

On behalf of Eaton Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group please find below our responses to the questions raised to us in your letter dated 30th March 2020
Examination Ref: 01/AF/ENP.

Question No 3

Policy BNE1 – Undeveloped land that makes a positive contribution to the character of the area: Is such land defined anywhere? How is an applicant to know whether any particular land falls within this definition?

Response

The policy has been drafted to be in general conformity with the emerging PG10 from the Cheshire East Local Plan Part Two, which does not define specific criteria. We agree that it would be useful for applicants to know whether any particular land falls within the definition. We would consider that the heritage assets, green wedges, local green spaces, gateways and views and vistas shown in Figure B2 make a positive contribution to the character of Eaton, and fall within the definition.

Question No 4

Policy BNE1 – CEC Settlement and Infill Boundaries Review (2019): What is the relevance of this reference?

Response

This report considered the approach to defining settlement and infill boundaries in Cheshire East. <https://cheshireeast-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/planning/cs/sadpd/pdevidence>
This forms part of the evidence base which supported the preparation of the part two local plan. The report defined the proposed infill boundary for Eaton. We are happy for the reference to be deleted.

Question No 5

Figure E: Instead of “Settlement Boundary”, should the figure show an “Infill Boundary” that is the same as that shown in Figure C?

Response

Yes, we agree that this “Settlement Boundary” is confusing and we would suggest deleting Figure E as the infill boundary is clearly detailed in Figure C.

Question No 6

Policy BNE4: Figure E actually shows two Heritage Interpretation and Improvement Zones. Are there any policy implications with regard to “interpretation and improvement”? For development management purposes, should the zones be shown on a plan base (of a suitable scale) rather than on an aerial photograph?

Response

Yes, apologies, the policy should refer to two heritage zones. We suggest replacing Figure E and agree that the zones would be more usefully shown on a larger scale map and can ask Cheshire East to help provide these.

Question No 7

Policy BNE4 – “historic assets”: Would it be helpful to use the term “heritage assets” and to refer, in the supporting text, to all the identifiable assets in Eaton that are regarded as heritage assets? Would the assets to be described include the permissive path to the River Dane as well as other assets not currently mentioned?

Response

Yes, we agree that it would be useful to use the term ‘heritage assets’. The permissive path would not be included as a heritage asset and we suggest deleting Figure E. We could expand the identifiable assets and detail in paragraph 4.3 of BNE4 to include Listed buildings – Christ Church, Church House, The Plough Inn, & Yewtree Farm, and other heritage assets including the former School and School House, the ancient Quaker Burial Ground and the Quaker School masters house, together with mill stones and mile markers.

Question No 8

Policy BNE6 - Local Green Spaces: Were the landowners consulted regarding designation? Were any objections received?

Response

We believe that the landowners for the Local Green Spaces are Tarmac, but leased to the parish council on a 99 year lease (the Millenium Park and Play Area); Cheshire East Council (Village Green and Beechwood Drive) and the Church (Parish Hall Green Space). The landowners were not consulted specifically re the Local Green Space designations, but were consulted with through the Regulation 14 consultation. The comments received can be viewed in the consultation statement. Cheshire East Council and Tarmac responded to the consultation, but raised no objections or comments to the proposed local green spaces. There were no objections raised to the local green spaces.

Question No 9

Policy BNE8 – Trees etc that make a significant contribution: Are these the features identified in the final paragraph of the policy? If not, how are applicants to know whether a feature is regarded by decision-takers as making a significant contribution?

Response

Yes, the trees that make a significant contribution are detailed in the policy. We agree that this could be made clearer with reference to trees that are protected with tree preservation orders (Figure I) and the woodland belts detailed in para 5.70.

Question No 10

Policy TI1 – Use of Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to improve traffic safety: Would they be used to facilitate the free flow of traffic as well?

Response

Yes – where it is demonstrated that free-flowing traffic does not reduce road safety

Question No 11

Policy TI2 c) – open spaces, facilities and nearby countryside: What is meant by facilities?

Response

We agree that this could be clarified in the justification. Facilities distinct to Eaton would include the church, Parish Hall, the Millennium Park and Play Area, The Plough and Bus Stops.

Question No 12

Policy LE2 – reference to “the quarry”: Should not the quarry be named in the policy (also in Policy BNE8)?

Response

We agree that the quarry should be more formally named, as “Tarmac Eaton Hall Sand Extraction Quarry”.

Cllr. Stephen Waltho - Eaton Parish Council & NP Steering Group