

Appendix 3

Summary of responses – February 2014

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
26/01/2014	Judie Collins, Altrincham and Bowdon Civic Society	Objection	Lack of flexibility of Forum membership which could jeopardise the Plan's success. The Forum is weak on representatives from the retail sector.	Appropriate review mechanisms are proposed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Forum will review membership periodically to ensure that it continues to meet the requirements of the Localism Act and that it is representative of all the different sections of the community it is seeking to serve.• Any 25 members of the Forum can call a Special General Meeting (SGM) to discuss any matter they choose to raise, including Forum membership.• The Working Group is able to co-opt anyone on to the Group or a sub group who can help deal with defined issues.• In preparing the Plan (Principle iv), the Council and Forum will consult with the wider public who look to the Town Centre to provide a range of services which they can access. All who are interested will be encouraged to get involved in the consultation in the most appropriate way for them. No consultation boundary will be drawn which, if it were, could exclude anyone who wants to get involved.

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum propose that the residents referendum should cover a much wider area than the plan boundary, the definition of the area to be informed by data collected (home addresses) about those involved in the consultation process. The Forum will request the Inspector to utilize this data to determine the resident's referendum boundary.
08/02/2014	Cedric Knipe	Objection	4 i) – Forum membership is over prescriptive. Retailers, ordinary shoppers and users of public transport are not particularly well represented in this composition of the forum.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Working Group is able to co-opt anyone on to the Group or a sub group who can help deal with defined issues.
		Objection	4 ii) – Contradiction with paragraph 4 i) which allows for reviews of membership and Paragraph 8 ii) which refers to composition of the forum at a particular point in time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum will review membership periodically to ensure that it continues to meet the requirements of the Localism Act and that it is representative of all the different sections of the community it is seeking to serve. Any 25 members of the Forum can call a Special General Meeting (SGM) to discuss any matter they choose to raise, including Forum membership. In preparing the Plan (Principle iv), the Council and Forum will consult with the wider public who look to the Town Centre to provide a range of services which they can access. All who are interested will be

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
				<p>encouraged to get involved in the consultation in the most appropriate way for them. No consultation boundary will be drawn which, if it were, could exclude anyone who wants to get involved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum propose that the residents referendum should cover a much wider area than the plan boundary, the definition of the area to be informed by data collected (home addresses) about those involved in the consultation process. The Forum will request the Inspector to utilize this data to determine the resident's referendum boundary.
		Objection	4 iv) – Clarification required about the channels for notifying about the General meetings and AGM - Improvements on current consultation required.	<p>The Forum will keep an up to date list of all members' names, contact details and skills and experience, for the purposes of involving them in work of the Forum, including organising its meetings and the AGM.</p> <p>The 6 principles underpinning the approach to Plan preparation (Appendix 5, iv) state that the publicity associated with Plan preparation should encourage anyone who is interested to get involved. The neighbourhood plan working group is currently preparing a consultation strategy which will ensure effective consultation.</p>

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
		Objection	5 ii) – A member of the Working Group should be designated as having a role in ensuring an evidence base approach to the preparation of the Plan.	Through close liaison and discussions with the Working Group, the Council is confident that the Forum will ensure the collation of a robust evidence base to support the preparation of a sound business neighbourhood plan.
		Objection	6 iv) – Suggested adding words “could be perceived to” between “could” and “gain”.	Agree. Wording to be amended in line with representation.
		Objection	Appendix 5 – Important section which needs more prominence.	Appropriate reference is made in Section 8 of the Constitution to the 6 principles set out in Appendix 5.
		Objection	Appendix 5, Section 3 – the Plan may need to address apparently non land use issues for example, public transport and public realm.	Appropriate reference is made in Appendix 5 iii) of the Written Constitution stating <i>That the Plan should focus on defining the land allocations and planning policies needed to underpin the sustainable and dynamic future of the town centre and should not deal with other, non town centre issues.</i>
		Objection	Section 4 – It is unfair to limit the number of members of the Forum. There is no reason why a limit should be set.	<p>Appropriate review mechanisms are proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forum will review membership periodically to ensure that it continues to meet the requirements of the Localism Act and that it is representative of all the different sections of the community it is seeking to

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
				<p>serve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any 25 members of the Forum can call a Special General Meeting (SGM) to discuss any matter they chose to raise, including Forum membership. • The Working Group is able to co-opt anyone on to the Group or a sub group who can help deal with defined issues. • Throughout the preparation of the Plan, the Council and Forum will consult with the wider public - at various stages of the process - who look to the Town Centre to provide a range of services which they can access. All who are interested will be encouraged to get involved in the consultation in the most appropriate way for them. • The Forum proposes that the residents referendum should cover a much wider area than the plan boundary, the definition of the area to be informed by data collected (home addresses) about those involved in the consultation process. The Forum will request the Inspector to utilize this data to determine the resident's referendum boundary.

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
13/02/2014	Leslie Cupitt	Objection	The publicity was extremely limited and somewhat rushed not allowing the maximum number of residents and businesses to find out about the forum and to become involved.	<p>People and businesses were given an appropriate amount of time to apply to become a member of the Forum and various means of communicating and informing the intention to prepare the Plan were also utilised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full page advert was placed in the Sale and Altrincham Messenger newspaper. • Posters were displayed in all public buildings in the town centre giving 3 weeks' notice for people to apply. • Further information, including details on how to apply to become a member were placed on the Council website and Altrincham Forward's website. • Twitter was used to publicise the intention to prepare a neighbourhood plan for Altrincham Town Centre.
		Objection	No evidence has been provided to justify the number of members of the Forum.	Regulations state that membership of the Forum must be a minimum of 21. The proposed neighbourhood Forum meets this minimum requirement and is considered to be sufficiently representative of the Area covered by the proposed Plan.

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
		Objection	Membership of the Forum should be open to all those who will be involved in the preparation of the Plan.	<p>Appropriate review mechanisms are proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forum will review membership periodically to ensure that it continues to meet the requirements of the Localism Act and that it is representative of all the different sections of the community it is seeking to serve. • Any 25 members of the Forum can call a Special General Meeting (SGM) to discuss any matter they chose to raise, including Forum membership. • The Working Group is able to co-opt anyone on to the Group or a sub group who can help deal with defined issues. • Throughout the preparation of the Plan, the Council and Forum will consult with the wider public - at various stages of the process - who look to the Town Centre to provide a range of services which they can access. All who are interested will be encouraged to get involved in the consultation in the most appropriate way for them. • The Forum proposes that the residents referendum should cover a much wider area than the plan boundary, the definition of the area to be informed by

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
				data collected (home addresses) about those involved in the consultation process. The Forum will request the Inspector to utilize this data to determine the resident's referendum boundary.
14/02/2014	United Utilities	General	<p>No specific comments to make at this stage. As the company which owns and manages assets and has business relationships with major stakeholders in the application area, we should be included in further consultations and the development of the Altrincham Town Centre Business Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Historical responses to the Council's Local Plans consultations, planning applications, pre-developer enquiries and planning policy liaison meeting comments are still valid and should be taken into consideration when the Altrincham Town Centre Business Neighbourhood Plan is being developed.</p>	Comment noted. Up to date contact details are placed on the Council's consultee database and will provided to the Forum.
		General	Wish to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept our comments and the future progress of the Altrincham Neighbourhood Plan.	Comment noted.
		Support	Welcome the proposal for a neighbourhood plan for Altrincham.	Comment noted.

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
21/02/2014	BOWDON DOWNS RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION'S	Object	<p>Poor publicity and consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original call-out for forum member was misleading and very poorly advertised. There is not 100% Messenger newspaper coverage. Insufficient direct contact made with residents and local groups; generally, people were unaware of the proposed Forum and boundary. • Future consultation stages should be far more thorough and accessible. 	<p>People and businesses were given an appropriate amount of time to apply to become a member of the Forum and various means of communicating in line with government guidance, in particular Locality's Road Map Guide relating to publicising the proposed neighbourhood plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full page advert was placed in the Sale and Altrincham Messenger newspaper. • Posters were displayed in all public buildings in the town centre giving 3 weeks' notice for people to apply. • Further information, including details on how to apply to become a member were placed on the Council website and Altrincham Forward's website. • Twitter was used to publicise the intention to prepare a neighbourhood plan for Altrincham Town Centre. <p>The 6 principles underpinning the approach to Plan preparation (Appendix 5, iv) state that the publicity associated with Plan preparation should encourage anyone who is interested to get involved. The neighbourhood plan working group is currently preparing a consultation strategy which will ensure effective</p>

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
				consultation.
		General	The boundary will be a joint boundary for future neighbourhood plans in the areas surrounding town area.	The Council is unaware of any other future adjoining Neighbourhood Plans being proposed in adjoining areas.
		Suggested Change	<p>Boundary extension:</p> <p>a) Extend to include the South side of St Johns Road (and also island of houses at the top of The Downs, No.1 Higher Downs, plus all houses into Albert Place). With potential to include Delamer Rd, Cavendish Rd and Higher Downs.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To allow residents the opportunity to comment on potential proposals on the outskirts of the Plan boundary, including changes to road layout and traffic management. • To enable additional development sites to be included within the Plan Area and to be consulted upon. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensions to the Area as proposed could prejudice the requirement for the area to be 'predominantly business in nature'. • Any resident who wishes to comment on the proposals with in the neighbourhood plan may do so whether they fall inside or outside of the Area boundary. • Specific development sites outside of the proposed Plan Area, can be dealt with under the remit of the Council's Land Allocations Plan and/or other appropriate Council documents such as the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
		Suggested Change	<p>Boundary extension:</p> <p>b) Extend to include Woodville Road north side (Woodville House and BT), bounded by The Narrows; all of Lyme Grove, all westerly back gardens of New St house; all of Normans Place. This would take in the large GPO Woodville House building (office use) and the BT exchange.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To allow residents the opportunity to comment on potential proposals on the outskirts of the Plan boundary, including changes to road layout and traffic management. • To enable additional development sites to be included within the Plan Area and to be consulted upon. • To include entire curtilages of properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensions to the Area as proposed could prejudice the requirement for the area to be ‘predominantly business in nature’. • Any resident who wishes to comment on the proposals within the neighbourhood plan may do so whether they fall inside or outside of the Area boundary. • Specific development sites outside of the proposed Plan Area, can be dealt with under the remit of the Council’s Land Allocations Plan and/or other appropriate Council documents such as the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. • The boundary reflects important frontages within the proposed neighbourhood plan Area. In certain circumstances this has resulted in curtilages being split. However, it is not considered that this would have a significant impact on the appropriateness of the boundary.
		Suggested Change	<p>Boundary extension:</p> <p>c) Extend to include area to north west of Old Market Place – this would include the funeral home business and St George’s Primary School and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific development sites outside of the proposed Plan Area, can be dealt with under the remit of the Council’s Land Allocations Plan and/or development management policies.

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
			<p>Church.</p> <p>Would include the vulnerable and dis-used Bowling Green site and should be part of any greenspace regeneration plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would include the west of Church Street so that any CIL/S106 money could more easily be applied to that area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensions to the Area as proposed could prejudice the requirement for the area to be 'predominantly business in nature'. Only 25% of those CIL receipts collected for a development site in a neighbourhood plan area can be determined by a Forum. The remaining monies will be determined by the Council. Therefore, sites outside of the Plan area will derive their CIL monies from the overall CIL budget, based on the Council's objectives, of which Altrincham is one.
		Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non representative and closed forum membership. Forum does not currently represent different sectors of the community. Limited on small shop keepers, Church and faith groups, disability groups, transport users, schools aged groups, sports groups and residents living in the core town centre. 	<p>Appropriate review mechanisms are proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum will review membership periodically to ensure that it continues to meet the requirements of the Localism Act. It is considered to be representative of all the different sections of the community it is seeking to serve. Any 25 members of the Forum can call a Special General Meeting (SGM) to discuss any matter they chose to raise, including Forum membership. The Working Group is able to co-opt anyone on to the Group or a sub group who can help deal with defined issues.

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Throughout the preparation of the Plan, the Council and Forum will consult with the wider public - at various stages of the process - who look to the Town Centre to provide a range of services which they can access. All who are interested will be encouraged to get involved in the consultation in the most appropriate way for them. • The Forum proposes that the residents referendum should cover a much wider area than the plan boundary, the definition of the area to be informed by data collected (home addresses) about those involved in the consultation process. The Forum will request the Inspector to utilize this data to determine the resident's referendum boundary.
		Suggested change	Despite positive work being carried out, concern is expressed that the neighbourhood plan might "rubber stamp" the work of Altrincham Forward.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forum must undertake public consultation as part of the plan preparation process which will need to consider the needs and aspirations of people living and working in the Plan area.

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
21/02/2014	Bowdon Conservation Group , Christine Bainbridge	Suggested change	<p>Support southern boundary extensions submitted by Bowdon Downs' Residents Association:</p> <p>Boundary extension:</p> <p>a) Extend to include the South side of St Johns Road (and also island of houses at the top of The Downs, No.1 Higher Downs, plus all houses into Albert Place). With potential to include Delamer Rd, Cavendish Rd and Higher Downs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensions to the Area as proposed could prejudice the requirement for the area to be 'predominantly business in nature'. • Any resident who wishes to comment on the proposals with in the neighbourhood plan may do so whether they fall inside or outside of the Area boundary. • Specific development sites outside of the proposed Plan Area, can be dealt with under the remit of the Council's Land Allocations Plan and/or other appropriate Council documents such as the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
			<p>Boundary extension:</p> <p>b) Extend to include Woodville Road north side (Woodville House and BT), bounded by The Narrows; all of Lyme Grove, all westerly back gardens of New St house; all of Normans Place. This would take in the large GPO Woodville House building (office use) and the BT exchange.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensions to the Area as proposed could prejudice the requirement for the area to be 'predominantly business in nature'. • Any resident who wishes to comment on the proposals with in the neighbourhood plan may do so whether they fall inside or outside of the Area boundary. • Specific development sites outside of the proposed Plan Area, can be dealt with under the remit of the Council's Land Allocations Plan and/or other appropriate Council documents such as the Strategic

Date received	Name/Organisation	Objection/Support/General or Suggested change	Summary of Comment	Council response
				<p>Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundary reflects important frontages within the proposed neighbourhood plan Area. In certain circumstances this has resulted in curtilages being split. However, it is not considered that this would have a significant impact on the appropriateness of the boundary.
21/02/2014	Altrincham and Bowdon Civic Society, Sandra Stone	Suggested change	<p>Paragraph 3 – Values (at the end of the Nolan Principles) the Committee want to see a clause that reads:</p> <p>“Executive decision makers, acting on behalf of the Forum Members in for example a Work Group and any other similar and related decision making groups must agree with, sign up to and adhere to the Nolan Principles of conduct in public office. All Forum members, vested with decision making authority, are accountable to the whole Forum in performance terms. Transgressions of the Nolan Principles, drawn to the attention of the Forum, means that the transgressor/s are removed from any decision making in the Business Neighbourhood Planning work.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Nolan Principles apply to ALL members of the Forum equally.