

Marple Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

From 8th February to 26 March 2023, the Council invited responses on the draft version of the Marple Neighbourhood Plan, in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The consultation was published in the local press, online on the Council's web site, and was communicated by email/post lists of organisations as required by schedule 1 of the Regulations above, and to individuals and organisations who have expressed a wish to be consulted on matters relating to the local plan for Stockport. The Marple Neighbourhood Forum undertook additional publicity, and more information is available within the Consultation Statement which can found within the Plan Appendices. Copies of the plan and accompanying documents were available at council offices and nearby libraries.

Responses were received one the online consultation system on the Council's web site and by email. Responses submitted via the online consultation system are in Table 1. The responses received by email are in Table 2.

Consultation submissions and responses were submitted to the independent examiner who subsequently considered them in his assessment and recommendations for the Plan.

Summary and Consideration of Online Consultation Responses

This summary relates to responses that are in Table 1, accompanying this summary. The email responses in Table 2 are succinct in nature and have therefore not been summarised.

Respondents were invited to respond to each of the following chapters of the Plan by free text comment box:

- Introduction and Overview
- A Vision for Marple
- Plan area and context
- Community involvement and consultation process
- A profile of Marple
- Town Centre
- Getting Around
- Housing
- Natural Capital and Climate Change
- Community Space
- Heritage and Tourism
- Business and Employment
- What next? Monitoring and Review

There were a total of 19 responses to the online survey. Most were in agreement with the Plan with particular support for policies on the protection of indoor community spaces, open spaces, historic assets and spaces for coworking. The key themes arising from the survey in relation to specific chapters include the following:

- **Town Centre:** A new food store could harm independent food retailers, the environment needs to be improved.

- **Getting Around:** Emphasis on resolving transport connections and congestion is crucial. Policies to discourage car use not appropriate in an isolated town such as Marple and where many older people have specialist access needs.
- **Housing:** Proposals to change the demographics are not likely to succeed. Development should be minimised to preserve character.
- **Natural Capital and Climate Change:** New open spaces should be created as well as protecting existing assets. Support and criticism on climate change proposals.
- **Community Space:** The aspiration for Marple Memorial Park is largely welcomed, although there is some preference for other sites and queries raised about the existing swimming pool site.
- **Heritage and Tourism:** Agreement that Goyt Mill has potential for alternative uses.
- **Business and Employment:** Importance of supporting independent small businesses.

Areas suggested for improvement include the need for the Plan to consider children and young people, use the most up-to-date data, and to address the impact of the pandemic on commuting and working patterns.

Conclusion & Subsequent Actions

All comments have been noted and may be viewed in Table 1 and Table 2. In the case of Table 2, some responses have been condensed from the previous version in the interest of brevity.

The overall feedback is positive, and some respondents expressed appreciation of the hard work put into the preparation of the Plan.

Some comments made recommendations for specific aspects. Not all of these can be accommodated in Planning Policy. There is consequently a limit on what neighbourhood planning policy can make happen or prevent from happening.

Having also gone through independent examination, several changes have been made to the plan. In some cases, these changes accommodate recommendations made through consultation, or otherwise amend the policy originally commented upon.

It should be noted that the email representations and responses from Marple Neighbourhood Forum could refer to policies that may have been subsequently renumbered following recommendations from the Examiner at a later stage. Please see the Examiner's Report on the Council's website for clarification on these subsequent changes.

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-001	Introduction	Happy that the plan is more than just land use, it needs to represent the community as a whole and not be parcelled into separate segments.	Heritage and Tourism Policies	I endorse the proposals for Goyt Mill.
	A Vision for Marple	Transport is a present deficiency for those living in Marple. Until the missing section of the A555 to the M60 is completed, there will always be congestion on the road towards Stockport town centre, making it a less inviting place to shop.	Business and Employment Policies	It is important to support small businesses, particularly start-ups. More enterprise in Marple alleviates the necessity for residents to travel on existing congested routes.
	Plan Area and Context	This section sounds like the plan is restricted into what it can propose and therefore not tackle the real problems.	Other comments	The emphasis on resolving transport issues urgently is crucial to maintaining and developing a vibrant Marple and achieving the aspiration set out in the plan.
	Community Involvement	No comment.	Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:	
	A Profile of Marple	The maps in the consultation documents are not very clear when enlarged. They have not been scanned with a high enough resolution to be able to be seen clearly on computer monitors.	Our section on Transport aims to address some of the issues that arise from the congestion in the broader area.	
	Town Centre Policies	Always good to have some competition between supermarkets etc. But, no mention of community facilities, like a swimming pool in this plan.	A Neighbourhood Plan is indeed restricted in what it can propose. It can address and is limited to, in simple terms land use and planning.	
	Getting Around Policies	It is important to separate cyclists from pedestrians. Walking is an important part of maintaining the health of the elderly, particularly when then are no longer able to cycle. However, cyclists are a hazard for the walking elderly, particularly when cyclists ride on footpaths and pavements,	The swimming pool was mentioned in earlier drafts but the successful bid for a new pool rendered that element achieved.	
			A registration system would be outside the direct remit of the plan but we would expect councils and other authorities to ensure proper signage is in place.	
			With regard to new green space, the plan considered that the vast areas of open countryside along with cared for green spaces was more than adequate and this was the feedback from our earlier consultation and the research done by the relevant task group on this subject.	

		and ignore traffic signals. Better education and signage is needed for cyclist, maybe a registration system is needed.	
	Housing Policies	It is essential to improve transport opportunities before more housing, otherwise more pollution will ensue and transport times by any means will increase.	
	Community Space Policies	The urgent re-provision of a swimming pool is needed to help the population maintain their health and fitness, particularly with an ageing population.	

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-002	Introduction	Not Answered.	Getting Around Policies	Not Answered.
	A Vision for Marple	Not Answered.	Housing Policies	Not Answered.
	Plan Area and Context	Not Answered.	Natural Capital Policies	Not Answered.
	Community Involvement	Not Answered.	Community Space Policies	Not Answered.
	A Profile of Marple	Not Answered.	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Not Answered.
	Town Centre Policies	I disagree with the aspiration to turn the centre of Marple into a copy of Poynton Centre with spaces shared between pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. I understand the thinking behind it but in my experience this is dangerous for everyone and greatly increases traffic congestion.	Business and Employment Policies	Not Answered.
		I agree with all other parts of this section and indeed with the rest of the plan which I think is excellent and a credit to those who have created it.	Other comments	Not Answered.
			Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:	
			Support welcomed. There is no stated intention to replicate Poynton's Town Centre nor their specific solution to transport issues, although we acknowledge that some of the issues are the same.	

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-003	Introduction	This is OK.	Community Space Policies	As chairman of Friends of Marple Memorial Park I and our group are very concerned about the impact of the proposed "Community Hub and Leisure Facility" on Marple Memorial Park. We were very involved in early consultations, made suggestions for a significant change to the location and asked for this to be considered and discussed with us several years ago. Since then we have been kept in the dark about evolving plans despite repeated requests for dialogue. We believe that original aspiration for a high quality replacement for the existing community buildings in the park may have fallen by the wayside and there is no longer any great benefit in using the park's green space. We wonder if it would be better for the community to build a new pool and fitness centre on the site of the existing pool on Stockport Road and leave the park and the library as it is.
	A Vision for Marple	Agree.		
	Plan Area and Context	OK.		
	Community Involvement	OK.		
	A Profile of Marple	OK.	Heritage and Tourism Policies	OK.
	Town Centre Policies	OK.		
	Getting Around Policies	OK.		
	Housing Policies	OK.	Business and Employment Policies	OK.
	Natural Capital Policies	OK.		
			Other comments	Apart from the concerns expressed about the well-being of Marple Memorial Park I am very supportive of the plan and what the team has achieved. Well done!
			Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:	
			Support welcomed. The new pool and hub project is now funded by Central Government and will be run by Stockport Council. It will be up to members of the public along with respected organisations like the Friends to make representations through the planning process and the addition of a consultation. The Neighbourhood Plan team would also expect to be consulted and test the plans against the contents of the Neighbourhood Plan if approved.	

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-004	Introduction	Marple is a village and a friendly and sociable one. It would be great to see these proposals circulated more widely in the many pubs and cafes and on the many social media sites that Marple supports.	Housing Policies	Not Answered.
	A Vision for Marple	Not Answered.	Natural Capital Policies	Marple is the perfect model of a walkable town. or could be if Cars were managed better or excluded.
	Plan Area and Context	Not Answered.	Community Space Policies	Not answered.
	Community Involvement	Not Answered.	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Not answered.
	A Profile of Marple	Not Answered.	Business and Employment Policies	Not answered.
	Town Centre Policies	Not Answered.	Other comments	Not answered.
	Getting Around Policies	<p>I have lived and worked in Marple for 25 years. Cars increasingly dominate and intimidate. Routes to and from anywhere in Marple for non Car users are constantly interrupted and safety threatened by lack of Traffic management, safe and logical crossing spaces and the behaviour of some drivers, which has a negative effect on all non Car road users. And that includes the many parked cars up on the narrow pavements.</p> <p>Specifically, can you urgently revive the idea of a one way system for Station Road/ Hollins Lane/ Stockport Road loop. Ive had near misses with cars and vans mounting the pavement at speed/ parking across pavements/ travelling the wrong way and against the lights/ emerging from or entering the numerous and often dangerous and unmarked junctions into eg. the tennis club on brabyns brow. the station car park, the private drives and the junctions eg. Hollins Lane or Stockport Road/ Co op Garage/ church lane junction - where you need to keep your eyes on at least three separate streams of traffic.</p> <p>i understand the opposition Car users put up eg. to speed bumps on Stockport Road, but there are many other, less vocal, road users and they try to walk to and from the stations, the shops and the many local schools and its an absolute lottery that needs to be managed better.</p>	<p>Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot address some of the aspects mentioned (e.g. speed humps) but the plan sections on Getting Around and Town Centre align with the principle of good accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists as well as vehicular traffic.</p>	

CS-005	Introduction	nothing to add	Getting Around Policies	<p><i>Our aspiration is to reduce road congestion at peak times in and out of Marple through a fixed public transport link to Stockport.</i></p> <p>My main worry would be the use of metrolink trams which don't allow bicycles on their services. Any fixed link needs to support multimodal travel.</p>
	A Vision for Marple	<p><i>We will press for the problems of traffic congestion on our roads to be addressed.</i></p> <p><i>We will ensure our roads and streets are safe and accessible, better balancing the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.</i></p> <p>Strongly agree with these two points and note that the solution is likely to reduce the amount of traffic and slow traffic down. A number of junctions around Marple have "racing corners" and my children report that they avoid those roads because they aren't safe to cross.</p>	Housing Policies	Not Answered.
			Natural Capital Policies	Not Answered.
			Community Space Policies	Not Answered.
			Heritage and Tourism Policies	Not Answered.
			Business and Employment Policies	Not Answered.
	Plan Area and Context	less cars	Other comments	Not Answered.
	Community Involvement	Not Answered.	Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:	
	A Profile of Marple	Not Answered.	The carrying of bikes by Metrolink is outside the scope of the Plan.	
	Town Centre Policies	Not Answered.		

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-006	Introduction	Not Answered.	Housing Policies	Not Answered.
	A Vision for Marple	Not Answered.	Natural Capital Policies	Not Answered.
	Plan Area and Context	Not Answered.	Community Space Policies	ASPIRATION: MEMORIAL PARK CIVIC AREA - Strongly agree.
	Community Involvement	Not Answered.	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Agree with all
	A Profile of Marple	Not Answered.	Business and Employment Policies	Not Answered.
	Town Centre Policies	Policy TC3 strongly disagree. Marple has an excellent selection of independent food retailers, which would be adversely affected by the addition of a 100m2 food store.	Other comments	Not Answered.
	Getting Around Policies	Policy GA3 whilst I agree with development of stations with retail, cafe, cycle hire etc, is reducing car parking overlooking the potential of the tourist attractions such as the middlewood way, and would it cause congestion with rail users parking in local residential streets??	Marple Neighbourhood Forum response: It is the view of the Forum that the approach under Policy TC3 is supported by the new Co-op store on Church Lane. The store has had no adverse effect on independent retailers and also serves to draw more footfall into the Town centre and benefit those outlets which retail items not available at the Co-op, along with the cafes etc.	

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-007	Introduction	Very proud to live in Marple and grateful that this process is taking place.	Housing Policies	I see no real problem with a demographic imbalance. Let the people who want to live here live here.
	A Vision for Marple	I agree with all points. Marple should retain its quaint character (and seek to address the problem of the out-of-character concrete buildings in the town centre) while also prioritising a sustainable future.	Natural Capital Policies	Yes, let's be more sustainable but in a way that preserves natural habitats and the overall character of Marple.
	Plan Area and Context	This is definitely a map of Marple.	Community Space Policies	Wholeheartedly behind the proposal for a new leisure facility.
	Community Involvement	All good	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Yes more preservation is a good thing. Only up to a point - please can we get rid of our hideous concrete buildings throughout the town centre?
	A Profile of Marple	Agreed	Business and Employment Policies	Yes coworking spaces would be ideal.
	Town Centre Policies	Agreed - all positive steps forward for the Town Centre.	Other comments	All very positive. Might it be worthwhile to have a town council?
	Getting Around Policies	Cycle routes should be well-thought-through and not put cyclists at risk of frustrated road users.	Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:	
			Support welcomed. In relation to housing, the Forum agrees We agree with this sentiment but we also think it should be possible for those who want to live in Marple to do so, hence the arguments about housing e.g. affordability and bungalows to free up family homes.	

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-008	Introduction	Not Answered.	Housing Policies	Not Answered.
	A Vision for Marple	SOME OF IT NEED ANOTHER SUPERMARKET TO MANY BARS ETC NO SWIMMING BATHS YET THE PARK IS EXELENT ROADS ARE APPALING	Natural Capital Policies	Not Answered.
	Plan Area and Context	Not Answered.	Community Space Policies	Not Answered.
	Community Involvement	Not Answered.	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Not Answered.
	A Profile of Marple	Not Answered.	Business and Employment Policies	Not Answered.
	Town Centre Policies	AGREE WITH NEW SUPERMARKET BUT WERE IN MARPLE.	Other comments	Not Answered.
	Getting Around Policies	Not Answered.	Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:	
			Comments noted.	

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-009	Introduction	Not Answered.	Community Space Policies	We welcome and support inclusion of Policy CS4 which seeks to protect valued facilities within Marple, including the Carver Theatre and Regent Cinema. These are important social and cultural venues for the town which provide opportunities to access and participate in culture and the arts. The policy is consistent with Paragraph 93 of the NPPF (2023).
	A Vision for Marple	Not Answered.		
	Plan Area and Context	Not Answered.		
	Community Involvement	Not Answered.		
	A Profile of Marple	Not Answered.	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Not Answered.
	Town Centre Policies	Not Answered.	Business and Employment Policies	Not Answered.
	Getting Around Policies	Not Answered.	Other comments	Not Answered.
	Housing Policies	Not Answered.	Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:	
	Natural Capital Policies	Not Answered.	Comments noted and support welcomed.	

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-010	Introduction	We need to ensure we engage everyone. Marple in its demographic is a very white upper middle class place. Those most likely to engage in this survey might not be representative of Marple as a whole community. We need to ensure we capture all voices.	Getting Around Policies	<p>I have concerns about potential additional crossings on Brabyns brow due to traffic's volumes from wider areas such as Romiley, Glossop and new mills that won't be controlled. There is a huge potential for major congestion in these areas at peak times.</p> <p>There is already an ill placed bus stop at the bottom of Brabyns brow near the traffic lights, to add an extra crossing will cause a pollution hot spot.</p> <p>Unsure I understand the vision for the Hollies. Or the plans to reduce car park space. Car parking at peak times is an issue and more likely to result in people spilling into local residential streets.</p> <p>I'm not convinced making it more difficult for car users will deter people from driving. The assumption is also that everyone driving is doing so locally when is not always the case. These proposals are actually making me want to leave Marple with my young family.</p>
	A Vision for Marple	<p>I'd be concerned about Marple as a niche tourist destination. Expansion and maintaining the feel of a small town sounds like a juxtaposition.</p> <p>Building on Brown spaces and extra housing would add to the pressure on resources like schools and doctors. Unsure about the road system though it would be nice if Stockport road wasn't the only way in and out. Better connections to Derbyshire would be welcomed especially to Glossop and new mills.</p>		
	Plan Area and Context	Nothing to comment.		
	Community Involvement	<p>Everyone who lives in Marple should be able to participate in the referendum.</p> <p>Also writing to 200 houses and assuming everyone is on Facebook doesn't capture everyone's views.</p>	Housing Policies	Unless there is a mess building project of social housing then Marple will always be out of the price range of most people. It's an affluent and desired area to live. I'm unsure where the space is for building these house. Also unsure about the consequences of changing the demographic.
	A Profile of Marple	<p>Development of goyt mill agree it has lots of potential.</p> <p>Also agree the population is changing and planning accordingly makes sense.</p>	Natural Capital Policies	Protect the wildlife yes.
	Town Centre Policies	I have concerns about the diversion of traffic flow around Stockport road and the introduction of one way systems as it won't ease traffic but rather nice the problem to a different location.	Community Space Policies	<p>Agree with protection of green spaces. Concerned about the destruction of potential wildlife habitation spots, specifically out local badger population who are a protected species.</p> <p>Agree we need a new leisure centre.</p>

MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

		The addition of an additional food store I question if this is needed when we already have an Asda and a local co op. Where is the space for this proposal ?!
	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Sounds okay in principle.
	Business and Employment Policies	Protect independent businesses. Agree focus on already exciting sites like goyt mill for development.
	Other comments	I have concerns about some aspects of this primarily the additional housing, changes to road systems and adding pressure to the services such as education and doctors.

	Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:	
	<p>Introduction and Community Involvement: The neighbourhood plan has been made widely available across the whole community and been advertised and promoted across every medium. Please see the Consultation Statement for further details.</p> <p>Getting Around: There is nothing in the Plan that removes car parking or advocates removal of cars - though we recognise the need to have greater accessibility for pedestrians. The crossings we would support would be subject to input from traffic engineers at the Council and sited carefully. There is no evidence to say that crossings reduce congestion (i.e. volume of traffic) only that it slows it down, which accords with the need to give more accessibility to pedestrians. Any reduction in traffic volume as a result (i.e. walking a journey rather than driving) will reduce congestion.</p> <p>Housing: Our policies seek to address this via the provision of affordable housing and the freeing up of family homes via availability of bungalows.</p>	

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-011	Introduction	Have an initial paragraph to introduce Marple, e.g. where is it, what is the population, how many businesses etc.	Housing Policies	An earlier section of the Plan talks about challenges for young families accessing housing in Marple. If we have a policy for older residents, shouldn't we have a policy for young families too?
	A Vision for Marple	Not Answered.		
	Plan Area and Context	Not Answered.		
	Community Involvement	4.10 is great as it shows how many responses were recieved. Can we do the same for 4.8 (how many focus groups and how many people at each, how many Survey Monkey responses) and 4.12? This would help to emphasis the strength of the evidence base		Policy H2 refers to developers needing to provide “a full open-book viability appraisal.” This is great. Shouldn’t the same requirement also be part of H1?
	A Profile of Marple	<p>There are a number of small changes that would considerably strengthen the evidence in this chapter: use of latest data; consistent presentation; sourcing data; including comparators etc. Suggestions below.</p> <p>Data time periods - The timing of Plan production/consultation and data release is awkward. Is the data in this section from the 2011 Census? It should be updated with 2021 census data where possible to make sure the evidence base is correct. Are things that were issues in 2011 still issues? Have new ones emerged?</p> <p>Data sources - data sources for Journey to Work and Tenure Type sub-sections are unclear. As is the time period they cover. It would help the reader if these were included</p> <p>Data presentation - Donut chart presentation is inconsistent, e.g. the tenure charts show %s (which is great) but the age and ethnicity ones don't show %s</p> <p>Lack of comparators - There are no comparisons with other towns/villages, and few comparisons with Stockport/GM. Is the tenure mix in Marple different to elsewhere? How different is the ethnic diversity to the rest of GM?</p>		<p>Policy H2 “The dwelling meets the needs of an identified older local person in affordable housing need” – does the use of “identified” mean that we wouldn’t support speculative development of units for older people? And do the second and third bullet points in combination mean that we wouldn’t support development of units for older people from outside Marple? Isn't this exclusionary?</p> <p>Policy H2 sometimes seems to be referring to affordable housing for older people, and sometime just housing for older people, e.g. the penultimate bullet point suggests that developers should be encouraged to charge high prices. Are we trying to encourage open market units for older people or affordable units for older people?</p> <p>H2 – is there a statutory definition of “older person”? How can we enforce this policy?</p>
			Natural Capital Policies	Not Answered.
			Community Space Policies	Policy CS4 “In all such cases it will have to be demonstrated that the overall level of social and community provision in the Plan area is improved and there is no demand for an alternative social and community use for that floor space.” Do we need to qualify “no demand”? E.g. what happens if there is

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

		<p>Road comparators - ""significant traffic volumes using Stockport Road."" How does this compare to, for example, traffic volumes through Romiley or High Lane? 20,000 seems high in isolation, but how does it compare?</p> <p>Railway - ""make good use"" of the stations. How does this compare to other stations in Stockport such as Romiley, Bredbury, Brahmall etc? And the data ends in 2016/17 - is more recent data available? Do we not also need to acknowledge that Covid will likely have changed this (e.g. as referenced later in the Plan at para 8.7)</p> <p>Para 5.14 - what does this add to the argument?</p> <p>5.18 – why is a lack of a town square or focal point important?</p>		<p>demand to use the existing space on, for example, Monday mornings but not the rest of the week? Or what if several user groups of existing space are content with the development proposals, could one other user group block development? Should CS4 be amended to “no significant demand” or similar language?</p>
	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Not Answered.		
	Business and Employment Policies	<p>12.9 - can we use 2021 census data? If not, don't we have to acknowledge that Covid is highly likely to change this patten with more people now working at home (as with para 8.7)</p> <p>12.11 - can we explain why a loss of employment in Marple would worsen transport conditions?</p>		
	Other comments	<p>The policies seem very sensible and well thought through (although perhaps the drafting could be improved on H2 and CS4 - comments above). The presentation of the plan and use of images is brilliant.</p> <p>The biggest issue is the data used in the profile of Marple and the lack of comparators. (This is no doubt due to parts of the Plan being prepared with what, at the time, was the most recent data but now appears very old to be relying on). This should be easily redeemable. We need to demonstrate a solid evidence base so that we can show the policies being proposed are responding to real issues in Marple</p>		
	Town Centre Policies	Not Answered.		
	Getting Around Policies	<p>Seems strange that this section doesn't mention the impact of Covid on commuting at all.</p> <p>7.10 – How many respondents to the survey?</p> <p>7.16 – “Generally, 400 metres is the accepted distance that people will walk to good quality public transport.” Is there a reference for this?</p>		

Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:

Introduction: This is in the body of the document in a section for this purpose.

Community Involvement/Profile/Other Comments: Comments noted and amendments required. We will consider these data for incorporation in the plan. However, we do not think the comparative data is helpful as we are considering Marple as an entity and not other areas. The difference in another area does not render an action in our area unnecessary or otherwise nor does it negate the views or opinions of residents these plans are based on.

Housing: Our policy aims to free up housing for families by the provision of more bungalows for older people otherwise stuck in family homes but with family who have left. We also address the need for affordable housing but not for any particular demographic. Our definitions under H2 will be looked at again, thank you.

Community Space: This policy is worded to protect development of community space that is being used. If user groups are content with losing their space it would imply they have alternative facilities and thus an overall provision that was the same or unaffected.

Business and Employment: We think Covid will have had the same effect on those coming in and those going out. Less employment land in Marple would imply more people going outside the area to work and thus more commuters.

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-012	Introduction	Not Answered.	Natural Capital Policies	<p>Many thanks for consulting the Peak District National Park on the Marple Neighbourhood Plan. We are fully supportive of communities producing Neighbourhood Plans and appreciate the enormous time and effort that goes into producing them.</p> <p>PDNP would like to make comments regarding the setting of the national park in this Dark Peak Western fringe area. Although Marple is some distance from the national park boundary we have had some landscape impact issues with large wind turbines a similar distance away on the south-east boundary of the national park. We therefore ask that, under Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 to protect the setting of the national park, proposed development does not have an unacceptable impact on the setting of the national park.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that policy NC3, and potentially policy HT1, could be amended to reflect the setting in the fringe area of a national park.</p> <p>All the best, Policy Team at Peak District National Park</p>
	A Vision for Marple	Not Answered.		
	Plan Area and Context	Not Answered.		
	Community Involvement	Not Answered.		
	A Profile of Marple	Not Answered.		
	Town Centre Policies	Not Answered.		
	Getting Around Policies	Not Answered.		
	Housing Policies	Not Answered.		
	Community Space Policies	Not Answered.		
	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Not Answered.		
	Business and Employment Policies	Not Answered.		
	Other comments	Not Answered.		
Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:				
Comments noted. Thank you, we will consider that change.				

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-013	Introduction	Really pleased with the proposed changes.	Housing Policies	Not Answered.
	A Vision for Marple	Not Answered.	Natural Capital Policies	Not Answered.
	Plan Area and Context	Not Answered.	Community Space Policies	Not Answered.
	Community Involvement	Not Answered.	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Not Answered.
	A Profile of Marple	Not Answered.	Business and Employment Policies	Not Answered.
	Town Centre Policies	Not Answered.	Other comments	Not Answered.
	Getting Around Policies	Not Answered.	Marple Neighbourhood Forum response: Support welcomed.	

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-014	Introduction	I agree that the Neighbourhood Plan captures the community's development aspirations but it seems that these are very much that, aspirations. There are fundamental issues that if not addresses will limit the ability of Marple to achieve these aspirations, namely it's placement and outlying road infrastructure and the affluence of its residents and their ability to support thriving businesses. Like it nor not, "where there's money there's brass" and in Marple's case, that demographic is lacking and in order to attract it, the outlying road infrastructure needs to support Marples accessibility. Pedestrianising and creating cycleways will not bring it the affluence and investment Marple needs in order to thrive, it will in fact have the opposite effect.	Housing Policies	"Demand for social housing in the Neighbourhood area far exceeds supply"..."... you can't have it all ways! if you build more social housing, you don't bring in the affluence and revenue streams required to sustain local businesses, quite the opposite in fact. The same is true of care homes and residents for over 65s. It's statistically proven that these demographics don't have the same spednign habits of younger mor affluent familes."
	A Vision for Marple	the statement ... 2.12 We will press for the problems of traffic congestion on our roads to be addressed... is at complete odds with a strategy to bring in investment and improve accessibility. The only viable solution is to provide a ringroad/bypass to Marple such that through traffic is removed but accessibility to the centre is improved for those who wish to visit and spend money in Marple. Marple isn't thriving now that's why it looks so tired and the only way it can truly thrive is to have people visit and spend money. At the moment they won't and don't because Marple is such a difficult place to get to and from.	Natural Capital Policies	no one can argue against being more energy efficient whether you consider the so called "climate crisis" a crisis or simply the boader effects of the planets within our solar system. Pragmatism is called for, and what has been labelled a climate emergency shouldn't be used to greenwash pragmatism in the shorter term.
	Plan Area and Context	I disagree with the statement... by reducing the need to travel by car. the more this is done, the fewer people will come into Marple or chose to live here and it's local economy will therefore not support growth or thrive as is the aspiration."	Community Space Policies	Allotments shoud indeed be protected, perhaps even expanded... local industry and recycling centres for example should be located out of Marple so as to reduce HGV traffic or should make use oif rail infrastruture. this is a perfect example of where the drive for recycling is actually making the situation worse by having local HGVs taking waste for recycling in and ourt of Marple many many times a day.
	Community Involvement	this is all about what Marple wants to be, but nothing about how it is achievable or economically sustainable	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Goyt mill is a perfect way to introduce affordable housing that appeals to a younger demographic. it however would require that transport links to and from the mill, (INCLUDING CARS) are massively improved in ordr to attract younger residents.

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

	A Profile of Marple	<p>Create greater sense of place by reducing traffic dominance, particularly on Stockport Road.</p> <p>If you reduce the traffic without providing alternative routes for vehicles (ie bylass or ringroad) you simply isolate Marple from the rest of the world and the current residents will live in their own little bubble as they do now, not younger families will want to move and live in Marple because it is so inaccessible.</p> <p>Marple's plan needs to stop being small-minded and think about how the fundamental issues of accessibility for cars in and out of the area is tackled. if this isn't done marple will simply isolate itself and not get the injection of revenue it needs from visitors or younger potential residents of the town.</p>	Business and Employment Policies	<p>12.2 Marple has no large employers. However, homeworking, creative industries, leisure and tourism and small service companies are significant employers and are set to grow</p> <p>unless Marple manages to attract a large employer or it builds road infrastructure to allow residents to get to a large employer by car it will not thrive, plain and simple! Basic economics!</p>
	Town Centre Policies	<p>promote cycling and walking!...</p> <p>this isn't the stuff of sustainable businesses benefitting in Marple. it's ideology that isn't financially sustainable. Making Marple centre look nice doesn't make money. As for using public transport... how many people will practically do their weekly ship by bike. walking or public transport. shopping habits have changed and your families don't have the time to shop locally as we did in the 50s, 60s and 70s... we live in a different world and yet this entire plan seems to want to take Marple backwards and live as we did 50 years ago.</p>	Other comments	<p>it's plenty of what we want but not a sniff of how the fundamental problems can be fixed preventing the changes aspired to in Marple can be achieved.</p>
	Getting Around Policies	<p>All of this and at what cost to the motorist. we seem to want to change a mindset and way of life that we are so entrenched in. People will not and cannot change. the Car is a reality whether we like it or not. Marple is on the edge of the Derbyshire Peak district and it is wholly unfeasible to think that people will cycle here. by all means, cater for locals and make local walking and cyling safer, but not at the expense of discouraging people to drive into or around Marple.</p>	<p>Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:</p> <p>We do not agree that economic development is solely about accessibility to all parts by car and attracting big employers. This is not the universal experience in other areas and assumes a linear development economically e.g. no green economy, no extra emphasis on health and wellbeing, no challenge to emissions. Nor is it accurate to say a community is solely dependent on economic development - this ignores the role of sustainability in its broadest sense. Our evidence finds that a significant number of people want to live away from traffic and industrial buildings. It is also worth noting that an improved, welcoming environment has been shown to be economically beneficial to business in those areas, as more people are likely to want to visit the area.</p> <p>With regard to aspirations, the plan includes a series of actions to back them up.</p>	

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-015	Introduction	7 years from the start of the plan [2016 according to you introduction] to this consultation in 2023 , shameful that it has taken that it has taken that long to present this basic outline , why exactly do things take so long at stockport MBC ?	Housing Policies	When allowing planning permissions, please be more vigilant on when work can be undertaken , recent house renovations in my area have resulted in works being done 7 days a week inc weekends & well into the evening , SMBC officers clearly were not interested in this when contacted. Also be mindful of open spaces being snapped up for housing at the detriment of existing properties.
	A Vision for Marple	The presentation and ambitions are fine , its the implementation i and many others doubt will happen , examples , planning permission granted for new houses & eye sore extensions , Stockport Road is a regular car jam with " rat runs " developing notably Dale Road which has a 20 mph restriction [presumably because of the number of local schools] but no enforcement , driving habits are often dangerous in this area , enforcement of local parking restrictions are reduced to effectively nil , the references to variety of shops & restaurants is laughable , suggest you go and walk around Bramhall , Heaton Moor , Cheadle , Cheadle Hulme [all comparable areas] and Marple looks shabby and lacking in comparison. No resources are put into walking areas , the traditional walk from Marple to Chadkirk via Dale Road is dangerous due to erosion of the footpath . Rose Hill station is "hit & miss " and unreliable especially for commuters , New regular Fun Fairs are being promoted at the Railway pub playing loud music well into late evening/night , this is not out of town but a residential area with an older population , who is granting these permissions [presumably as means of extending leisure provision but they attract visitors at a cost to residents] ditto no consideration of infrastructure with parking being a nightmare with casual visitors , so the point of this paragraph is to reaffirm that any ambitions need resources to implement which remains a concern.	Natural Capital Policies	Not Answered.
	Plan Area and Context	see earlier point on erosion of footpaths , also signage needs improvement	Community Space Policies	Not Answered.
	Community Involvement	Not Answered.	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Not Answered.
	A Profile of Marple	Not Answered.	Business and Employment Policies	Not Answered.
	Town Centre Policies	Not Answered.	Other comments	More speedier action needed.
	Getting Around Policies	see q1		

Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:

Introduction: The period from 2016 to 2023 included around 18 months of a pandemic when our consultation and meeting work was significantly curtailed. The work has not been done by Stockport Council but by residents and we have depended on their efforts and availability to dictate the pace of progress. We would have welcomed more help and regularly asked for volunteers!

Vision: Planning applications will be assessed against this plan alongside other regulations.

Housing: Construction work is regulated under condition in many planning applications. Our plan seeks to protect green spaces and lists a wide range of these for protection.

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-016	Introduction	This is a reasonable summary, although it overstates the importance of climate issues.	Housing Policies	Preserving the character of Marple is indeed essential. Ideally, minimise the building of houses as far as possible. You can't build many more houses and also preserve the character of Marple.
	A Vision for Marple	I disagree strongly with the comments on cars and traffic. There is no need to restrict car traffic in any way whatsoever. As a frequent pedestrian in Marple and at 64 I have no problem crossing roads and no wish to have any changes in traffic. I would like to see house building reduced to the absolute minimum possible. Marple is already far too big.	Natural Capital Policies	No real objections. The obsession with climate change is annoying, but can't be helped.
	Plan Area and Context	I disagree with all that encourages either building houses or reducing traffic. I think the need to follow ludicrous national guidelines negates totally the idea of a local plan.	Community Space Policies	Reasonably in general. Preserving what we have is very important. I really don't see the point in this idea of a community and leisure centre. I don't want any redevelopment in Memorial Park. Keep it as it is. indeed, keeping Marple as it is should be the main theme of this document.
	Community Involvement	I don't really thing that consultation is all that meaningful as to many things have been decided in advance and it is unlikely that anyone will take any notice of people who disagree.	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Mostly OK.
	A Profile of Marple	Not really anything to disagree with here.	Business and Employment Policies	Not too bad.
	Town Centre Policies	I do not think we need a new food store. It is pointless. I think the big priority must be to retain Marple as it is. It needs no improvement.	Other comments	Overall, the main aim must be to keep Marple unchanged. I don't like the idea of trying to reduce car use. I think this is fundamentally wrong. I don't like that it suggests there will be further house building beyond the absolute minimum and I do not like the idea of redeveloping the library site.
	Getting Around Policies	The section on car use is fundamentally wrong. We do not need such nonsense in Marple (or indeed anywhere else). Yes, walking is to be encouraged, but this does not mean the dangerous anti-car policies promoted here should be adopted.		

Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:

Vision/Context: There is a well-established national shortage of housing, and Marple is not immune from that.

Community Involvement: We have carried out previous consultations which are documented and been publicised, and we have adjusted the Plan as a result. It is also the case that the plan has been drawn up by residents and is thus a reflection of their views. Please see the Consultation Statement for more details.

Town Centre: This has already been overtaken by the new food store run by the Co-op on Church Lane which we believe has had no adverse effect on independent retailers and also serves to draw more footfall into the town centre.

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-017	Introduction	Agree	Natural Capital Policies	agreed
	A Vision for Marple	I feel that the visual quality of the town centre needs improving - especially at the main centre cross roads. The frontage of the old Nat West property (now flats) is terrible, with a huge running advert. There should be an emphasis on encouraging attractive shop /restaurant frontages to raise the environment within the town centre.	Community Space Policies	What is the proposal for the existing swimming pool site? can suggestions for this corner be included in the plan? Smaller housing units, with restaurant/shop units along frontages around the street corner?
	Plan Area and Context	Agree	Heritage and Tourism Policies	agreed
	Community Involvement	agree	Business and Employment Policies	This seems out of date, with no mention of lockdown and more people working from home. what is the proposal for M&co site? We shouldn't have another block of flats in the town centre. There should be a focus on attractive shop frontages in the town centre
	A Profile of Marple	Traffic data is very old and may have changed since lockdown. Over lock down, there was a lot of community support across the generations. Could this be built on?	Other comments	There is very little mention of children and young people in the whole plan - could there be some priorities specifically for children?
	Town Centre Policies	Agree with place making - the town centre environment falls behind neighbouring centres, and could be improved	Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:	
	Getting Around Policies	Agreed. Is there any opportunity for a tram system coming to Stockport/Marple? Also 20 mile an hour speed limits around primary school on Church Lane	Vision: Properties are generally owned by independent landlords and not the retailers, which makes it difficult to dictate frontage. There are existing provisions in the National Planning Policy Framework and in Planning regulations relating to visual amenity and the look of buildings in public areas as well as conservation areas. Our overall ideas for the Town Centre will have to be taken into account in addition to these.	
	Housing Policies	You could mention the need for more foster carers who are based in Marple - and the need to encourage families to foster Stockport children Also under H2 - could you suggest bungalows as an option? These are in short supply	Housing: Foster caring is not in the remit of the Plan, nor are children's services.	

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-018	Introduction	<p>Responses submitted on behalf of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum.</p> <p>Two members of the Woodford Neighbourhood Forum management committee attended the 2019 Marple Climate Emergency weekend and can confirm that it was an inspirational event that was very well attended, indicating that this issue is very important to Marple residents.</p>	Housing Policies	We support the aims of these policies which address what appears to be a national problem for local people who wish to stay in their area but encounter a shortage of suitable housing for first time buyers and older people wishing to downsize.
	A Vision for Marple	<p>The vision seems to have been very thoroughly researched. We can see elements that are very similar to the issues which arose in consultation with Woodford residents, such as preservation of important green infrastructure, community and heritage assets, village character and concerns about traffic.</p> <p>We are particularly impressed by the proposed structured approach to monitoring.</p>	Natural Capital Policies	<p>As neighbours we support POLICY NC1: PROTECTION OF OPEN SPACES and there are policies with similar aims in the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan. In Marple you are blessed with some special assets, which are also used by residents beyond your neighbourhood area.</p> <p>It is now very clear that climate change and loss of biodiversity represent existential threats to the human race, so we are pleased to see POLICY NC2: RENEWABLE ENERGY, POLICY NC3: SUSTAINABLE ENERGY PRODUCTION and POLICY NC4: RETROFITTING HISTORIC BUILDINGS in your neighbourhood plan. You are leading the way with these policies.</p>
	Plan Area and Context	The consultation statement records consultation with residents via a variety of means and the evidence base includes work by the forum committee and professional studies by AECOM and the Cheshire Wildlife Trust.		
	Community Involvement	We also undertook provision of information through letter boxes to every household in Woodford and found it the most effective way of reaching people and also enabled us to point them in the direction of further information online. The Marple Neighbourhood Forum did well to achieve it in a larger community like Marple.		
	A Profile of Marple	The data appear to be thoroughly collected and analysed.	Community Space Policies	The aims of these policies are important in the light of the evidence of the beneficial effects on mental and physical health produced by exercise, leisure and time spent outdoors in nature.
	Town Centre Policies	No comments.	Heritage and Tourism Policies	The aims of these policies look good to us.[We could come for a holiday!]
	Getting Around Policies	<p>As neighbours, we support encouraging walking and cycling. We have aspirations in common and included similar aims in our supplementary document on Woodford Aspirations.</p> <p>Consultation in Woodford led to similar to aspirations to reduce traffic speed and improve public transport identified during consultation with Woodford residents for the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Business and Employment Policies	We have a similar policy concerning loss of employment space. We like your aspiration to support local businesses.

Other comments
It is good to see plans for monitoring and review, which will be an important measure of the success of the neighbourhood plan. We have found it useful to catalogue the use of neighbourhood plan policies by the Council in determining the outcome of planning applications in the neighbourhood area.
Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:
Comments noted, support welcomed. We are also grateful for the advice you have given based on your experience - ahead of us - in writing your plan.

**MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

TABLE 1

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE ONLINE

CS-019	Introduction	Not Answered.	Housing Policies	Not Answered.
	A Vision for Marple	Not Answered.	Natural Capital Policies	Not Answered.
	Plan Area and Context	Not Answered.	Community Space Policies	The green space adjacent to, and owned by, Marple Sixth Form College is not mentioned as a public amenity in Appendix 4 although it has protected status. This is not surprising as the College does not currently allow full public access to this space (as was the case in the past), and of course the space would be of greater value to the public if the college were to allow more access, but it is important that this space is not lost by default as it makes an important contribution to air quality in an area where this is sorely needed due to the massive increase in traffic in recent years.
	Community Involvement	Not Answered.		
	A Profile of Marple	Not Answered.		
	Town Centre Policies	Not Answered.		
	Getting Around Policies	<p>1 Plans to limit vehicle access impact massively on those with access needs, and although this plan takes into account access using mobility scooters, not everyone is able to use these. Many older residents in particular do not have driving licences and are not able to use public transport, due to, for example, visual or mental impairment, but still need access to town centre facilities. For this reason carers need to be able to park close by, and for this reason there should be as much exceptional vehicle access and parking for Blue Badge holders as space allows.</p> <p>2 The importance of maintaining access to the Middlewood Way is highlighted several times in the plan, and, within this context in this section, the proximity of Marple Sixth Form College is mentioned. The route between the Middlewood Way and the College is via Buxton Lane, and this road has suffered a massive increase in motorised traffic in recent years, particularly since the opening of the A555 Link Road.</p> <p>Buxton Lane is now used as a 'cut through' between Hibbert Lane and Stockport Road and so any plan to improve the safety of walkers and cyclists moving between these two locations must take into account the dangers posed by motorised traffic. Existing 'traffic calming' measures on Buxton Lane (the humps) are ignored by many motorists and so consideration should be given to designating Buxton Lane as a green corridor, with access limited to residents and users of Arbour Court/Lodge and Marple College.</p>	Heritage and Tourism Policies	Not Answered.
			Business and Employment Policies	Not Answered.
			Other comments	Not Answered.

Marple Neighbourhood Forum response:

Getting Around: Our plan does not specifically take away any vehicle access but seeks to make things easier for pedestrians. Thank you for your comments about Buxton Lane, the traffic calming of Buxton Lane is beyond the scope of the Plan. Any proposals for this section of road would need to take into consideration it is the prime access for a large number of residential homes.

Community Space: Comments noted and amendments required. Thank you for your comment which we will consider for inclusion in the Plan.

MARPLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION

TABLE 2: RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS MADE BY EMAIL

Consultee	Issues raised	MNF Response
Private individual	I would like to suggest that the plan includes the planting of many more trees in Marple. There are large open areas on several public spaces, such as Brabyns, and I think we all need to respond to the royal plea to reduce carbon emissions by tree planting. The town is famous for its canal heritage but is not particularly welcoming to boaters. The moorings near the junction of the Upper Peak Forest and Macclesfield canals are in very poor condition but if improved would encourage boaters to moor and visit Marple. This would increase the use of local shops and also seeing more boats on the canals would add to its visitor attraction.	Comments noted. Thank you for your comments but both are outside the remit of the plan. We have included the protection of our green spaces and some of these have woodland or are currently being further planted.
Vodafone (via Atkins Global)	Please can you resubmit this and all future requests to include the site location address within the subject heading, send separate emails for each separate site location, 12-digit grid references within the body of the email, and a site location plan.	Comments noted, no change required. It should be noted that this consultation is in relation to a Neighbourhood Plan and not a planning application.
National Highways	In respect of the Marple Neighbourhood Plan, we are content that the proposals would not have a detrimental impact to the SRN. The closest motorway junction to Marple is M60 J25 at 4.8km from the edge of the Plan boundary, and as such it is unlikely that the measures proposed would have a significant impact. With respect to the transport element within the proposals, we are always supportive of Plans that look to promote the use of sustainable methods of transport ahead of private vehicle usage, with the aim of reducing traffic locally and on the SRN. In particular, we encourage the promotion of safe walking and cycling routes, including where they may start or end with other forms of public transport, such as trains, trams or buses.	Comments noted, support welcomed.
Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Marple Neighbourhood Plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.	Comments noted.
Private individual	Is the a joke! No I don't agree there is no climate change and the is no covid People need to wake to what you are actually doing!	Comments noted.
High Lane Village Neighbourhood Forum	The High Lane Neighbourhood Forum has read with interest Marple's impressive Neighbourhood Plan. As a neighbouring Forum, High Lane is keen to encourage collaborative working wherever possible. We recognise that Marple and High Lane share a number of common concerns particularly in relation to outdoor spaces such as the Middlewood Way and the canal towpath which link our communities and to our shared aims of providing the right housing in the right areas particularly for older and younger generations. HLVNF wishes the Marple Plan well. If we can be of any support, having recently been through the process, please get in touch.	Comments noted, support welcomed. Thank you for the comments and for the support we have already had from you.

Consultee	Issues raised	MNF Response
National Grid (via Avison Young)	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) assets which include high voltage electricity assets and other electricity infrastructure. NGET has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area. NGET provides information in relation to its assets at the website below. www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shapefiles/</p> <p>Please also see attached information outlining guidance on development close to NGET infrastructure.</p>	Comments noted.
National Gas (via Avison Young)	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission's assets which include high-pressure gas pipelines and other infrastructure. National Gas Transmission has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area. National Gas Transmission provides information in relation to its assets at the website below. https://www.nationalgas.com/land-and-assets/network-route-maps Please also see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Gas Transmission infrastructure. Information regarding the gas distribution network is available by contacting: plantprotection@cadentgas.com</p>	Comments noted.
Sport England	<p>It is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 98 and 99. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</p> <p>Of particular note are Policies CS1, CS2, CS4, HT3, TC2 GA2 and NC2 and BE2 which should take account of this.</p>	Comments noted.
The Coal Authority	<p>Our records indicate that within the Neighbourhood Plan area there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including; mine entries, shallow coal workings and reported surface hazards. These features pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety. It is noted however that the Neighbourhood Plan does not propose to allocate any sites for future development and on this basis the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no specific comments to make.</p>	Comments noted.
Canal and River Trust	<p>The Trust own and manage the Peak Forest Canal and Macclesfield Canal within the designated Neighbourhood Plan area. We note the way in which the Plan makes it clear that the canals are valued by the local community. We are confident that the policies proposed are based on a desire to protect these valued assets and we greatly welcome this. However we have concerns about possible unintended consequences of some of the policies.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Thank you for your detailed comments.</p> <p>Community consultation - An early meeting face to face was held with the CRT in the early stages of the plan and we</p>

Consultee	Issues raised	MNF Response
	<p>Changes are suggested to meet the basic conditions in response to the following issues: (a) Policy CS5 Canal Towpaths gives canal towpaths the same level of protection as residential properties and is not in accordance with national and local policy (b) Policy CS1 Outside Community Space proposes the allocation of Local Green Space and this is not in accordance with national policy.</p> <p>Policy CS5 - Support the inclusion of a canal towpaths policy but the wording as drafted does not achieve the aim set out in the supporting text as it is ambiguous and unclear. The 2nd part of the policy would be unworkable and unsound as towpath users are transitory, and would potentially hinder some positive canalside development. It would not conform with Paragraph 100 of the NPPF or the UDP or Core Strategy policies.</p> <p>Policy CS1 - It is not clear whether the listed 'canal towpaths and curtilage including parts of Brabyns Park' in Appendix 4 and supporting text to Policy CS1 means that all towpaths might be captured under this policy, and this needs to be clarified. It appears that the Plan is seeking to designate the canals as Local Green Space in accordance with Paras 100-103 of the NPPF. Doing so would elevate its status to that of Green Belt and could restrict the ability of the Trust and other landowners to provide facilities on and adjacent our canals that support them. Para 102 tests have not been met. It is not procedurally possible to designate all of the canals within the plan area as Local Green Space and insufficient evidence has been provided to justify this. The rationale for the designation is unclear and it is not believed that it is the Group's intention to give it this status. The whole canal is a planning unit and therefore cannot be segregated. No SEA statement is provided with the consultation and it is unclear if this has considered the impacts of the designation. There is conflict with other policies in the Plan such as Policy HT3. It is suggested that the designation does not meet the basic conditions, primarily due to inconsistency with national policy, and should be deleted.</p> <p>The vision is welcomed in relation to the recognition of the canals and references to them within the opening chapters.</p> <p>Section 4 Community Involvement and Consultation Process – Canal and River Trust (CRT) have not been consulted previously on this Plan. As set out within Appendix 7 Consultation Statement the group appear to have consulted with numerous other stakeholders. Whilst CRT are not a defined consultation body for neighbourhood plans, this is unfortunate given the waterway and assets</p>	<p>valued and used the guidance given at that stage.</p> <p>Policy CS1 - We do not agree that the policy seeks to introduce a Local Green Space designation as described in the NPPF under Paragraph 102. This is not the intention of the policy and the word 'local' was removed in an attempt to avoid this confusion. It is to be expected the CRT will want freedom to develop the adjacent area to towpaths and we are aware of this and want to give some protection to a great shared space for local residents. We do not believe the policy will be onerous and is, in all events a small section of the national canal infrastructure.</p> <p>Policy CS3 - The section referred to is an "aspiration" and thus not a regulatory part of the plan. CRT would be involved in any changes under "aspirations".</p> <p>Policy CS5 - Thank you for the suggested wording which will be considered.</p>

Consultee	Issues raised	MNF Response
	<p>within the Plan area and the important role they play, and the PPG notes that other public bodies and landowners should be involved in their preparation. The concerns expressed above could have been addressed prior to Regulation 16.</p> <p>Section 9 Natural Capital and Climate Change - Policy NC1 - We support the general thrust of the policy in terms of achieving biodiversity net gain. Our main concern is with the last bullet point of the policy which sets out that the corridors of blue space should be protected from development. This would include the Macclesfield Canal and Peak Forest Canal and may prevent any development along the corridors. The bullet point should be carefully considered.</p> <p>Section 10 Community Space - Policy CS3 - This includes the extension of one SBI to include the memorial park adjacent to the canal, although the map contained at Appendix 5 is of poor quality to review the extent of the area. CRT would like to be consulted further in relation to the designation of its assets and are happy to work with the Group on this.</p> <p>CRT recommend the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy CS5 to be redrafted to ensure that planning decisions do not result in development that adversely affects the setting of canals and towpaths, protected their character and heritage and seeks to enhance accessibility for users (suggested wording in original response). • The proposed Local Green Space allocation of the Macclesfield Canal and Peak Forest Canal and their towpaths in Policy CS1 be deleted. • The supporting text of Policy GA1 could be improved by clearly setting out that the policy includes canal towpaths and by promoting access to them. • Policy HT1 should make reference to the requirement for separate consent of CRT in relation to waterside business. 	
Historic England	<p>At this stage we do not wish to make any comments on Marple Neighbourhood Plan (February 2023). We should like to stress that this advice is based on the information provided by the Stockport Council on 8 February 2023. To avoid any doubt, this does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed neighbourhood plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.</p>	Comments noted.

Consultee	Issues raised	MNF Response
Private individual	My only concern with the plan would be if it was used to justify major changes to road systems / traffic restriction / surveillance without full consultation. Otherwise it looks positive - great effort by all.	Comments noted, support welcomed.
United Utilities	<p>Following our review of the Neighbourhood Development Plan, we note that there are no site-specific allocations for new development above and beyond those already identified in the wider development plan for Stockport. If this were to change, we would request early dialogue so that we can inform the site selection process and ensure any issues that are a concern to us are highlighted early.</p> <p>UUW supports the reference to the climate emergency and carbon neutrality within the Neighbourhood Plan. However, UUW would like to encourage the Neighbourhood Forum and LPA to consider further climate change policies / provision within policy, which focuses on sustainable surface water management and water efficiency.</p> <p>UUW welcomes Policy NC1: Protection of Open Spaces and wishes to highlight its support for the protection of open spaces and requiring development to achieve biodiversity net gain and contribute to the extension, protection and management of green infrastructure in the area. We are keen to ensure that Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is delivered in the most appropriate locations and without restricting the potential future expansion and operation of key operational infrastructure.</p> <p>Policy CS3 Extensions to Sites of Biological Importance: We note the aspiration to extend sites of biological importance as part of Policy CS3. Should this progress, we would welcome sight of such details so that our records can be kept updated. It is critical that any extensions give careful consideration to the future requirements of infrastructure providers. Flexibility is critical to ensure that future investment in key infrastructure for the community is not restricted.</p> <p>UUW recommend the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An additional policy relating to sustainable drainage in Chapter 9 Natural Capital and Climate Change Policies. • A section related to Flood Risk and Flood Risk Resilient Design, with consideration given to risk of sewer flooding. • An additional criterion to Policy NC2 Renewable Energy with regard to improving water efficiency. 	Comments noted. We thank you for the recommendations, although we find that these are covered by existing policies in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review and Core Strategy, namely EP1.7, SD-6, CS8 and SIE-3. It is also noted that UU are a statutory consultee on all relevant planning applications.

Consultee	Issues raised	MNF Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A section related to the evaluation of surface water management as part of proposals for landscaping and consideration of opportunities for tree planting. • Additional wording for Policy TC2 Environmental Improvement: <i>'Any public realm improvement will be expected to evaluate, identify and implement opportunities for sustainable water management in the landscaping.'</i> • An additional criterion to Policy CS1 Outside Community Space which includes flexibility so that investment in water and wastewater infrastructure that is ultimately beneficial to the environment, biodiversity and our watercourses can be delivered in the most timely and effective manner. Suggested wording: <i>'It can be shown that it is necessary investment in water and wastewater infrastructure.'</i> • An additional criterion to Policy CS2 Protection of Open Spaces as Sports Facilities which includes flexibility to allow for necessary investment in water and wastewater infrastructure (as above). Suggested wording: <i>'It can be shown that it is necessary investment in water and wastewater infrastructure.'</i> • Clarify the locations of the designated green spaces in Appendix 4 with associated site plans which clearly define the areas. 	