

Matter 2 – Planning for growth

Question 21

Representor name - Mckay, JA

Representor ID – 1198643

SAPD version – Revised Publication Draft

In addition to my representation on PYT3, I wish to make the following Hearing position statement.

Question 21

In light of the evidence in the Poynton Sports Mitigation Strategy, would the proposals for housing development on Sites PYT1, PYT3 and PYT4 and the provision of replacement playing fields and sports facilities on land within the Green Belt at Site PYT2 north of Glastonbury Drive, meet the policy requirements of Sports England as a statutory consultee and be consistent with national policy?

No.

Both national planning policy, and the Sport England Exception 4 – require a suitable location.

Location and access to the proposed relocated site is not discussed in the strategy.

The Glastonbury Drive site is 1.5 miles from Poynton High School.

How are they going to get children down to Glastonbury drive during the school day if needed?

The LPS policy quoted (2.5) specifies “readily accessible by public transport, walking and cycling.

But the new proposed relocated site is in an out of town location.

That would also present a barrier to access for the public – it’s a long walk for children, and I wouldn’t want children cycling along the main road.

So, it’s a car journey – if you have a car, or you don’t go.

That would also not align with:

BD01 – Local Plan Strategy – Sustainable development principles

Policy SD1 6 & 17

Policy SD2 1.vi & 1.vii g,

All designed to reduce trip generation

The strategy explains that only one 3g pitch is required for Poynton – and that it should be located at the High School.

The proposed site of the 3g pitch at the High School is insufficient for it to be a full size pitch – which would also make it too small for full size use of other sports on the same surface.

Instead of selling off the 0.76 acres for housing, the LPA should be investing in a full size 3g pitch at the High School for the benefit of future generations.

Because the new site for the sports club has to be profitable, they would also want a 3g pitch – but having two in the town would create competition - so, the new proposed location may not be able to maintain the required quality of the provision due to unknown issues of maintenance costs

The mitigation strategy incorrectly calculates the anticipated pitch demand in relation to population growth.

The strategy at 5.3 identifies a figure of 1.61 people per dwelling which is considerably lower than the evidence base in the LPS:

BD01 – Local plan strategy

Page 15

2.17 “average household size in Cheshire East was 2.29 people”

Poynton is a family town, so the actual population growth is probably higher.

There are a significant number of illogical / unresolved issues in the strategy.

3.21 - Why have ball strike issues not been considered in advance of the proposal?

3.33 Why has the possible loss not been determined before publication of the strategy.

3.34 Another unknown. A clear strategy for the site does not exist and is not evidenced.

3.4 Will membership costs at the new site be the same?

4.3 But not a qualitative gain? and access remains an unknown.

4.12 Will the revenue from not having a 3g pitch fund the future of the facility? Another unknown.

4.15 “This is because of spare capacity elsewhere in the area”

Where?

There is no evidence to say where and how this identified remaining loss will be met.

4.18 Why does there remain an under supply of provision for females? that matches the current state of provision (3.3) and is worrying when you link in with the removal of the netball courts at the high school.

4.21 So the new pitch is even too small for lacrosse

4.23 The pre-planning assessment of the site suitability has not been evidenced to support flood lights?

4.43 & 4.44 It is disappointing that the potential impact on the cricket provision has not been considered and evidenced as part of the strategy.

I sympathise with the authors of the strategy.

Their original evidence base was clear and did not support the release of the Poynton sites.

Nothing has changed in that regard, and if anything, this strategy reinforces their original evidence.

Question 21

Given the need to replace the playing fields and sports facilities in advance of the commencement of housing development, is there a reasonable prospect that three sites will be available and developable for housing within the plan period?

Because of the number of unresolved issues, lack of coherence, and concerns around financial viability – it is unlikely.

The disposal of the playing fields also requires consent from the Secretary of State – I remain doubtful that this strategy would be convincing, or that sufficient time has been allowed.

Thank you