

Dear Ms Kingaby,

**Council's Response to Altrincham Neighbourhood Business Forum's Regulation 16 Response**

Thank you for giving the Altrincham Neighbourhood Business Forum the opportunity to submit a response in relation to the Regulation 16 representations.

In relation to this response the Council would like to reiterate its position on two of the points which are raised within the Forum's response.

Site F - Regent Road Car Park Allocation

The Council's Regulation 16 response stated the following regarding the above site:

In relation to the proposed allocation of the Regent Road car park and adjoining land for mixed use purposes the justification now makes reference to the preparation of a 'Master Plan' which should be led by the Council. This statement has been introduced to the Plan since the Regulation 14 consultation. Whilst the Council is in discussions with neighbouring land owners with the aim of bringing forward development on a wider footprint to maximise potential of this site in the future, there are currently no plans to produce a masterplan for the site. As the land owner of the majority of the site, the Council is keen to see a comprehensive development scheme for the site, but this might not necessarily be through a masterplan.

It is suggested that the Policy wording of Site Allocation F could be amended as follows: *"Given the complexity of the site and the fact that several individual parts of it are likely to come forward for development at different times, an overall 'master plan' should could be prepared, led by the Council, to provide an integrated context within which proposals for individual developments can then be prepared."*

The Forum has responded that the need for a comprehensive development scheme/masterplan should be recognised and maintains that the Council should take the lead in producing it.

Whilst the Council wishes to see development come forward in an integrated manner, as the major land owner in the locality and sole land owner of Site F a masterplan is not considered necessary to achieve this. Therefore the Council maintains its position as set out in its Regulation 16 response.

#### Referendum Boundary

In relation to the referendum boundaries, the Council wishes to maintain its position as stated in its Regulation 16 response. To define two different boundaries would be inequitable and therefore there should be only one boundary for both referendums. The Council's preferred boundary for both referendums remains the Plan boundary.

Notwithstanding this, as detailed in the Council's Regulation 16 Response, if you consider that there is merit in extending the boundary beyond the Plan area, it is suggested that a single extended boundary to include the wards of Altrincham, Bowdon, Broadheath, Hale Barns, Hale Central, Timperley and Village would be a reasonable extension for both referendum boundaries.

Please do not hesitate to get in touch should you require any further information.

Yours Sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Clare Taylor-Russell.

Clare Taylor-Russell

Strategic Planning and Growth Manager