed with the preferred approach. 111 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main issues raised related to the definition of a ‘settlement’ or a ‘village’; queries over the status of settlements that were not listed as Key Service Centres or Local Service Centres; requests for amendments to boundaries, and the inclusion of sites or whole settlements; the allowance for infill in all settlements and not limited to 2 dwellings; inclusion of a presumption in favour of development; and deletion of the approach to minimising the loss of greenfield land. Comments were received providing suggestions of the requirement for additional housing in Tattenhall could be met, through enlarging the settlement boundary; the submission of various sites; the determination of extant planning applications; and the redevelopment of brownfield land. Comments were provided on employment land allocations in the rural area from landowners/developers, with alternative sites provided for consideration. Some comments related to policy wording and design criteria suggested for specific employment allocations. Land adjacent to Mere’s Edge, Helsby (R3.B) is promoted for residential or mixed use development. A new policy for Middlewich should be included in line with STRAT7 of the Local Plan (Part One to designate land adjoining Holmes Chapel Road (Cheshire Fresh) for	In response, preferred approach policies R1 and R2 have been combined into a single new policy R1 covering all identified settlements in the rural area, which lists the settlements designated as Local Service Centres; defines that an ‘identified settlement’ are those categorised as a Key or Local Service Centre; and clearly sets out how development proposals within and outside of identified settlements will be dealt with, in relation to Local Plan (Part One) policies STRAT8 and STRAT9. Following consideration at Local Plan Working Group and engagement with the Parish Council, a revised approach to meeting the housing requirement in Tattenhall is now proposed (set out in new Policy R2) that seeks to meet the housing requirement by allocating land west of Ravensholme for up to 30 dwellings and safeguarding additional land post 2025 should the expected development of at least 13 units on smaller sites not progress as planned. Site assessments have been updated through the HELAA (2017) and Land Allocations Background Paper (2017), considering representations received, updated information, the SA/HRA or other evidence reports including a Heritage Impact Assessment of the potential sites carried forward for assessment from the HELAA. The Local Plan (Part Two) makes employment land allocations to meet the strategic development requirements of the Local Plan (Part One), including at least 10ha additional employment land for the rural area. The policy

employment use. Alternatively, policy R3 on employment land provision should be amended to include the site. Clarify support and/or make provision for small scale employment development in the rural area beyond allocated sites. Comments encourage inward investment at Oulton Park but require a more structured approach to noise mitigation in future development.	wording considers the site assessments and design issues raised through the consultation. Local Plan (Part One) STRAT7 states the Council will work closely and effectively with Cheshire East Council to plan for sustainable development in Middlewich. Cheshire East has not requested land allocations, or amendments to the settlement boundary, within Cheshire West and Chester to meet the development needs of Middlewich. The policy on employment land allocations in the rural area should be read alongside other relevant policies within the Local Plan, particularly Local Plan (Part One) STRAT1 Sustainable Development, STRAT2 Strategic development, STRAT8 Rural area and STRAT9 Green Belt and Countryside. Renumbered policy DM13 has been amended to provide additional environmental criteria to guide development at Oulton Park.
Green Belt and countryside – Policies GBC1 to GBC6 181 responses were received, of which 63 agreed and 29 disagreed with the preferred approach. 89 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main issues raised concerned the definition of various terms used in the policies; the implications of housing numbers; more flexibility is required; the policy approach is not supported by NPPF. The requirement to have run a business for 3 years for permanent and temporary dwellings is inconsistent; definition of rural workers should include other rural activities; 10/30% restrictions on extensions are not required/too restrictive; references to changes of use are in conflict with the NPPF; materially larger' and 'appropriate' should be defined; a blanket approach across Green Belt and countryside is not consistent with NPPF;	Proposed policy GBC 1 has been deleted and new / revised policies set out criteria for the development of previously developed land. New policy DM1 promotes the use of previously developed land within identified settlements and sets out the limited circumstances where development would be permitted in the countryside and Green, to clarify the application of Local Plan (Part One) policy STRAT 9. The purpose of the commercial sites in the Green Belt policy (renumbered GBC1) is to provide guidance for sites where there is the potential for redevelopment to occur within the plan period. In response, the policy has been split into separate

the approach fails to acknowledge permitted development rights. The main issues raised related to the need to provide separate policies for the sites; additional policy wording for various of the sites; the identification of Dale Barracks; more flexibility for the Countess of Chester; the removal of a reference to the Chester Business Park; general support for the key gaps policy with some additional Key Settlement Gaps proposed and some objected to. The main issues raised related to consistency with national policy; the tests of harm need clarification; the approach is overly restrictive; and a number of additional Areas of Special County Value (ASCV). Other concerns were raised in relation to the landscape impact of oil and gas development.	policies, one for each commercial site, with an additional policy for Dale Barracks. The reference to Weaver Park Industrial Estate has been removed, as the site is not required as a waste allocation and will be treated as previously developed land under NPPF. The reference to Chester Business Park has been retained to provide guidance on the remaining undeveloped land within the site. The policy wording (renumbered policy GBC2) in relation to protection of the landscape has been amended to ensure that protection to ASCVs is commensurate with their status as a local landscape designation and in line with national policy, to better provide for a judgement to be made on the impact of a development proposal (including oil and gas development) upon the special qualities of an ASCV. To further support the policy approach, an additional study to confirm that the ASCV designations continue to be appropriate and robust and clearly identify their special landscape qualities has recently been completed. Based on this updated report and the evidence presented in the CWAC Local Landscape Designation Review Advisory Position Papers, it is considered that the additional ASCVs proposed for inclusion are already recognised and protected for other characteristics and qualities covered by other policies in the Local Plan (Part One), whereas this policy is a purely landscape designation (which was not adequately replaced by policy within the Part One). The key settlement gaps policy (renumbered policy GBC3) has been amended to move criteria from the explanation to the policy to strengthen the guidance on where development within key settlement gaps may be permitted. It was not considered necessary to designate any of the suggested settlement gaps, as they are not between identified settlements and would have sufficient protection from Local Plan (Part One) policy STRAT 9. It was considered important to maintain the identified gaps to ensure the individuality of the settlements that form the wider
---	---

D

Preferred Approach consultation summary

	built up area of Northwich are safeguarded in line with Part One policy STRAT 5. The rural workers dwelling policy (renumbered policy DM25) has been amended to clarify the requirements for permanent and temporary dwelling and a clearer definition of rural workers has been provided to include rural land based activities. The policy has been reviewed and redrafted as a general development management policy to provide clarity and is in line with the NPPF and permitted development rights. The percentages have been retained as a guide for extensions and will be used to inform appropriate scale and massing of development.
Transport and accessibility – Policies T1 to T6 93 responses were received, of which 46 agreed and 10 disagreed with the preferred approach. 37 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	The main issues raised related to the Chester Western Relief Road and the need to reconfigure Overleigh Roundabout, and carry out feasibility, alignment, funding, design and environmental assessment work, along with an exploration of alternative routes in liaison with Flintshire. Both Park and Ride site options were supported, but the need for a 5th site was questioned, and existing sites should be expanded instead. The safeguarding of land at rail stations, especially for additional car parking, was supported, along with the use of disused rail corridors for cycle paths. The re-opening Northwich-Sandbach line to passenger services; the provision of new rail connections between Northwich and Crewe and Northwich and Warrington; and the potential for new stations at Gadbrook Park, Beeston and Tattenhall were supported. There was
How main issues were addressed	Policy T1 has been amended to refocus on the Council's priorities for local road network improvements in the longer term that are necessary to promote an improved and efficient transport network, and to take account of future feasibility work with a range of partners, including Highways England, Cheshire and Warrington LEP, Cheshire East, to support the Mersey Dee Alliance Growth Strategy, Strategic Economic Plan and wider Constellation Partnership Growth Strategy. In relation to a Chester Western Relief Road (CWRR) the Council's Transport Strategy team consider that the current safeguarded route for the Chester Western Relief Road (CWRR) would not represent the most practicable or deliverable solution. In particular the current route would join the A483 Wrexham Road to the south of the Park and Ride site / strategic housing allocation which could potentially negatively impact on the A55 / A483 junction. Retaining the protected line would be likely to elicit objections

a request for factual updates to the policy on safeguarded areas around aerodromes.	from the landowner (Lingley Estates) and also Highways England should they consider an access close to the A55 / A483 would unacceptably impact on the Strategic Road Network. The Council had been working on the basis that the CWRR route would have to be an English only solution given previous discussion with Flintshire County Council. This position has now changed significantly due to the high level partnership working taking place with the Council, Welsh Assembly Government and Welsh Local Authorities. The Welsh Assembly Government is leading on a cross-border study which will consider transport issues on the strategic highway network in the Chester / Deeside area. This study could lead to a route being identified in Cheshire West and Flintshire that would deliver wider economic benefits and would be delivered through joint funding packages. The Council is committed to ensuring the highway network in and around Chester operates effectively and efficiently. Further work is necessary to ensure that the optimum solution is delivered and this will be progressed through the cross-border study. Given the lack of certainty required to safeguard a specified route it is proposed that the current protected line is deleted from the Policies Map but policy T1 retains a commitment to delivering a relief road to serve the west of Chester. Whilst having a protected route would aid future delivery, the lack of an identified route on the policies map would not prevent a scheme coming forward within the Plan period. The revised policy also identifies improvements to the link between Winsford/Middlewich and the M6; and highway improvements for the north of Northwich (including the Winnington Swing Bridge) as priority schemes, subject to further investigation and ongoing work, such as the Northwich Transport Strategy. In response to consultation comments in relation to the proposed Park and Ride site, the Council has carried out a detailed assessment of the two site options which were consulted on in the Local Plan (Part Two) preferred approach
--	---

	document. The 'A56 Hoole Road, Chester - Park & Ride Site Selection Report' (2017) concluded that a site to the north west of the A56 is the preferred location based on the comparison of a range of technical, cost, environmental and land-use factors, supported by stakeholder and landowner consultation. The study also showed that the site can be safely accessed from the A56. Policy T2 has therefore been amended to identify a 3.9ha site for the provision of a 5th Park and Ride site located to the north of the A56 and revised text commits the Council to working closely with Highways England to develop a detailed design that benefits both the local and the strategic road networks. In response to consultation comments and to support the Council's wider work towards improving rail services and infrastructure, Policy T3 has been amended to support improvements in the capacity of Chester station, and to include a reference to the stations identified as priorities for the provision of additional car parking in line with the Council's borough-wide parking review (i.e. Hartford, Northwich, Winsford, Helsby, Frodsham and Cuddington). No amendments were required to policy T4. Factual updates have been made to renumbered policy DM11 on safeguarded areas around aerodromes.
Infrastructure – Policies INF1 23 responses were received, of which 10 agreed and 6 disagreed with the preferred approach. 7 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main issues raised related to the need to include superfast broadband in new developments.	Renumbered policy DM18 has been amended to require the provision for the installation of superfast broadband is included within new developments.
Development management – Policies DM1	

40 responses were received, of which 16 agreed and 2 disagreed with the preferred approach. 22 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
While the draft policy was well supported, the main issues raised related to the policy being too long, complex, unnecessary, overly restrictive; replicating other policies in the plan and not consistent with national policy. Requests were made for the inclusion of additional criteria on: local characteristics; soils and agricultural land; rainwater capture; carp parking and access; solar energy; residential amenity daylight and sunlight; and viability considerations.	In response to comments received, policy DM1 will be deleted and the content covered within other relevant policies in the plan. Topography, landscape character and soil is covered in revised policy GBC2. Revised policy DM4 encourages the inclusion of sustainable design features to achieve the highest levels of water efficiency, energy performance including renewable energy generation. Revised policy T6 includes criteria for parking and access. New policies DM2 – Impact on residential amenity and DM3 – Design, character and visual amenity, provide criteria that the Council will take into account in the consideration of planning application, with respect to the impact a development proposal will have on residential amenity and design, character and visual amenity. In response to internal consultation with Development Management officers and general themes arising from across the preferred approach consultation, a additional number of new policies have been developed to guide the consideration of planning applications for all residential development. New policy DM19 sets out the detailed criteria on when new dwellings will be allowed within identified settlements, the countryside and Green Belt, to clarify the application of Local Plan (Part One) policy STRAT 9. New policies DM21 and DM22 provide criteria that the Council will take into account in the consideration of planning applications for house extensions, outbuildings, annexes, replacement dwellings, the extension of gardens and the change of use of buildings to dwelling houses.
Economic growth, employment and enterprise – Policies DM2 to DM5 54 responses were received, of which 25 agreed and 10 disagreed with the preferred approach. 19 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed

D

Preferred Approach consultation summary

The main issues relate to the requirement for marketing evidence on employment sites; allowing brownfield sites to be developed for housing, redevelopment of sites can support regeneration initiatives. The need to recognise permitted development rights in relation to agricultural buildings and rural diversification; reference to 'traditional' rural business is too restrictive and the policy should apply to all types of business. Concerns were also raised over criteria in the policy on equestrian development seeking to protect the openness of countryside; harm to the character of the rural area; the assessment of cumulative impacts, when such enterprises are often 'clustered'.	The policies should be read alongside revised policy DM1 'Development of previously developed land' and the other employment and urban regeneration policies in the plan. In response, a reference to the GDPO has been included within the explanation to the policies where relevant, including references agriculture and forestry, and land based rural businesses in line with NPPF. The Council will prepare a brownfield land register to encourage the appropriate reuse of previously developed land for housing, where this is compatible with other policies in the plan. The Local Plan (Part Two) policy on equestrian development has been amended to clarify the approach.
Town centres – Policies DM6 to DM9 47 responses were received, of which 24 agreed and 9 disagreed with the preferred approach. 14 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised There is insufficient recognition of suburban/district centres (particularly in Chester) which should be identified for protection in the same way as rural centres are identified; policy should address: contracting town centres; empty shop fronts; sufficient car parking in town centres for services and residential units; other constraints for alfresco dining including historic environment, visual amenity and highways licensing; and the provision of public conveniences for both day-time and night-time use; Local retail centres should be listed in policy; excessive concentrations of non-A1 use should be quantified with a percentage; viability test should be applied loss of shops in local retail centres; Farm shops require an access appraisal and parking provision. The approach is too restrictive and should include animal food, agricultural equipment, service and repair as these functions cannot	How main issues were addressed In response, criteria relating to alfresco dining has been added to the policy; the policy has been amended to reflect current and future functions of the town centre; the Council has considered site submissions / promotional material during the preparation of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and amended site assessments, constraints and delivery information. Renumbered policy DM15 has been amended to list the designated local retail centres within the explanation and confirm that NDPs can show local centres for their villages if justified. Policy DM8 on local shops and farm shops has been deleted and the content included within revised policies DM7 'Rural diversification of land based businesses' and DM39 'Culture and community facilities', which sets out the circumstances where proposals for retail sales in the rural area will be supported. The shopfronts policy has been amended to clarify that Local Plan (Part One) policies

normally be accommodated in the urban areas. There is little guidance for shop proposals in rural areas; The policy also needs to make reference to the Community Right to Buy options and Shops registered as Assets of Community Value (ACV); and the policy relating to shopfronts needs to be strengthened, particularly in conservation areas, listed buildings and in the Boughton area.	ENV5 and ENV6 should be considered in the planning application process, and clarity has been provided that proposals on listed buildings will also be subject to listed building consent.
Visitor economy – Policies DM10 to DM11 26 responses were received, of which 15 agreed and 5 disagreed with the preferred approach. 6 neither agreed nor disagreed	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
Comments suggested that there is no specific approach towards tourism attractions in the Borough. Comments raised sought clarification on visitor accommodation in the Green Belt. There is no provision for a comprehensive leisure/recreation scheme; a site is put forward for consideration in Bostock Green.	The policies have been amended to clarify that visitor accommodation will be permitted in line with the plan's settlement hierarchy, and to confirm the approach towards new build visitor accommodation, static caravan and chalet development, caravan and camping sites in the green belt. Local Plan (Part One) policy ECON3 relates to the visitor economy and notes that additional controls will apply in the Green Belt. The Publication Draft Local Plan (Part Two) includes some policies for specific tourist attractions. The Cheshire Retail Study (2016) does not identify the need for any additional land allocations for leisure use. In the rural area there are sites with planning permission, yet to be developed, for large scale leisure schemes. There is no requirement to identify land allocations for leisure use through the Local Plan (Part Two). Any development proposals should be an appropriate scale that reflects the size and role of each centre and be a suitable scale and type for its location.
Delivering affordable housing – Policy DM12 20 responses were received, of which 5 agreed and 7 disagreed with the preferred approach. 8 neither agreed nor disagreed.	

D

Preferred Approach consultation summary

Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main issues raised included that affordable housing should only apply to major applications; policy should support a range of tenures and include starter homes and rent-to-buy; viability assessments should not be required where affordable needs are met; the need for development must be clearly demonstrated through an up to date assessment of local housing needs.	In response, renumbered policy DM23 has been amended to clarify the Council's position in relation to affordable housing thresholds (as set out in Local Plan (Part One) policy SOC 1); preferences for affordable housing provision; the need for an economic viability assessment; and to set out the Council's current position on starter homes in the introductory text to the housing section. Local Plan (Part Two) policies DM 23 with DM 20, encourage the delivery of the right mix and type of market and affordable housing across the borough.
Rural exception sites – Policy DM13 22 responses were received, of which 5 agreed and 6 disagreed with the preferred approach. 11 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main issue raised was that rural exception sites shouldn't be restricted to the edge of Key or Local Service Centres.	Renumbered rural exception site policy DM 24 clearly sets out where rural exception sites would be acceptable. The policy (and the spatial strategy of the Local Plan) does not support the development of housing (market or affordable) in the countryside, and encourages sustainable development in the most sustainable locations. The policy has also been strengthened in relation to local connections, requiring an independent assessment of need carried out for or by the Parish Council.
Housing mix and type – Policies DM14 to DM18 84 responses were received, of which 36 agreed and 11 disagreed with the preferred approach. 37 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main issues raised related to the overly prescriptive approach to specific house types; mix and type should be related to identified demand; references to building regulations should be removed. The main issue in relation	In response, revised policy DM20 has been amended to recognise that larger schemes will be able to provide a mix and type and include viability and design considerations. Policy DM26 relating to specialist housing has been reordered and

to the draft policy DM16 approach to student accommodation was whether or not applications for purpose build student accommodation (PBSA) should be required to demonstrate a need for the development. Various comments were received on the use of a needs test ranging from the draft policy being weak and inadequate, and that it should apply to all applications for student accommodation; to the policy being seen as unnecessary, unworkable and contrary to the Part One plan. Issues were also raised relating the evidence base required for a needs assessment and in particular querying exactly how such a test or assessment could be applied. It was suggested that there would be reliance on the University to provide regular and up to date information in order to prepare a robust assessment. There was general support for the content of policy DM17 on HMOs. However, concerns were raised about the increase in HMOs and in particular in relation to student population. Comments were also received requesting an extension to the area of the City covered by Article 4 directions that restricts the change of use to a HMO without requiring planning permission.	general policy requirements set out as bullet points at the start. The student accommodation policy was considered at the Council's Local Plan Working Group on 26 June 2017, where it was recognised that student accommodation developments are limiting the mix and type of housing coming forward in Chester and there is a risk of oversupply of PBSA leading to vacant or underused buildings. The policy has been amended to include a 'needs test' with an amendment to emphasise the demonstration of both qualitative and quantitative assessments. The HMO policy has been amended to clarify that HMO properties are not solely for use by students and in fact provide an source of affordable accommodation for young professionals, particularly graduates. With regard to Article 4 directions, specific circumstances and evidence are required to apply a new direction and this is achieved through separate legislation to the Local Plan process. In response to internal consultation with Development Management officers and general themes arising from across the preferred approach consultation, a number of new policies have been developed to guide the consideration of planning applications for all residential development. Additional new policy DM19 sets out the detailed criteria on when new dwellings will be allowed within identified settlements, the countryside and Green Belt, to clarify the application of Local Plan (Part One) policy STRAT 9. New policies DM21 and DM22 provide criteria that the Council will take into account in the consideration of planning applications for house extensions, outbuildings, annexes, replacement dwellings, the extension of gardens and the change of use of buildings to dwelling houses.
Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpersons' accommodation – Policy DM19 1,113 responses were received from 1,049 individuals in answer to the questions: Do you have any comments on the suitability of the sites suggested in the WYG study, including the availability of site(s)? Are there any other sites, including those on the consultant's long-list of sites that should be taken forward?	

D

Preferred Approach consultation summary

Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
Responses addressed a wide range of themes from the identification of need for traveller pitches / plots, to the content and details of the assessment carried out by WYG; and range of sites were suggested for consideration as alternative sites to those set out in table 10.1 of the preferred approach document. The main issues raised were that the WYG site selection process was flawed and that not all site information was correct especially in relation to sustainability; a range of other site options were put forward for consideration; comments were received that the Gypsy Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2014 was not now in line with latest Government guidance therefore not sound.	In response to the comments relating to site identification in the WYG study the Council reassessed site selection options, including alternative sites, and presented an updated analysis to Local Plan Working Group 24 July 2017. With regard to the GTAA, the Council in consultation with the sub-regional partnership took the decision that the GTAA should be updated to reflect the revised definition in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. This work has been commissioned.
Health and well-being – Policies DM20 to DM24 67 responses were received, of which 26 agreed and 13 disagreed with the preferred approach. 28 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main issues raised related to the lack of evidence linking hot food takeaways and schools with childhood obesity; the requirement for health impact assessment should only apply to large schemes; there should have been co-operation with public health. The main issues raised related to the requirement to keeping industrial or commercial noise to at least 5dB below existing background noise, the inclusion of construction noise/ noisy business time limits; that the policy will be applied to onshore oil and gas extraction; and the need to consider: windfarm noise, M56 motorway noise; clustering of noisy development together and the cumulative impact on residents and ecological receptors. With regard to air quality, references to measurable increases in Nitrogen Dioxide and particulate matter levels is not defined; no mention is made of	In response, renumbered policy DM29 has been amended to allow more flexibility, especially for small house builders and concentrate on development that will have a significant impact on health in line with PPG; the reference to hot food takeaways near to schools has been removed as the policy itself allows for applications to be refused where there are adverse impacts or there is a failure to take reasonable opportunities to improve health. Clearer links in the text to the Local Evidence in the JSNA and Health and Wellbeing Strategy have also been added. The policy text to the revised noise policy has been amended to confirm the importance of keeping noise from industrial and commercial uses, including oil and gas developments and energy generation schemes, to at least 5dB below background

emissions from waste incineration; and developers must be required to contribute to contribute to active monitoring in areas of identified air quality concern. The main issues raised in relation to land contamination and instability concerned the requirement for a Phase 1 desktop study for brownfield sites and assessment of potential land instability; flooding and watercourses and the potential to impact on the integrity of the canals. Other concerns were also raised with regard to the potential impact on land instability from oil and gas and other minerals development. With relation to culture and public art, policy should state that demolition or change of use should only be considered when the users of the building are satisfied with the alternatives being offered; there should be recognition of the value of appropriately sited public art in the countryside, and the policy should be reworded to enable public art being provided as part of new development.	noise, to protect residential amenity; and that construction and demolition noise will be restricted to certain times of the day and days of the week. However, the policy applies to new development (requiring planning permission) and does not address existing issues. Renumbered Air Quality policy DM31 has been amended in consultation with Environmental Protection officers to focus more on the impact on air quality from new development and provide clarification on how the policy will be applied, including the identification of monitoring measures as an expected output from an Air Quality Assessment. The explanatory text to the land contamination and instability policy has been amended to clarify when a Phase 1 desktop study will be required and the policy has been amended to confirm requirements for a ground stability assessment and that development must not result in an increased risk of subsidence or land instability on the site or in the surrounding area. The public art policy has now been combined with revised community facilities policy DM 39 which includes criteria for loss of the facility with the addition of a reference to the catchment of the existing facility; compensatory facilities of equivalent community benefit; the provision public art as part of 'significant development' and as part of regeneration schemes especially within town centres and on key sites rather than as part of all major developments; and guidance on the provision of public art in appropriate locations, including sites within the rural area.
Open space, sport and recreation – Policies DM25 to DM30 76 responses were received, of which 43 agreed and 5 disagreed with the preferred approach. 28 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed

D

Preferred Approach consultation summary

The main issues raised in relation to open space concerned clarifying the approach to calculating and securing open space requirements, including making clear the thresholds and standards for on-site provision, circumstances when off-site provision should be allowed and that development is not expected to make good existing deficiencies; the need for further clarity of play space requirements; the protection of existing open space and sites identified on the policies map; and that requirements for allotments should be based on adequacy and location of the current supply rather than a quantity standard. It was also suggested that the threshold for play space should be lower in the rural area.

The main issues raised in relation to provision for sport and recreation concerned providing guidance on how contributions for playing pitches and other recreational spaces will be sought, including the need to consider indoor facilities; the need for guidance on how lapsed and disused sites should be dealt with; clarification on requirements of laying and renewing grass and artificial pitches; and further consideration of impacts on residential amenity. Concern was also raised about the need to designate sites for sport and recreation in rural areas to meet local need.

The main issues raised in relation to recreational Routeways concerned the need to support aspirations and safeguard opportunities for expansion of specific recreational routes (including Weaver/Weaver Navigation, Frodsham marshes, Frodsham to Delamere Forest, and the Sandstone Trail), the inclusion of Active Design principles; and the consideration of medium/long-distance routes across the borough and into neighbouring boroughs for different types of user. Other concerns were raised in relation to the need to re-route public rights of way and recreational routeways as a result of new development.

The approach to calculating open space requirements with new development has been clarified by setting out the standards and thresholds in the policy, making clear when off-site contributions would be appropriate and clarifying factors that will be considered in establishing the amount and type of open space. This will ensure that open space requirements are based on the additional demand placed on existing provision by the development. The supporting text has been revised to clarify requirements for surrounding playable space; link to the Council's Play Strategy which provides further guidance on play space in the rural area; and emphasise that existing open spaces are protected in Local Plan (Part One) policy SOC 6 and will be identified on the policies map, based on the open space audit within the updated Open Space Study.

The following guidance has been added to the policy: how developer contributions for pitch provision will be calculated and assessed; how loss, replacement and provision of new indoor and sport facilities should be approached; how lapsed and disused sites will be dealt with; and requirements for laying and renewing grass and artificial pitches. Greater consideration of potential impacts on residential amenity and mitigation has been provided in the policy explanation. The revised policy steers decisions relating to the provision of sport and recreational facilities in line with the recommendations and needs identified in the evidence base.

Revised policy DM37 'Recreational routeways' has been amended to identify strategic recreational routeways and to offer support for new routes and improvements to the existing network, naming specific routes in the explanatory text. The policy was also amended to confirm that the re-routing of recreational routeways should be avoided, but may be allowed if the alternative route is acceptable and/or the re-routing is for a temporary period. Since the consultation on the Local Plan (Part Two) preferred approach, planning permission has been granted at Fourways Quarry, Chester Road Oakmere

The tourism and recreation use at restored minerals sites policy does not include provision for holiday accommodation (at Fourways Quarry); engine powered water sports should be allowed in no impact on land stability; and moorings in marinas should be small in scale. The main issues relating to waterways and community facilities concerned improving clarity in relation to the provision of additional moorings; the need include a focus on existing waterways; clarify which waterways the policy applies to (excluding the Manchester Ship Canal); and comments that support the protection and provision of community facilities, but suggest that community facilities are also allowed outside of the urban and service centres.	(15/01803/FUL) with conditions for “<i>Siting of 143 holiday lodges and a new sailing facility, together with soft landscaping</i>” . Therefore policy DM28 has been deleted as the site can now be developed in accordance with the permission for the site. Other policies in the plan cover development in relation to water sports, land stability and moorings. The policy wording has been amended to ensure that proposals for the extension of mooring facilities at existing locations will be considered in relation to the potential cumulative impacts; to cross-reference to policy DM37 Recreational Routeways; clarify the approach within the Green Belt; safeguard the structural and operational integrity of the waterways; and recognise the permitted development rights associated with port related uses, in the context of the Manchester Ship Canal. Policy DM39 ‘Culture and community facilities’ has been moved to the health and well-being section and amended to support neighbourhood planning groups to plan for new community facilities in their area.
Flood risk and water management – Policies DM31 to DM36 71 responses were received, of which 56 agreed and 2 disagreed with the preferred approach. 13 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main issues related to the incorporation of SuDS and providing flexibility for situations where it is not possible to implement SuDS; the requirement for greenfield rates is unachievable; where there is no flooding, proposals should only need to reduce runoff by 30% of existing; the policy should be strengthened; SuDS maintenance is vital; pollution to any aquifer would be unacceptable; on site water capture, storage and re-use should be encouraged; the potential pollution to any aquifer would be unacceptable; the quality of river water should be protected by not allowing	In response, for clarity, policies relating to flood risk and development, the requirements for a site specific flood risk assessment and critical drainage areas have been merged; specific requirements for the need for a flood risk assessment has been removed and a reference to the NPPF footnote and the SFRA inserted. The SuDS policy has been reworded to clarify the required surface water run off rates for greenfield and brownfield sites, and a reference to the opportunities to enhance biodiversity through the provision of SuDs has been included. In consultation with the Environment Agency, a

D

Preferred Approach consultation summary

hydraulic fracturing; the need to establish water supply and waste water treatment capacity at plan stage; and that policy should strongly encourage more on-site water capture, storage and re-use.	definition has been inserted to clarify what is meant by development 'adjacent' to a flood storage area. Explanatory text has been amended to include guidance on the assessment of the impact of development on the water supply and treatment network. Further text has been added to refer to the Environment Agency's Source Protection Zones and the need for these to be taken into account in assessing planning applications.
Landscape, green infrastructure, biodiversity and geodiversity – Policies DM37 to DM39 51 responses were received, of which 25 agreed and 6 disagreed with the preferred approach. 20 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main issues raised related to the need to include the detail of any off-site trees and woodland provision contribution; mitigation may be a more beneficial, practical and realistic and clarify the process for reviewing TPO designations; new planting should comprise locally native species; all significant trees and hedgerows should be preserved. The main issues raised related to the Ecological network policy being the most appropriate means of planning for biodiversity at a landscape scale; the relevance of the policy to unconventional oil and gas development; the need to protect marshes, meres and wetlands; the policy is over-precautionary and not in accordance with national policy; biodiversity should be fully recognised outside of areas of new development; soils should be included in addition to geodiversity; benchmarks for the evaluation criteria for the value and extent of the features should be included in the policy; the need to clarify the relationship with designated areas in Neighbourhood Plans; and the proposal that the policies could be strengthened through their combination.	In response, the trees and woodland policy has been amended to require enhancement to existing trees, traditional orchards and hedgerows, wherever possible, in line with national policy; and to require that locally native species are used where appropriate; and to prioritise off-site replacement provision within the locality of the development, which should contribute to ensuring that the benefits of such planting are felt locally. The Ecological Network and Biodiversity policies have been combined to more clearly define how development proposals should consider biodiversity/geodiversity in relation to sites and assets of importance, and the wider ecological network, and an explicit reference to the need to 'maintain' the borough's habitats and biodiversity has been added. Text relating to the protection and sustainable use of soils has been added to the policy. The revised policy provides guidance on the implementation of existing Local Plan (Part One) policies and it is not considered to be over-precautionary or at odds with national policy. Furthermore, it is considered that existing Part One policies in conjunction with the draft Part Two oil and gas policy and the adopted SPD sufficiently identifies the key issues that a developer should address in any development proposals,

	including the impact on nature conservation/biodiversity habitats and the hierarchy of protected sites, together with any proposed habitat mitigation and compensation measures.
Historic environment – Policies DM40 to DM44 81 responses were received, of which 51 agreed and 9 disagreed with the preferred approach. 21 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main issues raised related to the need to carry out heritage impact assessments; amendments to the conservation area policy; requirements for recording of features; clarifying the approach in line with national policy; reference to neighbourhood plans and other evidence documents; reference to the 'setting' of archaeological resources; the preservation of archaeological remains in situ; requirements for field evaluation prior to determination of planning applications; the need to weigh harm to heritage assets against the public benefits of new development; and the inclusion of areas of historical/archaeological interest on the policies map.	In response and in consultation with Total Environment officers, a heritage impact assessment has been carried out on the Local Plan site allocations, and minor policy wording changes have been made, including the requirement for an appropriate level of survey and recording (including archaeological investigation); the deposition of results with the HER; the addition of landscapes to the definition of a heritage asset; and clarifying the need to assess the scale of any harm and the significance of a heritage asset. The key views diagram and mapping has been updated supported by an evidence base document. The explanatory text has been amended to clarify when and where a field evaluation will be required, prior to the determination of a planning application, along with the preference for preserving remains in situ. It is considered that the policies map would become too detailed if amended as proposed; however, the explanatory text has been amended to provide references and links to other documents containing the relevant information.
High quality design and sustainable construction – Policies DM45 to DM49 29 responses were received, of which 37 agreed and 8 disagreed with the preferred approach. 14 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed

D

Preferred Approach consultation summary

The preferred approach consultation responses generally supported the inclusion of a policy on sustainable construction, but questioned the requirement for a sustainability statement on all developments. The main issues raised in relation to parking, concerned to need to require measures to assist safe access to and around a site by pedestrians, and cyclists, subject future parking standards to public consultation or ensure requirements for parking levels are flexible, based on the characteristics of a development; and clarify that access for heavy goods vehicles (HGV) will be permitted, or where restricted, that alternative routes are made available. Other concerns arising from the Council's emerging Low Emissions Strategy and the recently adopted Parking Standards SPD, include the need to incorporate the parking standards and the requirement for electric vehicle charging points in policy. Adequate baseline information should be submitted and regularly monitored, and HSE hazard zones should be shown on the policies map. Conflicting responses were received on whether policies on hazardous installations should also apply to underground oil and gas exploration.	In response, to provide a more flexible policy that encourages innovative solutions, the text to policy the renumbered sustainable construction policy DM4 has been amended to require that new developments should aim to achieve the highest levels and energy and water efficiency that is practical and viable, and encourage the use of sustainable construction techniques. In response to comments relating to parking, revised policy T5 has been amended to include references to the Council's preferred parking standard and the requirement for the provision of electric vehicle charging points in new developments within the policy; and the requirement that any unacceptable impacts on amenity or road safety from a development is mitigated. The explanatory text has been amended to provide examples of potential mitigation measures, including routing agreements between the Council and the developer. Renumbered policies DM33 and DM34 have been amended to clarify what types of development are covered, with respect to hazardous installations and pipelines.
Alternative energy supplies – Policies DM50 to DM52 102 responses were received, of which 27 agreed and 39 disagreed with the preferred approach. 36 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised A large number of comments were received in relation to oil and gas, covering a wide range of issues, including legislation, landscape, biodiversity, pollution and health. Many of the comments received relate to concerns or requirements (e.g. pollution and safety) that will be dealt	How main issues were addressed An additional criterion has been added to require above ground structures to be minimised by using pipelines where feasible and economically viable. Additional guidance is provided in the oil and gas Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The oil and gas policy within the Local Plan (Part Two) must fit

with by the other statutory bodies involved in assessing and permitting proposals for oil and gas development – the Health and Safety Executive, Environment Agency and Oil and Gas authority. Some comments identified the need to protect landscape, by screening and putting pipelines below ground. Others stated that oil and gas proposals do not fit with Government aims and could impact negatively on climate change. Mixed comments were received relating to site liaison committees, with some stating that the policy should not set requirements, while others stated that the policy should set more specific requirements. Some respondents felt that the wind energy and the solar energy policies were unnecessarily restrictive whilst others considered they should go further. It was suggested that solar and wind development should be avoided in areas of high landscape sensitivity and additional criteria were proposed on aerodrome safeguarding and heritage. In relation to wind energy, the need to address noise impacts, effects on playing fields and requirements for decommissioning were highlighted, as was the need to better reflect the Written Ministerial Statement. It was suggested that the solar policy be strengthened to ensure that development on best and most versatile agricultural land be avoided. Support was given for solar panels on new and existing buildings. More generally, questions were raised as to why other renewable energy developments such as hydro, tidal and geothermal were not covered in the plan.	within the relevant Part One policy, ENV7, which states that proposals to exploit the borough's alternative hydrocarbon resources will be supported in accordance with specific criteria and all other policies within the Local Plan. The most significant changes are the change to the layout in order to provide a list of general criteria applicable to all stages, then specific criteria for each stage; addition of a criterion relating to control and minimisation of gas emissions; and inclusion of links to other relevant policies. The criterion relating to site liaison committees has been removed from the policy, as it is not enforceable through the policy. However, it is referred to in the explanation and within the SPD. Both of the wind and solar energy policies DM51 and DM52 have been amended to clarify that development on areas of high landscape sensitivity will not be allowed, with those areas being shown on the policies map (in the case of wind development). Key Settlement Gaps and ASCVs have also been identified as areas where wind development should be avoided. The need to take account of impacts on heritage, playing fields, noise and aerodromes has been added to the policies and/or text as applicable. No changes have been made in relation to other types of renewable energy which are considered to be adequately covered by policy ENV7 of the Local Plan (Part One).
Managing waste – Policies DM53 to DM54 32 responses were received, of which 10 agreed and 10 disagreed with the preferred approach. 12 neither agreed nor disagreed.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed

D

Preferred Approach consultation summary

The main issues raised related to the need for information to be provided on the type and source of waste proposed to be treated; and the need for monitoring of impacts throughout the lifetime of waste facilities. Questions were raised over the size of facility covered by the policy and whether it adequately addressed smaller scale development. The prioritisation of sites safeguarded under policy ENV8 over other sites was questioned. The failure of the plan to cover waste collection and storage and handling construction waste was highlighted. A separate policy on biomass was requested. Comments were also received through the preferred approach consultation requested rewording the policy to reflect a re-use provision at Bumpers Lane; that options are being explored for replacement facilities for Tattenhall and Frodsham; with Wimbolds Trafford, Council depot at Milton Green, Mill Lane (Frodsham) (or adjoining land), Weaver Industrial Estate (or adjoining land) and land within the Bolesworth Estate, all suggested as potential locations for additional HWRCs.

In response, renumbered policy DM54 has been amended to direct new large scale waste development to the safeguarded sites of Ince Park (Protos), Lostock and Kinderton Lodge. Smaller scale development is directed to operational or permitted waste management sites, or where that is not practical or desirable, to Stanlow or other industrial or degraded areas. Text has been added to renumbered policy DM4 on the need to minimise waste during construction. The need to provide appropriate waste storage and recycling facilities in new development is addressed in new policy DM3 on design, character and visual amenity. An new policy DM53 on energy generation, storage and district heat networks has been added, which covers biomass.

The Council's contract for managing its HWRCs has recently been extended until 2023. The revised contract involves retaining the existing network of seven HWRCs across the borough, with service improvements and changes to opening hours to reflect patterns of usage. Planning permission has been granted for expansion of the current site on Bumpers Lane to incorporate a new 'pay as you throw' Trade Waste Recycling Centre. The new site, once operational, will meet the needs of the Chester catchment area and therefore there is no need to identify any additional site for a Chester HWRC. A site search has been carried out, informed by responses to the consultation and discussion with the Council's Waste Management Service, which has not been able to identify any suitable sites for in Frodsham and Tattenhall, that are either not located in the Green Belt, or with a willing landowner. It is proposed, instead to include a criteria based policy to provide a framework for the consideration of any future planning applications. Officers in the planning team will continue to work with colleagues in waste management services to identify future options for both facilities. The methodology for identifying and assessing sites and the justification for this approach are set out in the 'Land Allocations Background Paper'.

Minerals supply and safeguarding – Policies DM55 to DM61

60 responses were received, of which 38 agreed and 9 disagreed with the preferred approach. 13 neither agreed nor disagreed.

Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
The main comments received through consultation requested the inclusion of references to the viability of minerals extraction; clarification on minerals liaison committees; the identification of buffer zones for mineral safeguarding areas; the identification of a preferred area for silica sand; the design and mitigation of minerals development; and that the safeguarding of wharves is not enforceable. Several respondents agree with the proposed approach to the restoration of minerals sites, with a request that the policy includes a commitment that the priority after-use of these workings will be for nature conservation and that they will be restored to habitats which will deliver the borough's strategic ecological network. Another comment objected to the requirement that there will be net gains in biodiversity as this will not always be deliverable.	In response, text has been added to refer to the viability of minerals extraction and include references to site liaison committees in the explanation; land at Rudheath Lodge has been allocated for silica sand extraction; and the approach to the identification of additional buffer zones and safeguarding of minerals infrastructure has been clarified. The wording to the restoration of minerals sites policy has been amended to state that opportunities for restoration to improve or enhance habitats, biodiversity, landscape, historic environment or community use should be maximised. The explanation identifies that long term benefits may include features that impact on the ecological network.
Other issues	
In addition to questions on the draft policies, the consultation document also asked whether there were any other comments on the preferred approach or policies map; and whether there were any other comments on the supporting evidence base, including the draft Sustainability Appraisal and draft Habitat Regulations Assessment.	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
A range comments were received, the main issues raised included: that the map scale and quality should be improved and that the Local Plan should have a final map that integrates all policies and boundaries; numerous changes to settlement boundaries and alternative housing and employment sites were suggested; Part Two treats housing figures as a maximum and not as a minimum and incorrectly suggests no further allocations, restricting the	In response, the maps that will accompany the publication plan have been revised so that they are easier to use and will be accompanied by a user friendly key / legend, and that identifies all of the relevant boundaries, designations and allocations in accordance with the policies in the plan. The Council has considered site submissions / promotional material during the preparation of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and amended site

D

Preferred Approach consultation summary

delivery of housing; and all significant derelict, unused and neglected land should be identified with a proposed use.	assessments, constraints and delivery information where appropriate. The HELAA (2017) has been used to prepare the Land Allocations Background Paper (2017) which sets out the Councils approach to making allocations for housing and employment land, and identifies potential sites. Please see Local Plan Working Group Report dated 24th July 2017 for more information. Settlement boundaries have been drawn around the core built envelope of Key and Local Service Centres using physical and natural features. No changes have been made as a result of comments received because there is no need allocate any additional sites adjacent to settlements - development in these locations should only come forward where it is for rural exception housing or a community land trust development, where supported by the Parish Council, or where it is brought forward through a Neighbourhood Development Order or a Community Right to Build Order or it is allocated in a made Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Council is also in the process of preparing a Brownfield Land Register that will be published in accordance with the National Planning Guidance. Responses to the majority of all other comments received have been made in relation to other comments received in relation to other policy areas.
Sustainability Appraisal/ Habitats Regulations Assessment	
Summary of main issues raised	How main issues were addressed
Sustainability Assessment refers to the need to consider employment land at Middlewich but makes no reference to housing land. It requires amendment on this basis.	The Sustainability Appraisal includes an appraisal of potential employment sites and reasonable alternatives, including some sites near Middlewich and Winsford. However, the Local Plan (Part Two) identifies that given the allocation of sites in Winsford for housing development within the Winsford

	Neighbourhood Plan and the current housing supply situation in the rural area and key service centres there is no need to make additional allocations through the Local Plan (Part Two). The Sustainability Appraisal provides a summary of the individual appraisals of each policy and as the policies do not allocate or refer to housing land near Middlewich, the Sustainability Appraisal does not refer to housing land near Middlewich.
Draft HRA – new development should enhance and protect surface and ground water quality and not cause deterioration in status of inland waters. Would like to see further evidence to support suggested policy wording and highlight recommendation in HRA conclusion (page 70). Site specific issues (as set out in detailed representation)	SA Objective 3 is 'to protect and enhance the borough's biodiversity and wildlife habitats'. As set out in the SA Scoping Report, the appraisal criteria / sub-objectives for this objective are: "will it protect and promote effective management of the borough's sites of ecological and nature conservation importance?", 'will it provide opportunities for the enhancement and creation of habitats and to foster species conservation, diversity and resilience to climate change?' and 'will it maintain, enhance and increase (rural and urban) tree cover and woodlands?'. The impact of each policy has been considered. SA objective 12 relates to protecting and enhancing landscape and townscape and the sub-objectives refer to protecting landscapes and provision of open space. As such, it is considered that green infrastructure and ecosystems are sufficiently covered by the appraisal objectives. Remaining uncertainties and negative impacts will be explored in the next iteration of the SA to identify avoidance and / or mitigation measures where possible. The potential to refer to ANGSt requirements within the SA monitoring indicators will be reviewed.
Question SA outcomes for policy DM 50 and how the Local Authority will enforce this policy. A review of available evidence would change assessments for water. Air, climate change and energy form positive to negative.	The Sustainability Appraisal assesses the impact of the policy and compares the situation with the policy, to the situation without the policy. The appraisal of policy DM50 'Oil and gas development' assesses the impact of the policy, not the impact of oil and gas development. Appendix A of the SA report states

	that the policy is considered to have positive effects, for example on climate change in terms of promotion of environmentally preferable alternatives to road travel and positive impacts on land and resources by promoting development on the least environmentally sensitive locations - this is compared to the situation without this policy. The policy is considered to have very positive impacts (when compared to the situation without the policy) on cultural heritage as it promotes the consideration of landscape character assessments and encourages appropriate screening, finishing and colour, and also requires high-quality and appropriate after use and restoration. The policy is considered to have very positive impacts on community safety, for example by ensuring that unavoidable dust and particle emissions, noise, vibration and illuminations are controlled so as not to have a detrimental impact on residential amenity.
Draft plan policies should be amended to include draft HRA recommendations as set out in paragraph 17.1.3 (page 70)	The recommendations made in the draft HRA have been taken into account in the draft Publication policies. An additional HRA of these policies will be undertaken and the policies will be amended further if required before publication, as part of the iterative process.
SA includes specific objective to protect land and soil quality but soil is not mentioned in the detailed policies. This should be included and clearly cross referenced to the SA.	Any omissions relating to soil quality will have been identified through the Sustainability Appraisal process and in the Interim Sustainability Report. The recommendations made in the Interim Sustainability Report have been taken into account in the draft Publication policies. An additional Sustainability Appraisal of these policies will be undertaken and the policies will be amended further if required before publication, as part of the iterative process.

E Publication Draft consultation summary

Table E.1 Summary of main issues raised in response to the Publication Draft consultation (Regulation 20)

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
General	• Support/ no comment. • Gypsy and traveller sites issue remains unresolved. • The Part One plan housing growth figures are minimums and the Part Two plan should consider options for potential allocations, or safeguard land for future housing growth. • A new policy is required which provides for an early review of the plan to ensure that housing land supply needs are met at the end of the plan period and beyond. • To be effective the plan needs to take into account feedback from consultation. • More consideration needs to be given to supporting older people to live independently at home and the contribution of residential mobile homes to the housing land supply. • The Council's THRIVE objectives have been ignored. • Object to proposals for commercial development in the area of Bostock Green. • The Gypsy Traveller DPD should override 5-year land supply policy on employment sites which have been marketed for employment use and have not been progressed. • Additional sites should be allowed to come forward in addition to Wrexham Road. Land at Sealand Road, Chester should be allocated for housing development. • Green Belt boundaries should be amended and additional sites suggested for allocation/ safeguarding for housing with the Green Belt.
1 Introduction	• Clarify that gypsy and traveller issues will be addressed separately in a Traveller DPD.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• A full impact assessment and community discussion of the impact of the expansion of higher education in Chester is required. • Evidence that Duty to Co-Operate has been satisfied is required. • The gypsy and traveller sites issue has not been resolved – the new DPD process must be based on an up to date GTA and an accurate assessment of available sites.
2 Chester	• Policy for Chester is overly restrictive and will deliver far too much student accommodation in the city centre to the detriment of other agreed housing and social needs. • The plan fails to give significant weight to the unique character of Chester neither as a whole nor as a historic city of national & international importance.
CH 1 - Chester settlement area	• Policy is over-protective and inflexible and prevents use of Green Belt to meet development needs for expansion of higher education and student housing. • Support the deletion of development principles for the Wrexham Road site, from the draft policy. • Support for the policy to deliver development for the Chester settlement area, while preserving and enhancing the character of the city centre. • Additional sites to meet housing needs within Chester settlement area were submitted.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Evidence informing the historic approaches to Chester as identified within Policy CH1 should be updated to ensure that changes which have occurred within national planning policy and the character of the landscape is reflected in the extent of this designation; • Reference to the Chester Western Relief Road should be included within Policy CH 1.
CH 2 - Chester regeneration areas	• Policy is over-protective and inflexible and prevents use of Green Belt to meet development needs for expansion of higher education and student housing. • Support for the policy to deliver development for the Chester settlement area, while preserving and enhancing the character of the city centre. • Residential development within the Northgate area must be appropriately designed and soundproofed. • The policy title should be amended to reflect the scope of the policy (i.e. the entirety of the city centre and not just defined Regeneration Areas). • Clarification or flexibility should be applied to the wording of Policy CH2 in relation to small scale development proposals. • The area is crossed by a number of sewers and protection measures will be required where development would impact upon these assets. • There is no reference to the need to improve connectivity with the rest of the city centre.
CH 3 - Employment land provision in Chester	• The identified sites are crossed by a number of sewers and protection measures will be required where development would impact upon these assets.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• The approach to student housing has adverse impacts on the intentions set out in this policy. This is reinforced by an inflexible stance on the use of Green Belt, together these fail to meet development needs for expansion of higher education and student housing. • Policy should require project-level HRA in respect of allocation CH3.G. • Approach to allocation of employment land is unsound. Policy EP 2 should be modified to allocate Land to the East of Protos for large-scale (25 ha) employment uses (B1(c) and B2 use classes). • Support for the policy to deliver development for the Chester settlement area, while preserving and enhancing the character of the city centre. • An up-to-date Employment Land review is required in support of the Local Plan (Part Two). The employment land strategy does not align with the housing strategy in Local Plan (Part One) – further employment land should be identified for Chester. • The policy is ineffective when applying Policy GBC 1 to allocations and undeveloped land within Chester Business Park. • Policy should be more flexible to allow other uses on the land allocations identified particularly for developments that may not fall within the identified use classes and which may be temporary in nature.
CH 4 - University of Chester	• The identified sites are crossed by a number of sewers and protection measures will be required where development would impact upon these assets. • Policy is unrealistic and undeliverable. Support for university expansion is not in line with Local Plan (Part One) and NPPF. The expansion of student accommodation will not achieve safer communities or mixed residential development. • Policy is welcomed and supported in principle.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• The 'Glenesk site' should be allocated for the potential expansion of the Parkgate Campus, and the whole of the 'Kingsway' site should be included within the allocation. • Support for the policy to deliver development for the Chester settlement area, while preserving and enhancing the character of the city centre.
CH 5 - Chester conservation areas	• The policy should be clarified to ensure that the historic character of the conservation area is not harmed by illuminated signage • Support for the policy to deliver development for the Chester settlement area, while preserving and enhancing the character of the city centre. • The intended concentrated expansion of Higher Education across the city centre has adverse consequences for this policy. • Include a reference to Appendix 2 in the policy. • Support flexibility added to the policy which broadens permitted uses allowed at The Rows.
CH 6 - Chester key views, landmarks and gateways and historic skyline	• The Policy is deficient, particularly with regard to the prevention of upward creep of new tall buildings, to the importance of mature trees and skyline vegetation and to the removal of existing tall buildings. • Nature of built development being delivered – in particular student accommodation – has compromised this policy. Student accommodation is needed beyond the inner city and urban fringe areas. • Support for the policy to deliver development for the Chester settlement area, while preserving and enhancing the character of the city centre.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
3 Ellesmere Port	- Text should note that the Ellesmere Quays element of the Waterfront Vision is no longer being brought forward. - Policy should support proposals for an observatory to research new and low-carbon energy technologies and foster world-class science and innovation within the Ince Marshes area of Cheshire.
EP 1 - Ellesmere Port settlement area	- Support changes made from Preferred Approach 2016, including reference to economic development and job creation. - Prioritising the use of previously developed land is too restrictive. - Land west of Ince Park should be released from the Green Belt and allocated for employment/ mixed uses. - Policy should refer to both the new footbridge and the alternative of improving the existing footbridge, in the Rossmore area. - Approach to allocation of employment land is unsound. Policy EP 2 should be modified to allocate Land to the East of Protos for large-scale (25 ha) employment uses (B1(c) and B2 use classes). - The Council's claimed housing supply may be higher than reality because there is no allowance for slippage of sites with planning permission and delays in delivery of strategic sites. - Additional housing sites suggested that should be allocated to provide greater flexibility and improve the prospects of achieving the housing requirement, including sites within the Green Belt.
EP 2 - Employment land provision in Ellesmere Port	- Support the allocation of land at Encirc Glass for employment development. - Employment land supply should be more flexible to deliver the employment land requirements of Local Plan (Part One).

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Approach to allocation of employment land is unsound. Policy EP 2 should be modified to allocate Land to the East of Protos for large-scale (25 ha) employment uses (B1(c) and B2 use classes). • Support the inclusion of B2 land use in employment allocation EP 2.F Rossmore Road East. • Employment allocation EP 2.C Booston Oil Depot should include a reference to energy related uses. • Development on allocations EP 2.A (Encirc) and EP 2.G (Station Road) should take account of high voltage electricity transmission overhead lines crossing the sites. • Support employment-related regeneration in Ellesmere Port. • Policy should be more flexible to allow other uses on the land allocations A-H identified particularly for developments that may not fall within the identified use classes and which may be temporary in nature. • EP 2.A Encirc – policy does not provide sufficient flexibility. Criteria 2 (amenity of nearby residents) and 3 (rail based freight) are unduly restrictive. • EP 2.A Encirc – support criteria requiring that new development minimise and mitigate against harm to the landscape and visual impact. • EP 2.B New Bridge Road – landscape setting should be considered as part of any development proposal. • EP 2.E Cheshire Oaks Business Park – the site should left as ‘white land’ and not allocated for B1 employment use. • EP 2.G Station Road – new development should reflect and respect the landscape character of the site and the surrounding area.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
EP 3 - Stanlow special policy area	- Potential for harm should be widened to include the landscape impacts arising from development. - Thornton Science Park should be removed from the policy text and policies map allocation.
EP 4 - Hooton Park	Support employment-related regeneration in Ellesmere Port.
EP 5 - Thornton Science Park	Subject to a review of hazard zones, amend the policy to support specific higher education uses within the Thornton Science Park.
EP 6 - Ince Park	- Land east of Protos should be allocated for employment use. - Support criteria requiring appropriate landscaping that respects the landscape character of the site and its surroundings. - Ecological and landscape mitigation can be achieved without adhering to the currently consented scheme.
EP 7 - Ellesmere Port historic canal port	- Development within the Historical Canal Port should be compatible with the surrounding land uses including the operational port. - Amend criterion 5 to 'preserve and enhance the urban spaces...' - The policy should also acknowledge and refer to the impact (if any) on the operational Ellesmere Port Docks and the use and navigation of the Manchester Ship Canal.
4 Northwich	More certainty is needed to ensure that the Plan will not lead to adverse impacts on the site integrity of Mersey Estuary SPA/Ramsar.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
N 1 - Northwich settlement area	• In the presence of a minimum housing target for the town and the borough as a whole, question whether the policy provides sufficient scope and flexibility for delivering further sustainable development to meet the future housing needs of Northwich and its adjoining communities. • Question whether the aim of preventing the loss of countryside and urban sprawl to the south of Northwich is a realistic and appropriate requirement. Given the Green Belt constraints that limit the development opportunities to the north of the town, this principle could serve to prevent the sustainable growth of the Northwich settlement area. • To ensure the delivery of the necessary scale of housing within the Northwich settlement area the Council should be over allocating to provide sufficient contingency for instances when sites do not come forward as planned. • Additional housing allocations should be identified in the Plan. • The wording in Policy N1, or explanatory text, should be amended to make it clear that where planning applications propose new housing beyond the settlement area boundary, and where the development is found to be sustainable, such proposals will be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. • Support for the approach set out within Policy N1 in that it accords with the policies set out in NPPF, NPPG, and it builds on the aims and objectives within the Local Plan (Part One) STRAT 5. • Amended wording suggested addressing the ambiguity in the policy which as drafted, could be interpreted to state that all land adjacent to waterways has a historic association with the waterway. • Support for Policy N 1 which is considered consistent with the objectives in the emerging policies of the Northwich Neighbourhood Plan.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• The Northwich settlement area boundary should be amended to include a number of suggested sites for housing development. • Requests to review the Green Belt around Northwich and to allow development of land for housing, including the identification of specific sites within the Green Belt.
N 2 - Northwich regeneration areas	• N2.A Weaver Square – request to include three vacant retail units located immediately adjacent to the draft boundary of the Weaver Square Development Area to be included within the regeneration area. • N2.B Winnington Works – considered the policy could be strengthened by including a requirement to safeguard land for the provision or extension of a school within the site. • Policy N2.B should include sufficient flexibility to allow for some elements of the wider development scheme to come forward where it is economically viable, and it is in accordance with a wider comprehensive development scheme for the site. • Promotion of brownfield land to provide a logical extension to the Winnington Urban Village site. • N2.C – suggest that this policy includes a requirement for proposals to include an assessment of the impact on education facilities, and also a requirement to safeguard land to meet this need. • N2.C – important for the Council to ensure that any proposed residential development would not conflict with the existing and emerging surrounding employment land uses. • N2.C – the area proposed for residential development within the Wincham site should be identified on the proposals map • The allocations/HELAA sites in Northwich have been assessed against their relative potential impact in terms of radio interference to the Jodrell Bank telescopes.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
N 3 - Meeting the outstanding housing requirement in Northwich	• Support for the Council in the need to allocate sites in and around Northwich, however it is recommended that further flexibility/ contingency is still required. • Considered that there is a need to review the proposed site allocations in the Northwich Urban Area, and ensure that any sites which are allocated are deliverable within the Plan period. • Submission of a number of sites as additional and alternative housing land allocations. • N2.C – the area proposed for residential development within the Wincham site should be identified on the proposals map and in policy N3. • N3.B – object to the proposed inclusion of Site N4.B as a suitable employment site, and as such other employment land needs to be allocated within Northwich to address this shortfall.
N 4 - Employment land provision in Northwich	• Support for the employment allocation on land to the south west of Gadbrook Park (N4.F). • Land identified in Policy N2.C as a regeneration area is also identified under policy N4 as employment land which is considered to be inconsistent with Part One of the Local Plan STRAT 5. • The Policy should be more flexible to allow other uses on the land allocations identified particularly for developments that may not fall within the identified use classes and which may be temporary in nature. • Objection to the proposed inclusion of Site N4.B as a suitable employment site, and as such other employment land needs to be allocated within Northwich to address this shortfall. • Approach to allocation of employment land is unsound. Policy EP 2 should be modified to allocate Land to the East of Protos for large-scale (25 ha) employment uses (B1(c) and B2 use classes).

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
N 5 - Gadbrook Park	- No further development of Gadbrook Park is warranted until the impacts on the road network have been addressed. - Support for improvements and enhancements to the rail network and safeguarding sufficient land for a railway station. - Support for the site specific policy to comprehensively plan the site and the principle of a development brief. - Support for the policy and points 5, 10, 11, 12 and 13 to be taken forward through a comprehensive masterplan (some impact assessment work already been done and will be expanded for the development brief together with additional studies on ecology and drainage).
N 6 - Northwich conservation area	Unconventional building methods and techniques may need to be employed when building in Northwich town centre.
5 Winsford	This section should make specific reference to the proposed improvements to the link between Winsford/ Middlewich and the M6 Junction 18 by means of proposed by-pass, consideration of developer contributions and evidence of effective co-operation with Cheshire East Council.
W 1 - Winsford settlement area	- Settlement boundary changes proposed. - The HELAA sites in Winsford have been assessed against their relative potential impact in terms of radio interference to the Jodrell Bank telescopes. - Housing supply may not be as high as Council claims, with no allowance for delay in delivery of planning permissions or strategic sites. Additional housing sites should be identified.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	- It is not appropriate to rely on Winsford Neighbourhood Plan sites because they have not had rigorous assessment that other sites allocated for housing in other settlements in Part Two have had. - Additional residential land allocations submitted.
W 2 - Employment land provision in Winsford	- Approach to allocation of employment land is unsound. Policy EP 2 should be modified to allocate Land to the East of Protos for large-scale (25 ha) employment uses (B1(c) and B2 use classes). - The Policy should be more flexible to allow other uses on the land allocations identified particularly for developments that may not fall within the identified use classes and which may be temporary in nature.
6 Rural area	- Support consistency with draft Cuddington and Sandiway neighbourhood plan. - The assumptions and interpretations made concerning transport availability for Ashton Hayes are flawed. - Object to the absence of a policy for Middlewich within Part Two of the Local Plan to reflect Policy STRAT 7 of Part One. - Land should be identified at Centurion Way for housing led mixed-use development, or otherwise an opportunity area, to acknowledge and address unresolved housing land supply issues in Cheshire East.
R 1 - Development in the rural area	- Local Service Centre methodology incorrect because: - it should factor in neighbouring Council's public transport provisions, for settlements close to Cheshire West and Chester boundaries; - the latest public transport data should be used;

Publication Draft consultation summary

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	○ settlements only served by shuttle bus or Rural Rider Service are not sustainable; ○ consideration of public transport availability is too narrow; ○ use wider sustainability indicators/ range of services and facilities is too narrow; ○ it is too simplistic and contains errors/omissions; ○ services and facilities data needs updating and checking; ○ availability of employment is not considered; ○ availability of a school should be given greater weight; ● Support/object to the identification of various settlements as Local Service Centres. ● Suggestions for the identification of settlements as additional/alternative Local Service Centres. ● Local Plan (Part One) housing requirements are 'at least' minimum totals; however, Local Plan (Part Two) treats these as maximums. Extant planning permissions may not come forward. Additional housing allocations should be made to boost the delivery of housing, in line with national policy. ● Development should be supported on the edge of Key Service Centre settlement boundaries, which is consistent with Local Plan (Part One). ● Amend policy to: support the redevelopment of buildings and vacant or underused land; support infill development of 1-8 dwellings; support affordable housing to meet local needs, within Local Service Centres; set out criteria for defining a Local Service Centres; provide land for self-build and custom house-building; provide further explanation on what constitutes a local housing need; allow settlements to change designation to a Local or Key Service Centre with the addition of facilities; allow all settlements with a community facility should be able to grow by 5% over the plan

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	period; clarify that infill development is appropriate all Green Belt villages not just those identified as Local Service Centres; introduce a presumption in favour of development for schemes up to 10 dwellings in a Local Service Centre where re-use of rural buildings are proposed; allow any scale of development with Local Service Centre boundaries; include wording that neighbourhood plans will require HRA screening; include provision for a planning charge to support the upkeep of the Sandstone Ridge. • Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres are not concepts recognised in the NPPF. • Concern that development in Local Service Centres must be matched against the capacity and investment of services and facilities, including already consented development. • Policy should include all rural development or references to specific relevant development plan policies within the Rural Chapter, and could be divided into separate policies relating to Neighbourhood Plans, Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres and the countryside. • The boundaries of villages and settlements should be defined by physical characteristics other than the current existing built development and designated open space. • Various suggestions received for settlement boundary amendments, including land located within the Green Belt. • Local Service Centres that lie in the Green Belt should be inset rather than being washed over. • Numerous sites/land suggested for allocation for residential, retail and mixed use development, including sites located within the Green Belt. • Land to the east of Protos should be allocated for large-scale employment development.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
R 2 - Meeting the outstanding housing requirement in Tattenhall	• Sites suggested for allocation/safeguarded for residential development to meet needs at the end of the plan period and beyond. • Amend settlement boundary and R 2.A site boundary to match current outline planning application. • Criteria 2 and 4 repeat other policies and should be removed. • The identified sites are crossed by a number of sewers and protection measures will be required where development would impact upon these assets. The sewerage network and treatment works can accommodate flows from the proposed development.
R 3 - Employment land provision in the rural area	• Land adjoining Holmes Chapel Road in Middlewich (Cheshire FRESH) should be allocated for employment uses and included within the Middlewich settlement boundary. • Further comments on the Cheshire FRESH relating to adjacent land (subject of a planning application for residential development). • Approach to allocation of employment land is unsound. Policy EP 2 should be modified to allocate Land to the East of Protos for large-scale (25 ha) employment uses (B1(c) and B2 use classes). • Site allocation R 3.B should reflect the site's significance as the interface with the rural surroundings of Helsby. • Support site allocation R 3.B. • Offsite sewers will be required for site allocation R 3.A and R 3.C.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Other sites promoted for mixed-use and employment development. • Policy should be more flexible to allow other uses on the land allocations identified particularly for developments that may not fall within the identified use classes and which may be temporary in nature.
7 Green Belt and countryside	• More certainty is needed to ensure that the Plan will not lead to adverse impacts on the site integrity of Mersey Estuary SPA/Ramsar. • Support that Bostock Green remains within the Green Belt and Countryside. • Object to large-scale tourist/leisure development at Bostock. • Support that Bostock is not identified as a Local Service Centre. • Agree with policy support for existing rural businesses. • Object to the over restriction where Higher Education development including student housing might be delivered to accommodate the growth of the University. • Green gap separating Higher Wincham from Pickmere should be retained. • Support for landscape policies. • Productive farmland should also be protected for food production. • A Green Belt policy should be included, and the policies map should show clearly where Green Belt applies as distinct from Countryside. • Amend wording and include all developments permissible in open countryside and then separately in the Green Belt. NPPF paragraph 55 identifies outstanding or innovative designs as an acceptable exception in the open countryside.



Publication Draft consultation summary

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
GBC 1 - Commercial sites in the Green Belt	- GBC1 should be extended to refer to other commercial and employment sites within the Green Belt. - The policy should be more flexible to allow other uses on the land allocations identified particularly for developments that may not fall within the identified use classes and which may be temporary in nature. - Minerals developments need not be inappropriate in Green Belt – include a specific policy for minerals. - Support requirements for agreed development briefs which make provision for appropriate infrastructure. - Support for the identification of Chester Zoo in GBC 1.A, and reference to the development strategy for the site. - GBC 1.A – expand site boundary to include land supporting zoo operations. Parking requirements should be considered on a case-by-case basis. - Support for intention of GBC1.C, although boundary should be amended to include land to the east of the barracks/A41, north of the barracks and south of Shropshire Union canal. - GBC 1.C – policy could make provision for phased residential development, through a comprehensive masterplan in accordance with the policy across the current and next local plan period. Given the site is to be covered by a development brief, criterion 6 relating to open space is inflexible and should be covered by DM 35 and DM 36. - GBC 1.D – amend policy to consult with Highways England, and any mitigation measures, if required. - Support for GBC1.E at Capenhurst. For clarity this could be expanded to support development associated with the ongoing management and processing of NDA owned material and the nuclear decommissioning process.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Dale Barracks, if disposed of could be a community in its own right. • Suggestion of land/sites to be included in the policy, including sites located within the Green Belt.
GBC 2 - Protection of landscape	• Change the title to Areas of Special Landscape Value. • The policy, in addition to Part One policies STRAT 9 and ENV 2 is unnecessary, and should only relate to landscapes defined as ASCV status. • Support policy/ protection with respect to Bostock. • Request to include Oakmere as an Area of Special County Value. • Include a further requirement that development in or affecting an ASCV should achieve a net environmental gain. • The policy should be more flexible to allow developments which may be temporary in nature. • Minerals safeguarding needs to be considered and referenced in the text. • Green Belt release is required to meet the minimum housing needs of the Borough over the Plan period, including suggestions for the allocation of a site for housing development within the Green Belt. • Policy should be split into two separate policies – not all countryside qualifies as an ASCV. • Object to the designation of the Dee Coastal Area ASCV – North.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	- Land suggested for allocations for residential development and for employment uses and inclusion with s settlement boundary. - Support the deletion of Policy NE12 and support that land at Green Lane, Davenham Site should not be designated as an ASCV.
GBC 3 - Key settlement gaps	- Policy should cover other areas such as Mickle Trafford and Guilden Sutton. - Amend policy to clarify how applications will be judged in terms of the definition of 'harm'. - Additional settlement gaps suggested between: Helsby and Frodsham; Hampton Heath and Malpas. - Object to the identification of land within key settlement gaps: A. Lostock Gralam and Northwich; D. Davenham Village and Leftwich Grange (Kingsmead); and, E. Davenham and Moulton. - Policy must retain flexibility to allow for development within key settlement gaps, provided that the specific policy criteria can be met. - Minerals safeguarding needs to be considered and referenced in the text.
8 Transport and accessibility	- Support inclusion of Cuddington Railway station in policy T 3 and proposals in T 5. - Support Transport Strategies evidence base.
T 1 - Local road network improvement schemes	- Until an alignment is approved for the Chester Western Relief Road which has at least as big an impact as the currently protected alignment from the Chester District Local Plan in mitigating congestion, this alignment should not be rescinded and should be retained in the Local Plan (Part Two). - Consider that the Plan should include a much stronger commitment to the Chester Western Relief Road.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Support for the removal of the safeguarded land for the Chester Western Relief Road from the Plan. • Protection measures in respect of water assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset in relation to the alignment of the new Chester Western Relief Road. • Support for the realignment of the Chester Western Relief Road. • Alternative routes for the Chester Western Relief Road should consider the impacts it may have on the development potential of land which may be central to Chester delivering is housing supply at the end of and beyond the current plan period. • When seeking s106 contributions for the Chester Western Relief Road, the Council will need to ensure that they are not seeking S106 contributions toward schemes which are already being funded through CIL contributions. • Support for the inclusion of a northern by-pass of Winsford and Middlewich, however the policy should include specific measures to take it forward within the plan period and should be based on effective co-operation with Cheshire East. • Specific wording in the policy text is required to provide protection to the River Dee and Bala Lake SAC. • Additional wording could be added to acknowledge support for other, as yet undefined, local road network improvement schemes to address the capacity issues at the Winnington Swing Bridge, Northwich. • Support for the Winsford/ Middlewich/ M6 road network scheme. • It is recognised that local road network improvement schemes are necessary to deliver planned levels of growth, and the references in T1 to schemes having to provide for sustainable active travel modes is welcomed.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
T 2 - A56 Hoole Road Corridor	- Alternative provision for the Park and Ride is recommended through increasing the capacity at existing Park and Ride sites. - Continued working between the Council and Highways England is welcomed to understand any highways impacts and ensure suitable junction design.
T 3 - Railway stations	- Include a cross reference to policy DM44 within the policy. - Recommend that Beeston Station is recognised in this policy to strengthen conformity with the 'made' Neighbourhood Plan. - Encouragement for the Plan to promote Frodsham and Helsby Railway as gateways to visiting and exploring the Sandstone Ridge. - Support for the inclusion of Policy T 3 to safeguard land for the expansion and/or improvement of facilities at railway stations, and the statement that development involving the construction of new rail stations, the re-opening of former rail stations, improvement of rail freight facilities, or the development of transport interchange facilities will be supported.
T 4 - Rail corridors	- Encouragement for the Local Plan to designate the Helsby/ Mouldsworth and Tattenhall/ Whitchurch rail corridors as recreational route improvement schemes. - Support for the policy which seeks the protection of disused rail corridors for possible future transport use. - Request for the railway link adjacent to New Warrington Road to be reinstated as a cycle/ footpath and included in policy N 2.C.
T 5 - Parking and access	Concern that there does not seem to be any Council provision for new public car parks in the centre of local service centres.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Wording amendment suggested, deleting the minimum provision requirements for non-residential development electric vehicle parking infrastructure from Table 8.1. • The policy seeks to add in further standards for electric vehicle charging from those in the Parking Standards SPD. In doing so the relationship between the adopted standards and the Local Plan standard for proposed electric standards is confusing and places too high a requirement in relation to retail development. • Wording amendment suggested, deleting the minimum electric vehicle charging provision requirements for residential development from Table 8.1. • Requirement for the Plan to recognise the need for electricity substation provision at New Crane Street car park. • Criterion 1 should provide clarity on the visibility splay standards required. • Policy is not based on proportionate evidence of the need for electric vehicle charging infrastructure or the costs used to assess viability, threatening the delivery of development. • The Plan should include a commitment to investigate car parking provision in the wider countryside (or at least in the Sandstone Ridge area). • Policy should T 5 emphasise that the design of new car parks in the countryside should be appropriate to their setting and the character of the local landscape. • Consideration needs to be given wherever possible to 3 car park spaces per household is provided on new builds. • Parking and access needs secure parking for cycles and access to toilets. • May be more appropriate to apply the requirement for electric charging points to be on a case by case basis, which would allow electric charging points to be incorporated at a later stage to avoid being redundant.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
9 Minerals supply and safeguarding	• Employment Policies and Housing policies must give due regard to the need to safeguard mineral deposits and minerals infrastructure to accord with the NPPF. • There is no reference to silica (industrial) sand which should also be safeguarded. • Amend text to clarify how the steady and adequate supply of minerals will be planned for. • Other text changes required to align with NPPF. • The policy and text should be extensively reviewed and a more detailed assessment undertaken of mineral resources which need to be safeguarded including silica sand, brick clay and building stone.
M 1 - Future sand and gravel working	• Access to quarry sites should be fully assessed for the potential impact on the local road network. The policy should reference the need to mitigate any impacts on the rural road network through improvements to local road infrastructure. • Community engagement should be sought on the plans for the after use of the sites at the planning consent stage. • Forest Hill should not extend too close to the railway; banks need to be maintained for unusual future weather patterns. • The policy is negatively worded – wording changes proposed. • The word minimum needs to be inserted, to ensure the figures quoted are not deemed to be a maximum or cap to appropriate development. • Any control of phasing should be conditioned as per the working programme and is not a matter for policy – the related text should be deleted from the policy.
M 2 - Mineral safeguarding areas - prior extraction of minerals	• The policy provides protection for mineral resources but omits minerals infrastructure.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• The policy would benefit from advice to developers on the nature of information required to ensure any proposed development does not impact upon mineral deposits or infrastructure. • It is proposed that reference to hydro carbons should be deleted from the policy and supporting criteria. • Notwithstanding the nature and depth of hydro carbons, the exploration, appraisal and production of such should not be constrained within MSAs as proposed by the policy.
M 3 - Proposals for minerals working	• Criterion iii of the policy does not accord the GDPO – wording amendments suggested. • It is not clear what the term “sensitively located” means – the paragraph should be deleted. • The reference to the transportation of minerals should be deleted as this would be addressed through an EIA and STRAT 10. • Criterion 3 should be deleted as it is duplicated in Policies DM 44 and 45. • Slope and tip stability are covered by Mines and Quarries legislation and should therefore be deleted from this policy. • Any impact on utilities will be a commercial decision between the land owner, the utilities supplier and the developer – the paragraph should be deleted.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
M 4 - Proposals for exploration, appraisal or production of hydrocarbons	- There are elements of the criteria which would benefit from clarity and possible amendment. It is proposed 'supported' is substituted with 'permitted'. - The explanatory text should be amended to refer to the 'use of land for the exploration, appraisal and production of oil and gas...' and safeguarding be deleted as the exclusion of such in safeguarding areas would be contrary to national policy and unnecessarily restrictive.
M 5 - Restoration of minerals and oil and gas sites	- The policy should include a commitment that the priority after-use of sand and gravel workings will be for nature conservation and that they will be restored to habitats which will deliver the borough's strategic ecological network. - Minerals should only be removed where the operator has sufficient financial reserves to restore the site to something acceptable and usable by the local community. - It is suggested the policy be titled 'Restoration of minerals and hydro carbon sites' to be consistent with policy M 4. - The policy criteria should make provision in the phased sequence for exploration and appraisal of hydrocarbons and should make provision for hard end uses and provide for aftercare 'where appropriate'. - The word minimum is superfluous in relation to restoration proposals and should be deleted.
M 6 - Salt and brine working	No comments received.
M 7 - Industrial sand proposals	Clarification is required as it is unclear if the reference to "outside this site" is referring to the area immediately adjoining the site boundary or to other sites where proposals for industrial site may be submitted in the future.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• The policy should be amended to ensure that there is a commitment to maintain provision of permitted reserves at the end of the plan period. • Amend the title and the text throughout the plan to read “Silica (Industrial) Sand”.
M 8 - Minerals infrastructure	• The minerals section should be restructured to have the provision policies together and safeguarding policies together. • It is imperative that the safeguarding is not limited to the site boundary.
10 Development Management	• Support alignment with draft Cuddington neighbourhood plan. • Support clarity policies provide.
DM 1 - Development of previously developed land	• Amend policy to support alternative uses on previously developed land where they result in benefits to the surrounding area. • Policy assumes all commitments, strategic sites and housing land allocations will be delivered. There is no flexibility in this approach and further sites should be allocated in Part Two. • Object to prioritisation or that a sequential approach to previously development land should be taken. • Amend policy to set out sustainability criteria against which all types of land should be assessed. • Amend policy to reflect minerals safeguarding areas.
DM 2 - Impact on residential amenity	• Delete text “...other considerations including separation distances in the immediate surroundings.....,” to prevent weakening in standards.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	- Policy must be applied on a case by case basis where site specific circumstances can be taken into account. - The term 'amenity' is too ambiguous and requires clarification, to ensure the policy is applied consistently.
DM 3 - Design, character and visual amenity	- Add reference to the 'Manifesto for Contemporary Design' approved as part of the One City Plan. - Policy unnecessarily duplicates Local Plan (Part One) Policy ENV6 and may stifle innovative development through being overly prescriptive. - Policy recognises that it will not be possible or appropriate for all proposals to meet all of the criteria identified. - Policy needs to be applied on a case by case basis where site specific circumstances can be taken into account. - The term "in keeping" is overly prescriptive, may stifle innovative development, and may result in poor quality schemes where the quality of existing development in the surrounding area is poor – replace with "respect".
DM 4 - Sustainable construction	- Object to policy requirements as unduly onerous and unjustified – in particular requirements for highest levels of energy and water efficiency that is practical and viable, and BREEAM rating of 'Excellent'. - Policy provides a very low threshold and should be stronger. - Evidence has not been provided for the introduction of the optional higher national standard for water consumption. - Amend policy to encourage higher levels of sustainable construction (rather than mandate them) and allow scheme viability to be taken into account.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Policy should make reference to neighbourhood plans that exist and the further detail that they provide. • The requirement for major development proposals to be designed and incorporate measures to enable connections to a district heat network to be made now or in the future, is likely to have viability and delivery implications, which do not appear to have been considered in the Viability Study.
11 Economic growth, enterprise and town centres	• Support that Bostock Green remains within the Green Belt and Countryside. • Object to large-scale tourist/leisure/commercial development at Bostock. • Support that Bostock is not identified as a Local Service Centre. • Agree with policy support for existing rural businesses. • Very small-scale camping and caravan sites in rural areas are supported. • Support inner city regeneration of mixed residential community in partnership with small business, which is undermined by the plan's emphasis on the studentification of Chester city centre. • Approach aligns with draft Cuddington neighbourhood plan. • Visitor accommodation should be located main towns and smaller developments in Local Service Centres.
DM 5 - Protection and refurbishment of employment land and premises	• The requirement to market a site for 12 months would delay acceptable development in certain circumstances. • Support for the policy which requires an assessment of ground conditions. • The policy is too onerous and inflexible in its approach to allowing alternative uses to be proposed on sites allocated for employment.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• The requirement for a development to be necessary to secure additional employment development that would not otherwise be viable is contrary to the provisions of national policy. • It is recommended that the policy includes provisions for the decision maker to consider other criteria on a case-by-case basis so as not to preclude the delivery of development which helps meet wider sustainability objectives in line with NPPF. • The policy is overly onerous in that it requires all five of the listed policy tests to be met for a loss of employment land to be acceptable. • Consideration should be given to the introduction of a threshold for sites which require marketing evidence before they are considered for redevelopment.
DM 6 - New agricultural and forestry buildings	• The requirement for developer to show that there is “an established need” for the development in connection with the agricultural or forestry enterprise should be removed.
DM 7 - Rural diversification of land based businesses	• The restriction to only allow rural diversification related to an existing business is contrary to paragraph 28 of the NPPF. • The reference to ‘goods that require a countryside location’ should be removed from the policy or should be specified for clarity. • Where proposals for rural diversification are allowed within and adjacent to the Cheshire Sandstone Ridge, a planning charge should be levied. • Support for the inclusion of criteria setting out the need for transport assessments in sensitive locations. • The policy should be revised to apply to all types of rural business and enterprise. • The policy should reflect minerals safeguarding areas where redevelopment of land may be incompatible.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
DM 8 - Equestrian development	• The requirements in the policy for additional buildings are too restrictive and fail to allow new enterprises on open field sites where there are no current buildings. • The policy should clarify what is meant by 'small in scale'. • The policy should include the requirement that where proposals are allowed within and adjacent to the Cheshire Sandstone Ridge, a planning charge should be levied and earmarked for a Sandstone Ridge Sustainable Fund.
DM 9 - Visitor accommodation	• Support for DM9 which directs large-scale visitor accommodation to sustainable settlements where amenities and transport links are available. • Support for directing smaller scale visitor accommodation to key and local service centres which is appropriate to the size of the settlement. • Agree that agricultural diversification should only be supported where the viability of a rural business is in need of support and should not be allowed where change of use requires the removal of a viable rural business. • The requirement to utilise existing buildings in the countryside is too restrictive and precludes holiday accommodation such as chalets. • To seek to define all new build visitor accommodation and chalet development as inappropriate development in the Green Belt therefore contravenes National Policy. • In line with NPPF, the policy should support the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations. • Where visitor accommodation is allowed within and adjacent to the Cheshire Sandstone Ridge, a planning charge should be levied. • The restrictive policy may disadvantage the potential to add to the rural economy and employment opportunities.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
DM 10 - Caravan and camping sites	- Support for the explanatory text to the policy which recognises that caravans and chalet developments have the potential for significant harm to the landscape. - Support for the policy and its relationship with the overarching policies of Local Plan (Part One) which seek to ensure that proposals for touring recreational caravan and camping sites in the countryside are small in scale to limit impact on landscape. - Support for the policy which seeks to ensure that new visitor accommodation is provided in the most sustainable locations where they are accessible by sustainable modes of transport and have access to services and facilities and where there is good accessibility via major roads. - For clarity, the policy should refer to ancillary buildings being “of a scale appropriate to the level of camping and caravanning provided on the site” rather than small scale. - Where visitor accommodation is allowed within and adjacent to the Cheshire Sandstone Ridge, a planning charge should be levied.
DM 11 - Safeguarded areas around aerodromes	The supporting text should be strengthened to include reference to lighting that may affect the operations of an aerodrome.
DM 12 - Jodrell Bank	The policy could be strengthened by stating that only development that would not impair the efficiency of the Jodrell Bank radio Telescope will be supported.
DM 13 - Oulton Park	Support for the policy which includes criteria specifying the need to ensure development does not lead to unacceptable increases in traffic congestion and promotes sustainable forms of transport to and from the site.
DM 14 - City and town centres	- For clarity, the explanation of ‘adequately marketed’ should be included in the policy text. - Local Retail Centre map changes proposed for Saltney.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• The marketing requirements are too onerous and inflexible and should be removed from the policy. • The policy's reference to "current market conditions" is superfluous as market conditions will evolve over the plan period to 2030. • The policy fails to recognise there could be overriding reasons to ensure buildings are kept occupied and in active use, that might outweigh the policy requirements. • The policy sets out two differing and conflicting approaches to applications within the Rows. • Policy CH 5 (Chester conservation areas) encourages new uses for historic buildings on the Rows for commercial viability reasons, however, this is not properly recognised within this policy.
DM 15 - District and local retail centres	• Saltney (Chester Street) Local Centre boundary should be amended to include retail uses to the west of the railway line.
DM 16 - Shopfronts	• The reference to the Chester city conservation area and The Rows should be included in the main policy text rather than the explanation.
DM 17 - Advertisements	• Criteria 1 and 8 of the policy are too onerous and should be deleted. • The requirements set out in the explanatory text for conservation areas and listed buildings should be included in the policy text. • Question whether the policy extends to banners and 'A' boards? • For clarity, wording is suggested to improve the definition of a 'moving' signs, Areas of Special Control of Advertisements and the types of illumination.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
DM 18 - ICT and telecommunications	- It is considered that the Council should work proactively with the telecommunications providers to extend the provision rather than relying on the development industry to provide this infrastructure. The requirement for developers to make provision for the installation and maintenance of ICT networks within new developments should be removed from the policy. - Policy wording changes proposed as the inclusion of digital infrastructure is not within the direct control of the development industry. The policy could create deliverability issues for development and developers. - Policy DM18 should be strengthened to highlight the sensitivity of ICT and telecommunications developments in ASCVs, and that they must preserve and enhance landscape character and will not be permitted if they cannot do so.
12 Housing	- Amend policy to place greater emphasis on the delivery of other mixed residential etc. needs in Chester (other than student accommodation). - The plan should allocate sites or include policies that will assist in securing specialist housing accommodation. - The Part Two plan treats the Part One housing minimum delivery targets as maximal ceilings and ignores the national focus of seeking to significantly boost housing delivery. - Plan needs to be in line with Council's THRIVE objectives and recognise the impact increasing demand of a growing student population will have on delivery of services to other sections of the community.
DM 19 - Proposals for residential development	- Travellers should be identified as an exception to this policy. - Accessibility for disabilities is not age restricted i.e. relevant to wider population that just the elderly. - Criteria 7iii and 7ix should be deleted as they are contrary to the NNPF.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Paragraph 12.18 should be amended as capacity should be based on individual site and not always same volume / density as buildings being replaced. • Support for policy relating the 'identified settlements'. • Criteria for the countryside are too restrictive (contrary to paragraph 55 of the NPPF).
DM 20 - Mix and type of new housing development	• Traveller plots should be required on large scale housing developments. • The plan should identify / provide land for self-build and custom build housing, and further details should be provided to aid the design and viability of schemes. • The objective of providing mixed and balanced communities is supported but there is an imbalance caused by expanding University. • Higher optional Building Regulations – have not been justified and there is no evidence to support the inclusion in policy. • Flexible and pragmatic approach welcomed. • Requirements relate solely to new build dwellings and therefore the policy does not address the needs of an ageing population wishing to remain in their current homes. • Policy does not address adaptations to existing housing stock. • Viability of developments may affect delivery of housing. • Policy does not consider houseboats and moorings. • Wheelchair accessibility requirements can only be applied to affordable housing elements that are allocated by the LA. How will the Council identify need and allocate houses? • Support provision of range of house types and sizes but policy should remain flexible and ensure scheme viability.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• The policy should apply to the needs of the borough and not the needs of the 'local area'. • Support recognition that higher Building Regulations standards are considered through viability. • No land is allocated in the rural area where there is greatest need for older persons housing.
DM 21 - Development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse	• There should be an allowance for demolished buildings when calculating the size of new buildings. • Policy should make reference to the rural areas as well as the Green Belt. • Support for maintaining character and appearance of buildings and their surroundings. • Paragraph 12.21 should be expanded to include 'extensions to existing dwellings'. • Backyard and loft developments should be carefully monitored so that additional student accommodation is not created through these developments.
DM 22 - Change of use to dwellinghouses and residential conversions	• Concerned about permissions for HMOs. • Policy prohibits the development of modern agricultural structures being converted to dwellings which can provide housing in rural areas to meet needs. • Support for change of use to dwellings in identified settlements – this should be expanded to include whole of the rural area. • Criteria 1 and 2 are contrary e.g. buildings being redundant, and restricting to ancillary / incidental to the dwelling house. Both criteria should be deleted.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Criterion 3 goes beyond the NPPF and should be amended to read “without the need for disproportionate additions”. • Requirements of para 12.35 are not included in the policy itself and should be moved to the policy.
DM 23 - Delivering affordable housing	• Approach to off-site delivery / financial contributions should be flexible. • Support for overall approach to delivery of affordable housing. • Request for a 4th preference – transfer of land to Parish Councils or Community Land Trusts where there is no demonstrated need in a spatial area. • The term ‘exceptional circumstances’ needs further explanation / should be deleted. • Do not agree with preferences 2 and 3 to be provided within same spatial area. • Welcome options of off-site provision or financial contributions to deliver affordable housing in same spatial area. • Policy should consider inclusion of Starter Homes as an intermediate form of affordable housing. • Welcome cross references to SOC 1. • Policy fails to acknowledge Written Ministerial Statement relating to threshold (10 or more) and CWaC has no areas subject to lower thresholds. • Policy would not deliver affordable housing in LSCs (as threshold should be as set out in Written Ministerial Statement).
DM 24 - Rural exception sites	• Local connection should remain in perpetuity. • Policy is overly prescriptive.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Support aims of policy / providing rural exception sites for affordable housing. • Definition on need is required – suggest using eligibility criteria for Council's housing register. • Policy does not accord with SOC 2 / Local Plan (Part One). • Not reasonable to expect Parish Councils to prepare up to date needs assessments. • Support details that require local needs surveys prepared in consultation with Parish Councils. • A needs study by an independent body is questioned – any study should be considered on its merits – should not be an essential requirement.
DM 25 - Essential rural workers dwellings	• Criterion 6 is contrary to paragraph 55 of NPPF – delete requirements for legal tie to farm holding / rural business.
DM 26 - Specialist accommodation	• Policy should make reference to mobility and the needs of people with disabilities as well as the elderly. • Support policy / making provision for specialist accommodation. • Concern as no sites have been identified to deliver specific housing to meet needs of ageing population. • Sites should be allocated in rural area to meet needs for specialist accommodation. • Higher building standards should not be required.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Object to requirement for affordable housing as part of any self-contained element of a scheme. • Agreement that extra care schemes should be within close proximity to services and facilities.
DM 27 - Student accommodation	• Strongly oppose policy as detrimental to other development intentions set out in the Local Plan. • Overly restrictive locational requirements (acceptable travel distance should be much greater). • Adverse impacts of location of multiple approved PBSA schemes. • Student accommodation should take account of disabled access and rooms designed to be accessible. • Welcome / support inclusion of a needs test. • Supportive of principles to guide location and ensure high quality developments that are sympathetic to communities. • Policy should refer to “or other further/higher education establishment” in relation to needs test.
DM 28 - Houses in Multiple Occupation	• The thresholds should be defined by number of occupants of dwellings and not the proportion of dwellings • The Council does not have a robust system of management of stock. • Studentification has adverse effects on health and well-being of communities; puts pressures on services, businesses and communities. • HMO should include disabled access.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Impacts of studentification have not been researched. • Parking – no reference to car parking in the policy. The policy also assumes that HMOs are only in urban locations as it references secure cycle parking.
13 Health and well-being DM 29 - Health impacts of new development	• Studentification will have an adverse effect on the health and well-being of communities, through increased pressure on services and anti-social behaviour. • Studentification of conurbations will have an adverse effect on the health and well-being of communities – counter to the Council's THRIVE policies. • Support greater flexibility included in policy in response to previous comments. • Amend policy to specify the threshold of development that would trigger the need for a health assessment. • Amend policy to include reporting health impacts in Design and Access Statements, indicating when significant adverse effects on health and well-being might occur, and remove reference to proximity to schools. • Remove requirement for all new build residential and commercial schemes to include a statement considering the health implications. • Amend policy to clarify what scale of development will require developer contributions and how viability considerations will be accounted for. • Policy should require development proposals to provide accessibility to greenspace and recreational routeways. • Policy is negatively worded and should be redrafted to put the emphasis on promoting health communities through good design and layout and promoting access to green/blue infrastructure.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
DM 30 - Noise	• Policy does not address noise/adverse impact from student occupation in local communities. • Policy is considered to be overly prescriptive, it does not reflect the relevant standards and good practice guidance, and is not justified. • The noise levels set within the policy do not reflect good practice guidance and BS 8233:2014, and should be deleted from the policy. • The policy lacks flexibility to accommodate development which may be suitable despite not meeting the standards quoted. • It fails to properly consider national policy, which highlights the importance of considering new development within an appropriate context. • The identification of working hours for demolition and construction works when residential development is likely to be affected within the policy is over prescriptive and unjustified and should be deleted. • Reference to 'Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise published in May 2017 should be included. • The text should correctly reference the title of BS 5228, namely BS5228:2009=A1:2014 "Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites". • An SPD is the more appropriate location to provide specific noise standards, methodologies and guidance, and absolute thresholds should not be applied in the policy. • The requirement for industrial or commercial noise to be 5dB (A) or more below background level is contrary to Mineral Planning Policy Guidance, WHO Guidance, and recent planning appeal/application decisions.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
DM 31 - Air quality	- It is not clear what 'adjacent' to an Air Quality Management Area constitutes, and unreasonable to provide for 'future occupiers'. It is also unclear what would constitute an 'appropriate scheme of mitigation'. The policy would benefit from clearer definition of what it seeks to provide for. - Should be clearer guidance on how funding for projects to improve air quality will be calculated and more clarity on what those projects may be and how they will be delivered. - Support the inclusion of criteria to ensure development does not give rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life, particularly proposals within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).
DM 32 - Land contamination and instability	Wording amendments required to improve clarity. Suggestions include: moving the last sentence to the of the 'instability' part of the policy, and replace the term 'underground' with 'land stability'.
DM 33 - New or extension to hazardous installations	No comments received.
DM 34 - Development in the vicinity of hazardous installations	The supporting text should be clear that mineral extraction could be an acceptable exception as a form of development.
14 Open space, sport and recreation	Approach aligns with draft Cuddington neighbourhood plan.
DM 35 - Open space and new development	- Policy should include provision for disabled access. - Suggest that a site threshold (ha) be used rather than a capacity approach, as it might not be appropriate for all sites to deliver on site provision. - Concerned with the requirement for provision of allotments and parks, particularly where there are well used and under-funded facilities nearby which could benefit from additional funding.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Should remove the site size thresholds for allotments and introduce a commuted sum for all allotment provision. • A definition of play space for children and play space for youths should be provided as part of Policy DM 35. • Should provide details of surrounding playable space that is required in addition to the quantity standard of play space. • Should amend the access standards in Table 14.1 for play space for youths to reflect the appropriate access standard set out in FiT guidance for MUGAs, NEAPs etc., unless it can be justified otherwise. • Policy should be amended to say that where no suitable, accessible sites exist for the provision or enhancement of open space then no planning obligation will be sought by the council. • Object to the protection of non-designated open space. This requirement should be removed from the policy and supporting text. • Standards should take account of local site specific circumstances and should be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document rather than the policy. • Support the inclusion of open space standards and thresholds in the policy and the flexibility to provide a financial contribution for off-site provision. • Object to the designation of land SW of the Old Broken Cross pub, Middlewich Rd, Rudheath as open space under policy SOC 6. The site does not meet the definition of 'Accessible Natural Green Space as suggested in the Open Space study. • The allotments adjacent to the recreation ground in Willaston have been incorrectly shown on the Policies Map. This should be amended so that the whole of the recreation ground including the allotments is protected. • Support the non-designation of site at Lache Lane as open space.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
DM 36 - Provision for sport and recreation	- Support policy as a number of Wirral based sports clubs regularly use facilities within Cheshire West and Chester. - Policy should take account of disability access.
DM 37 - Recreational routeways	- Policy should take account of disability access. - Request that the Marches Way be added to the list of strategic recreational routeways. - Support recognition of the need to improve strategic cross border recreational linkages. - Support reference to opportunities to extend and improve access to green corridors and the local footpath and cycle network.
DM 38 - Waterways and mooring facilities	- Suggest amendments and additional criteria including: conservation and enhancement of the industrial heritage of canals; opportunities for maximising carbon emissions and the need to avoid impacting on navigational safety. - Should clearly define which waterways this policy applies to and specifically exclude the Manchester Ship Canal.
DM 39 - Culture and community facilities	- Object to the requirement to provide public art which is not necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms and would fail the tests in the NPPF and CIL regulations. - Policy should be reworded to say that where appropriate, the Council will discuss with applicants the prospects of public art being provided as part of new development. - Policy should allow for development of new healthcare facilities within and on the periphery of key and local service centres.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Support policy, reference to DCMS needs to be corrected to reflect the department's new title. • Welcome support for proposals that would provide new community facilities in local service centres. • Add to point 1 of the policy – 'supported by the Parish Council'. • Policy is not broad enough in its consideration of what 'community facilities' might include. • Add wording which would support proposals for community facilities across all land use classes where community benefits can be demonstrated. • Policy should take account of the need for disabled access in community facilities.
15 Flood risk and water management	• Support removal of protection of the 'Glenesk' site for development given its high-risk flood designation.
DM 40 - Development and flood risk	• The Local Plan (Part One) does not specify the sequential test is to be borough-wide and this requirement is considered to be overly onerous and not consistent with national planning policy. • The policy imposes a sequential test requirement, regardless of what flood zone the development is located within. If development is proposed within Flood Zone 1 it is not necessary to apply the sequential test.
DM 41 - Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)	• Support for requirement that SuDS must be incorporated into proposals for major development.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	- The policy is not sufficiently flexible. It does not acknowledge that there are some situations, such as certain ground conditions, where it would not be feasible or appropriate to incorporate SuDS. - Request that the wording of this policy is amended to ensure that SuDs only required “where it is demonstrated to be necessary”.
DM 42 - Flood water storage	No comments received.
DM 43 - Water quality, supply and treatment	Full support for policy DM 43 in those development proposals will be supported where adequate drainage and wastewater infrastructure already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development Support for Policy DM 43 on the basis that the development or expansion of infrastructure could help to support any future increase in demand for water supply in Wirral.
16 Green infrastructure, biodiversity and geodiversity	Request a commitment to prepare Supplementary Planning guidance setting out the types of habitats to be created, restored and managed; where they need to be created; quantitative and qualitative targets for each habitats type to be created/restored; guidance on the shape and configuration of habitats; and suggested mechanisms by which the network is going to be delivered and managed in the long term.
DM 44 - Protecting and enhancing the natural environment	- Policy is overly prescriptive, should simply state that the need for (and scope of) ecological work will be determined through the development management process. - Policy is flexible enough to accommodate new development coming forward which meets strategic policies (STRAT 11) such as an expansion of an existing substation. - Object to inclusion of site at Lache Lane under policy DM44 on the proposals map. - Policy should be amended to include the words ‘where appropriate’ in points 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
	• Points 1 - 15 are overly onerous particularly in relation to non-statutory sites which include the need for a biodiversity metric calculation and HRA. Policy should be amended and streamlined. • Policies map showing the ecological network should be improved. • Need to clarify what information is sought from developments to meet the aims of this policy. • Policy will support the protection and enhancement of cross-boundary ecological links.
DM 45 - Trees, woodland and hedgerows	• Object to the requirement for replacement tree planting which should be at a ratio of one tree rather than at least two new trees for each tree lost. • Policy is flexible enough to accommodate new development coming forward which meets strategic policies (STRAT 11) such as an expansion of an existing substation. • Policy does not take account of the quality and function of trees and hedgerows. It should be amended to ensure that when vegetation is removed its value is established then appropriate mitigation can be offered. • Support the general approach but policy should also define areas designated as 'traditional orchards' and include a commitment to reviewing the current list of Tree Preservation Orders.
17 Historic environment	• Where a proposal would cause less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, this harm should be outweighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
DM 46 - Development in conservation areas	• Concern that the boundaries of conservation areas are out of date and no longer appropriate. Specific information on the planned review of conservation areas needs to be included.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
DM 47 - Listed buildings	The setting of a listed building needs to be assessed on a case by case basis and take into account site specific characteristics. This may mean that parts 6 – 14 of the policy do not always need to be considered in full and could all be given different weighting.
DM 48 - Non-designated heritage assets	- Support that the policy takes account of the fact that not all buildings, structures or landscapes of significance are captured on either the national lists or local lists and that in such cases where a building, structure or landscape can demonstrate its significance then the policy would apply. - It is necessary to ensure that assets which hold little historical value or benefit to the wider population are not unnecessarily protected to the detriment of bringing forward positive sustainable development. The policy is supported on the whole, but the Council must ensure that this is not over restrictive in its enforcement.
DM 49 - Registered Parks and Gardens and Battlefields	Addition of "and Registered Battlefields" should be added in the policy after "Registered Parks and Gardens" for the avoidance of doubt.
DM 50 - Archaeology	- Issue raised re "the setting" of scheduled ancient monuments – wording additions proposed. - Suggestion to add wording to the policy to require that the Planning Authority can request pre-determination archaeological evaluations, when there might be good reasons for believing that there is archaeological material to be found.
18 Energy	- There should therefore be recognition and support for shale gas as an energy which will contribute towards a low carbon future in accordance with national policy. - Policy should support proposals for an observatory to research new and low-carbon energy technologies and foster world-class science and innovation within the Ince Marshes area of Cheshire.

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
DM 51 - Wind energy	• Welcomes the inclusion in policy that applications for wind energy in areas of high landscape value will not be supported.
DM 52 - Solar energy	• Policy should recognise the need to consider Green Belt sites as well as agricultural sites for solar development.
DM 53 - Energy generation, storage and district heat networks	• Criteria should be added requiring good access to the highway network, encouragement of sustainable modes of transport and provision of space for vehicle turning, parking and manoeuvring. • Welcomes support for proposals that establish or expand district heat networks. • Policy should include guidance surrounding hydro-power/hydro tidal energy generation at a cross boundary level.
19 Managing waste	No comments received.
DM 54 - Waste management facilities	• With regard to proposals at Ince Park, welcome consideration of the impact of new development on distinctive townscapes, natural landscapes and features of historic significance and their setting. In particular views from key locations such as Helsby and Frodsham Hills. • Policy is supported as it provides important development management guidance on waste management proposals.
DM 55 - Sites for replacement household waste recycling facilities	• The policy wording should be amended to include the requirement for project stage HRA.
20 Monitoring framework	• Unlike with aggregate provision, the text makes no attempt to maintain the stock of permitted reserve of silica (industrial) sand throughout the plan period.



Publication Draft consultation summary

Local Plan Section/ Policy	Issues raised by representations
A Chester key views and landmark buildings	Plans are not clear and should include a key.
B Replaced and deleted policies	Explain why Policy DM 3 which is about Design, character and visual amenity would be a replacement policy for ENV 5 (Historic Environment) contained in part one of the Local Plan.
C Glossary	The definition of ‘Green Infrastructure’ does not correspond with the definition provided within the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).
SA	- Note that the report identifies that all new dwellings are within a maximum 30 minutes travel time by public transport to a primary school, which compares favourably with the Regional average. To help maintain this position, it would be helpful to safeguard specific sites for new schools within major strategic housing allocations. - Suggest a Planning for Schools topic/background paper is produced.
HRA	The HRA report should provide more information details of the work being carried out by MEAS to deliver a recreation management strategy with regards to potential recreational disturbance to Mersey Estuary SPA/ Ramsar.

Accessing Cheshire West and Chester Council information and services

Council information is also available in Audio, Braille, Large Print or other formats. If you would like a copy in a different format, in another language or require a BSL interpreter, please email us at **equalities@cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk**

إذا أردت المعلومات بلغة أخرى أو بطريقة أخرى، نرجو أن تطلب ذلك منا.

যদি আপনি এই ডকুমেন্ট অন্য ভাষায় বা ফরমেটে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে বলুন।

Pokud byste požadovali informace v jiném jazyce nebo formátu, kontaktujte nás

Jeżeli chciałoby Państwo uzyskać informacje w innym języku lub w innym formacie, prosimy dać nam znać.

ਜੇ ਇਹ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਭੁਗਤਾਨੂੰ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਜਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਰੂਪ ਵਿਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ, ਤਾਂ ਇਹ ਸਾਥੋਂ ਮੰਗ ਲਵੋ।

如欲索取以另一語文印製或另一格式製作的資料，請與我們聯絡。

Türkçe bilgi almak istiyorsanız, bize başvurabilirsiniz.

اگر آپ کو معلومات کسی دیگر زبان یا دیگر شکل میں درکار ہوں تو برائے مہربانی ہم سے پوچھئے۔

Tel: 0300 123 8 123 **Textphone:** 18001 01606 867 670

email: equalities@cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk

web: www.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk