INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE POYNTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EXAMINER: Andrew Mead BSc (Hons) MRTPI MIQ

Liz Osborn
Clerk to Poynton Town Council

Tom Evans
Cheshire East Council

Examination Ref: 01/AM/PNP

Via email

9 April 2019

Dear Ms Osborn and Mr Evans

POYNTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EXAMINATION

Following the submission of the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan (‘the draft Plan’) for examination, I would like to clarify several initial procedural matters.

1. Examination Documentation

I can confirm that I am satisfied that I have received a complete submission of the draft Plan and accompanying documentation, including the Basic Conditions Statement, the Consultation Statement and the Regulation 16 representations, to enable me to undertake the examination.

Subject to my detailed assessment of the draft Plan, I have not at this initial stage identified any very significant and obvious flaws in the Plan that might lead me to advise that the examination should not proceed.

2. Site Visit

I will undertake a site visit to the neighbourhood plan area during the week commencing 8 April 2019. This visit will assist in my assessment of the draft Plan, including the issues identified in the representations.

The site visit will be undertaken unaccompanied. It is very important that I am not approached to discuss any aspects of the Plan or the neighbourhood area, as this may be perceived to prejudice my independence and risk compromising the fairness of the examination process.

3. Written Representations

At this stage, I consider the examination can be conducted solely by the written representations procedure, without the need for a hearing. However, I will reserve the option to convene a hearing should a matter come to light where I consider that a hearing is necessary to ensure the adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case.
4. **Further Clarification**

I have set out in the Annex to this letter some initial questions seeking further clarification from the Qualifying Body, which is Poynton Town Council (PTC) and from Cheshire East Council (CEC). I would be grateful if written responses can be provided within **two weeks** of receipt of this letter. It is possible that I may have further questions, following my site visit.

5. **Examination Timetable**

As you will be aware, the intention is to examine the Plan (including conduct of the site visit) with a view to providing a draft report (for ‘fact checking’) within 4-6 weeks of submission of the draft Plan. However, as I have raised some questions, and may have others following my site visit, I must provide the opportunity to reply. Consequently, the examination timetable will be extended. Please be assured that I will aim to mitigate any delay as far as is practicable. The IPe office team will seek to keep you updated on the anticipated delivery date of the draft report.

If you have any process questions related to the conduct of the examination, which you would like me to address, please do not hesitate to contact the office team in the first instance.

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure a copy of this letter is placed on both the Town Council and the Cheshire East Council websites?

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Your sincerely

*Andy Mead*

Examiner
ANNEX

From my initial reading of the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan and the supporting evidence, I have the following questions and requests in relation to the Plan. I would appreciate it if comments could be received by two weeks from the date of this letter.

Questions for PTC and CEC

1. In the Regulation 16 response, CEC recommends the deletion of over 20 policies in the Plan for a variety of reasons, including conflicts with the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS), references to the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan and addressing strategic issues. Does the Town Council wish to make any response to those recommendations?

2. Policies EGB 4 and EGB 5 each refer to land at Glastonbury Drive. Is this the same site? If not, please could a map be supplied to show the difference?

Questions to CEC

3. Land at Glastonbury Lane is also referred to in the Poynton Settlement Report FD 39 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) evidence base, where it is proposed as a site for the relocation of the Poynton Sports facility. The Regulation 16 response from CEC in relation to EGB 5 comments about the potential relocation of the Poynton Sports Club. The map in FD 39 (page 22) indicates that the land for any such relocation would be a 10 ha site outlined in red. The land which is the subject of Policy EGB 4 appears to be a 1.35 ha site, just to the south east. Therefore, does CEC wish to reconsider its response?

4. Policy EGB 4 identifies the potential development of a small site in the Green Belt (1.35 ha) for housing. The Neighbourhood Plan states that it is safeguarded land for this use. The policies are developed further in HOU 14A and HOU 14B. The definition of Safeguarded Land is a strategic policy in the CELPS. Does CEC have any comments to make on the inclusion of these policies in the Plan?

Questions to PTC

5. I note the differences between the boundary of the Town Centre “as currently defined” in Policy TCB 1 and the boundary as proposed in the emerging SADPD evidence base paper FD 39. I may have further questions after visiting the neighbourhood plan area. However, in the meantime, I would be grateful to know the justification for the extension proposed in the NP of the town centre boundary eastwards along Park Lane to School Lane?

6. I would also be grateful to know the reason for the inclusion of the two blocks of land delineated by a black border on the Town Centre map on page 55 of the Plan. What is their current use and is there a NP policy for them?