



karl@pearceplanning.co.uk  
+44(0) 7952 048742

Pearce Planning Ltd  
Woodspring House  
17 Hill Road  
Clevedon  
BS21 7NE

Inspector Mike Hayden BSc DipTP MRTPI  
Cheshire East SADPD Examination

## **HEARING POSITION STATEMENT – SADPD EXAMINATION**

Pearce Planning Ltd has been instructed by Cognatum Developments Limited to respond to the Inspector's Questions and to represent their interests at the Examination Hearing for the Cheshire East Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD). To confirm, our client's site of interest is *CFS58 Land at Shirleys Drive, Prestbury*.

Our representation numbers as identified within the Representations database are 1186251 and 1186251 respectively (two numbers issued due to a change in consultancy – i.e. the client was retained by Alan Pearce throughout).

This document includes responses to Questions 13 and 16, which relate to hearing sessions on days 1 and 2 (which comprise Oct 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> respectively). The responses rely in part on our previous representations.

### **MATTER 2 – PLANNING FOR GROWTH**

#### ***Development at Local Service Centres (Policy PG 8 and Site HCH 1)***

13. *Is there a need for further site allocations for housing at the LSCs to be included in the SADPD to ensure the indicative level of housing development set in Policy PG 7 of the LPS will be met in full and the need for affordable housing addressed, in particular at settlements within the North Cheshire Green Belt?*

RESPONSE - PG8 does not make suitable allowance for the provision of Specialist Older Persons Accommodation, and thus fails to accord with the provisions of the NPPF and PPG.

#### ***Safeguarded Land at LSCs (Policy PG 12)***

16. *Is the selection and distribution of sites for designation as Safeguarded Land at the LSCs, as set out in the Local Service Centres Safeguarded Land Distribution Report[21] and the Settlement Reports for Alderley Edge, Bollington, Chelford, Disley, Mobberley and Prestbury[22], based on a robust methodology and justified by proportionate evidence and is it consistent with the LPS and national policy?*

RESPONSE - No, our view is that the site selection process has not been based on a robust methodology nor justified by proportionate evidence. Our submitted representations go into some detail as to how two of the safeguarded sites listed in Policy PG 12 (PRE 2 'Land south of Prestbury Lane' and PRE 3 'Land off Heybridge Lane', Prestbury) were selected on a flawed basis.