

From:

To:

Subject:

FW: Application SMD/2025/0243 - Outline planning permission with some matters reserved for access for residential development and associated landscaping and on-site infrastructure - LAND EAST OF MANIFOLD DRIVE AND SOUTH OF RAKEWAY ROAD , Manifold Drive ,

Sent:

04/11/2025 08:07:03

-----Original Message-----

Sent: 03 November 2025 21:42

Subject: Re: Application SMD/2025/0243 - Outline planning permission with some matters reserved for access for residential development and associated landscaping and on-site infrastructure - LAND EAST OF MANIFOLD DRIVE AND SOUTH OF RAKEWAY ROAD , Manifold Drive ,

Although this Application lies within Cheadle Town Council responsibility Checkley Parish Council (CPC) as a neighbouring Parish Council are most concerned with the advice and stance adopted by the Planning Officer which could have considerable impact on future Development Applications within both Cheadle Town and the Neighbouring Parishes.

The Planning Officer in the first instance rightly acknowledges that the development should not be permitted on this site as it is contrary to the Development Plan due to being located outside of the settlement boundaries in what is deemed to be countryside where residential development would not be permitted. It is also considered to be an area of greatest sensitivity where the 'evidential, historical, aesthetic and community values are all rated as being high'. It also falls within land parcels classified as undeliverable which were not taken forward into the site options stage of the Local Plan.

CPC are concerned that the Planning Officer in their conclusion positively acknowledges the Developers assertions that SMDC cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The Planning Officer then goes on to further negate the reasons for not permitting development, referring to Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and therefore paragraph 11d(ii) of the NPPF is triggered and the 'Tilted Balance' is engaged and accordingly, sites outside development boundaries in sustainable locations can be considered more positively for housing if the benefits outweigh the harm.

CPC are concerned with the Planning Officers application of Paragraph 11 of the NPPF. Whilst the 'tilted balance' is a policy approach in NPPF, there is no specific reference to the term within NPPF. Rather, it is shorthand for the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF. When engaged, the 'tilted balance' will change the 'balancing exercise' which the Planning Officer uses when deciding whether or not to grant planning permission. However the balance is whether the impacts 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits of granting permission. This is where the decision-making will afford varying degrees of weight to the harms and benefits associated with a proposed development. It is a nuanced and subjective process, and not as clear-cut as one benefit outweighs one harm. Whilst the 'tilted balance' may be engaged, the Planning Officer can, with appropriate reasoning, refuse planning permission if the impacts associated with a proposed development outweigh the benefits. The 'tilted balance' Does Not guarantee consent nor does it replace the legal responsibility of the Planning Officer to first consider whether planning permission should be granted in accordance with the Development Plan, when read as a whole, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

CPC would also point out that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted.

CPC are also concerned that the proposed development is on agricultural land not considered as suitable for development within the SMDC Local Plan. This area of land has never been considered for development at any stage whilst formulating the Local Plan.

Britain is running out of land for food and faces a potential shortfall of two million hectares by 2030 according to new research.

A report produced by the Cambridge Institute for Sustainability Leadership in collaboration with the National Farmers' Union (NFU), and companies including Asda, Sainsbury's and Nestle shows that agricultural land will need to be multi-functional, delivering a range of goods and services. We will need the full range of tools to meet future demand, employing the very best technology and innovation to drive efficiency, quality, yields and profitability." that there is a danger that the future farming landscape of Britain might not be compatible with the country's needs. The report, external, from the University of Cambridge, says the growing population plus the use of land for energy crops are contributing to the gap. It criticises the government's lack of a coherent vision on how to make the most of UK farm land. The authors warn that tough choices may need to be made on future land use.

The total land area of the UK amounts to over 24 million hectares with more than 75% of that used for farming. With a population expected to exceed 70 million by 2030, the extra demand for living space and food will have a major impact on the way land is used, the report says. Combined with increased yields and reductions in meat consumption that will boost land for farming, the authors say there is likely to be an overall two million hectare shortfall.

"What the UK Government are not doing is stepping back and looking at the overall direction and vision for future land use, and making sure that all of these different policies all add up so that we are clear about what our demands are and where the land will be released from to meet those needs."

CPC are also concerned that whilst Cheadle Town and its neighbouring Parish Councils have more than met and practically exceeded their allocated levels of development within the Local Plan, other Towns and Parishes within the SMDC have still not met their allocated levels. Hence the failure of the SMDC to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, CPC therefore consider it amoral that the 'tilted balance' is wholly Tilted

against those Towns and Parishes that have provided more than their fair allocation of housing land supply.

CPC are therefore in full support of Cheadle Town Council in seeking full refusal of this Application.

Cllr Steve Buckley
Planning Coordinator