



CEC SADPD Examination Hearing Statement: Matter 6 – General Requirements

Land at Heybridge Lane, Prestbury

On behalf of PH Property Holdings Ltd
September 2021

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	VIABILITY OF SADPD POLICIES AS A WHOLE	2

Prepared By: Charlotte Fowler

Reviewed By: Jon Suckley

Asteer Planning LLP, Suite 510, 275 Deansgate, Manchester, M3 4EL

Version: Final

Date: September 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Hearing Statement has been prepared by Asteer Planning LLP on behalf of PH Property Holdings Ltd (PH Property) and responds to the Matters Issues and Questions for the Examination (MIQs) prepared by the Inspector into Cheshire East Council's Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD).
- 1.2 This Hearing Statement relates to Matter 6 – General Requirements.
- 1.3 PH Property is an SME housebuilder focused on delivering high quality residential development in Cheshire. Over the past 25 years, PH Property has developed a strong track record of developing housing in Cheshire East and their recent developments include: Alderley Park, Alderley Edge, Somerford Booths Hall, Somerford, Congleton and Heys Green, Henbury, Macclesfield.
- 1.4 Our representations in this Hearing Statement reflect PH Property's role as a experienced regional housebuilder with various land interests in Cheshire East.
- 1.5 This statement responds to Question 108 of the MIQs related to Matter 6 – General Requirements. Abbreviations follow those used in the MIQs.

2. VIABILITY OF SADPD POLICIES AS A WHOLE

2.1 This chapter presents PH Property's representations in connection Question 108 of Viability of the SADPD policies as a whole.

Question 108: Does the evidence on viability demonstrate whether the additional costs of policies proposed in the SADPD could be viably supported by as yet uncommitted development sites in the borough, in particular for residential development? Is there any substantive evidence to demonstrate that these additional policy costs would put at risk the delivery of the development requirements in the LPS or planning development in the SADPD.

2.2 The Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies Viability Assessment (Document ED 52) provides viability testing of the SADPD.

2.3 We have raised concerns in our Hearing Statement to Matter 3 – Housing as to the viability implications of Policy HOU 1 Housing Mix and Policy HOU 3 Self and Custom Build Dwellings to the delivery of small and medium sized sites.

2.4 Whilst the Viability Assessment (ED 52) does make reference to the inclusion of Policies HOU 1 and HOU 3 as part of the assessments, the broad brush approach, means that these policies still have the potential to have a negative impact on the viability of a proposed development (particularly small to medium sized developments) based on individual site location and characteristics.

2.5 The Assessment (ED 52) concludes that a requirement for self-build plots is unlikely to adversely impact on viability applying a requirement of 5% of units to be made available for self and custom build. However, it is not clear in the policy wording in Policy HOU 3 what the actual percentage requirement will be with the wording referring to "a proportion" of service plots of land being provided.

2.6 Even at a requirement of 5% for self and custom build, PH Property has concerns that the impact on overall viability will be significant given the complexities in providing such plots as part of wider housing sites. Further representations are provided on this point in response to Question 53 of Matter 3 in PH Property's Matter 3 Hearing Statement.

2.7 Overall, where additional costs are imposed through new SADPD planning policies (such as policies HOU 1 and HOU 3), given the broad brush approach to the viability assessment

of the SADPD, we consider it essential that these policies (HOU 1 and HOU 3) make reference to viability as a consideration for individual applications as requested in our response to Matter 3.