

Family Name	(RLP Timperley) LLP
Given Name	Harlex
Company / Organisation	Harlex (RLPTimperley) LLP
Person ID	1286848
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Agent Company / Organisation	Rapleys LLP
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286848.pdf
Family Name	(RLP Timperley) LLP
Given Name	Harlex
Company / Organisation	Harlex (RLPTimperley) LLP
Person ID	1286848
Title	JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge
Agent Company / Organisation	Rapleys LLP
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286848.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	Sound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	<p>It is considered that there are a number of aspects within the current draft policy wording for JPA 3.2, which are not justified, taking into account reasonable alternatives, and based upon proportionate evidence.</p> <p>Firstly, the policy is considered too inflexible in its wording, which could prevent development from coming forward if criteria set out cannot be met.</p> <p>Secondly, the policy must include appropriate provision for the viability of development proposals to be assessed on an appropriate basis so that it does not overburden developers and prevent development sites from being delivered.</p> <p>4</p> <p>Further, it is not considered that the requirement for the site to provide a minimum of 45% affordable housing has been appropriately justified, having full and proper regard to the deliverability and viability</p>

	<p>of the allocation.</p> <p>Finally, there are a number of criteria within the policy, which will only relate to certain parts of the allocation. This should be clarified within the policy wording.</p>
<p>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.</p>	<p>It is suggested that the wording at the start of the policy should be amended to state that ‘Development of this area should:’ as opposed to ‘Development of this site will be required to:’. This provides more flexibility for developments coming forward within the Timperley Wedge allocation area, noting that not all of the points within the policy are of direct relevance to every development parcel.</p> <p>The policy wording must also include appropriate provision for the viability of development proposals to be assessed on an appropriate basis so that it does not overburden developers and prevent development sites from being delivered.</p> <p>It is considered that the affordable housing figure within the policy should be revised / reviewed. It is considered that a minimum of 30% affordable housing, subject to site specific viability assessment, is appropriate on the basis that this represents a minimum target, which can be exceeded. Whatever target is finally put forward, this most certainly should include appropriate provision for a site-specific viability assessment.</p> <p>If the minimum of 45% affordable housing continues to be included, this should be appropriately justified, having full and proper regard to the deliverability and viability of the allocation. It is not considered that this justification has been provided currently.</p> <p>More specifically, it is considered that the modifications below should also be made to the policy wording, in recognition that not all of the points within the policy are of direct relevance to every development parcel. It is considered that these amendments should be made to ensure that the policy wording is fully sound.</p> <p>In regard to criterion 15 of the draft policy, which states development should “Accommodate and contribute to the delivery of the Manchester Airport Metrolink Line Western Leg extension including Metrolink stop(s)”, it is considered that ‘Where appropriate’ should be added before the current wording.</p> <p>In regard to criterion 16 of the draft policy, which states development should “Deliver a new spine road through the site with connections to the existing road network and local access to development sites,</p>

incorporating separate pedestrian and cycling space and provision for future bus rapid transit to improve

east west connections between Altrincham and Manchester Airport”, it is considered that ‘Where appropriate’ should be added before the current wording.

In regard to criterion 19 of the draft policy, which states development should “Provide additional

primary school places, including a new primary school and contribute to the provision of secondary

school places”, it is considered that ‘Where appropriate’ should be added before the current wording.

5

In regard to criterion 31 of the draft policy, which states development should “Retain important

landscape views and landscape features such as ponds, woodland and hedgerows and use these features

to develop a distinct sense of place”, it is considered that ‘Where appropriate’ should be added before

the current wording.

Harlex would ask that these suggested changes are given due consideration.

Harlex fully support Allocation JPA3.2: Timperley Wedge being included within the Plan, subject to the

comments provided on this policy being taken into account in formulating a final version of the Plan.