

Annex

From my initial reading of the Alsager Neighbourhood Plan and the supporting evidence, I have the following preliminary questions for Alsager Town Council.

Employment sites

1. (a) The Plan states (page 9; second paragraph) that “The Radway Green (RG) Extension is technically outside the Alsager NP boundary...”. However, the Section on the Scope of the Plan (page 4) indicates that the Neighbourhood Plan boundary was extended in December 2018 to include the employment sites of Barthomley. The Plan on page.4 shows the Neighbourhood Plan Area, including the extension. The Plan on page 9 entitled “Alsager Town Map from the CELP” delineates the employment sites, including the RG Extension. The implication from comparing the Plans on pages 4 and 9 is that the RG Extension is within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. If so, the statement in the Plan quoted above is inaccurate. Is that correct?

(b) The Statement of Basic Conditions (April 2019), mentions that the Neighbourhood Plan area was extended on 11 January 2019, not December 2018 (see above). Which date is correct?

Open Space and Recreation

2. Policy NBE1 states that “All existing open spaces, formal and informal recreation spaces including play areas, many of which are identified in the open space tables (Appendix 2) will be retained and protected from development”. Appendix 2 includes two Tables: Local Green Spaces (LGS) (Table 1); Incidental Green Spaces (IGS) (Table 2). The final sentence on page 64 in Appendix 2 refers to a map showing the green spaces identified by Cheshire East Council. There is no map of green spaces in the Plan; nor is there a link to a map on the Plan web site.
 - (a) Please could a map(s) be supplied showing the LGS. The map(s) should be sufficiently detailed to show the location of each LGS and its delineation at a scale to be effective for development management purposes.
 - (b) Are the IGS listed in Table 2 of Appendix 2 meant to have the same policy applied as LGS, bearing in mind that national guidance for planning policies for managing development in the LGS is that it should be consistent with those for the Green Belt (National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 101)? If so, please could maps be supplied to show their location and delineation as in (a) above. Is there a reason for defining them as IGS and not LGS?
 - (c) Policy NBE1 refers to “... many of which are identified in the open space tables ...”. If the Plan seeks the protection of open spaces from development, they should be named and shown on a map. Therefore, if there are other spaces for which protection is sought, please could they be listed? How would this relate to those listed on page 40 of the Plan?
 - (d) Please could the Town Council indicate the approximate size in hectares of the LGS and IGS in Appendix 2 Table 1 and Appendix 2 Table 2?
 - (e) Policy NBE2 states that “Important local landscapes include: ... “. Are there other important local landscapes which should be within the list in the policy? If not, should the word “comprise” be substituted for “include”?

- (f) The list in Policy NBE2 has little supporting evidence to justify their particular importance in the landscape. The justification appears to confuse open space and landscape and this is reflected in the places listed in the policy. Wood Park and Cranberry Moss are mentioned as Public Open Spaces and reference is made to Fanny's Croft. There is no reference in the justification to Borrow Pit Meadows and adjoining land near Heath End Road, Cedar Avenue, Playing fields or vistas from Merelake Way and Wayside Linley.

It seems to me that Policy NBE2 could benefit from being general about safeguarding the characteristics which make the landscape and skylines important, rather than being too specific about sites. I am confident that I could recommend appropriate words in the report. Nevertheless, should it be felt by the Town Council that the more detailed approach is preferable, please could a map be supplied showing the location of the sites in the list?