

# INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE WESTON AND BASFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EXAMINER: Andrew Mead BSc (Hons) MRTPI MIQ

John Cornell  
Weston and Basford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Examination Ref: 02/AM/WBNP

Via email: [jcmaltkiln@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:jcmaltkiln@yahoo.co.uk)

cc.: [Tom.Evans@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:Tom.Evans@cheshireeast.gov.uk)

21 July 2017

Dear Mr. Cornell

## WESTON AND BASFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EXAMINATION

As a result of the initial work I have undertaken in relation to the Weston and Basford Neighbourhood Plan examination I would like to seek the assistance of the Parish Council in providing additional information on the following questions.

### 1.The existing settlement boundary.

The development plan for the area is the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan (LP). Weston is shown on the 2011 Proposals Map Urban Area Inset. The Map delineates the settlement boundary on a 1:10,000 ordnance base. The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) shows two maps: (1) "The Existing Weston Settlement Boundary" and (2) "Gladman Site and amended settlement boundary for Weston". I would be grateful if some discrepancies could be explained.

In comparing the maps there is a difference between the existing settlement boundary as shown on the LP Proposals Map and the NP in (at least) two locations.

The first location is to the eastern side of the primary school which may have been taken up by a new housing development at Poppy Close. If this is the case, I would be grateful if it could be confirmed or otherwise explained. The differing scales of the plans and lack of clarity also make it difficult to be precise about the boundary around the grounds of the White Lion Hotel and Conference Centre. Again, clarification of the boundary would be appreciated.

The second location is on the extreme north eastern boundary of the settlement. On the NP map, it is where the Red Lion Farm is shown. Land appears to have been excluded from the NP map which is included on the LP. Can I please have an explanation for this omission?

### 2.The amended settlement boundary

The NP implies that the only amendment to the settlement boundary is to take into account the planning permission at the "Gladman" site. However, in the extreme north western corner, the boundary has been extended to include a rectangular piece of land at the Fourways housing development. I would be grateful if the status of this land could be confirmed. If it is undeveloped land, evidence should be submitted demonstrating why it should be included within the settlement boundary.

I am not aware of any other “extensions” but, if there are some, I would be grateful to know their location and the evidence justifying them. If there are no other extensions, I would be pleased if this could be confirmed.

### 3.The Maps

When the NP is made, it will become part of the development plan for the area and form the basis for decisions on development management, including building new dwellings. Therefore, it is essential that the settlement boundary is clear and unambiguous. Accordingly, I would be grateful if an ordnance base plan could be supplied showing the amended settlement boundary at an appropriate scale and which would incorporate the existing boundary, the extension to include the “Gladman Site” and any other extensions which have been justified in evidence. I note that the map showing Weston Village (Settlement Boundaries) at Appendix 9.5 of the Regulation 14 Consultation document includes more detail and would be preferable.

Additionally, please could a map be supplied showing the northern boundary of the Green Gap as defined in the Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan.? The boundary as shown on the Neighbourhood Plan Green Gap map near the words “South Cheshire Growth Village” is inaccurate. Alternatively, if the boundary is intended to be amended, I would be grateful to receive evidence supporting the change.

### 4.Local Open Space

The NP shows a “Plan of Important Local Spaces”. I would be grateful for a plan, or plans, delineating those areas more clearly. It could be efficient to include the open spaces located within the village (the allotments, cemetery, playing field, school and bowling green) on the map which also shows the extended settlement boundary. The other open spaces should be shown on a plan at a more detailed scale than currently in the NP. These include the Amenity Open Space and Children’s Play Area at Wychwood, the Countryside Park at Wychwood, the Gorsty Fishing Lakes and the Golf Courses at Wychwood and Gorsty. In addition, I would be grateful for an extract from an ordnance base plan to confirm or otherwise that the Gorsty Fishing Lakes are all within the Parish and do not extend into Staffordshire.

Additionally, as I have not seen any evidence that supports the proposed LGS designations in terms of the Criteria set out in paragraph 77 of the NPPF, could the Parish Council therefore provide me with information on all the proposed LGS designations that indicates, in each instance, how the area is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves, how the area is demonstrably special to the local community and holds a particular local significance and finally, the extent in hectares of each area.

### 5.Policies

Some policies within the document include justification within the same paragraph or section. Examples are Policies H2, H4, H6, H8, LC4 and C3. In order to improve the clarity of the Neighbourhood Plan, I would be grateful if the actual policy wording could be provided, distinguished in some way by using bold or italic font.

### 6.Policy H1

Policy H1 in the Neighbourhood Plan states “*New development will be supported ....  
Infill Development*”

*Infilling of a small gap within the settlement boundary in an otherwise built up frontage of up to 2 dwellings in character and scale with adjoining development.”*

This is in contrast to both the adopted Crewe and Nantwich Replacement LP and the emerging Cheshire East LP where, according to the policies, infilling development is unrestricted and can apply to open countryside outside settlement boundaries. Is this difference deliberate and, if so, I would be grateful to know the reasoning? A follow up question is whether the NP is seeking to prevent infilling development in the settlements in the NP area, other than Weston. In asking the question, I have had regard to Policy NE2 of the adopted LP and paragraph 4.14 of the reasoned justification and also Policy PG5 of the emerging Cheshire East LP, paragraphs 111 – 113 of the Inspector's report into its examination and Main Modification MM08.

Can I have a response on the above matters by 4 August 2017 if possible? If you feel that you need more time to put this information together, then please let us know as soon as possible.

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure a copy of this letter is placed on both the local authority and qualifying body's websites.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Your sincerely

*Andrew Mead*

Examiner