

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2024 4:21 PM  
To: [REDACTED]; Mike Ellison [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]; friendsofpoyntonpool@gmail.com  
Subject: FW: 23/4152M - Poynton Pool - deferral from SPB

Dear [REDACTED] and Mike

I write further to your recent emails regarding the deferral of application 23/4152M from the Strategic Planning Board on 24 April. As you will be aware the application was deferred for the following reasons:

1. To consider and update where necessary any inaccuracies in the submitted data to ensure modelling is accurate.
2. To review the current condition and risks associated with the existing dam wall, and the impact caused by removal of trees on the dam.
3. Encourage engagement with third parties to consider / explain alternatives.
4. To instigate a further independent review, if necessary.
5. To review the location of the proposed mitigation and consideration of any alternatives

The responsibility for addressing each of these reasons for deferral lies with officers of the local planning authority (LPA), and as such the process will be led by planning officers. To do this I will need to initially obtain information from the applicant and interested parties (specifically Poynton Town Council (PTC) and Friends of Poynton Pool (FoPP)).

Therefore, taking each of the points above in turn, I propose the following:

1. Please can you provide me with a list of what information (relevant to the planning application) you consider to be inaccurate or requires updating, together with evidence to demonstrate why you believe this to be the case?
2. I have asked the applicant to respond to this point regarding the condition of the dam.
3. This is the start of the engagement with you and the applicant. If a meeting is considered to be necessary, this will be facilitated by the LPA and will follow an agenda set by the LPA. In the meantime, please can you provide me with details of any alternative schemes (not already considered) that you would like to be examined? As much detail as possible will be helpful. Lowering the water level was one option mentioned during the meeting, which LPA will be raising with the applicant.
4. The need for an independent review will be dependent on the outcome/success of the engagement process.
5. I have asked the applicant to respond to this point regarding alternative options for mitigation.

Please can you provide the information requested above (in points 1 and 3) by Friday 31 May 2024.

Many thanks and kind regards  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Cheshire East Council  
Planning Team Leader  
Office location: Town Hall, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK10 1EA  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Mob: [REDACTED]  
[www.cheshireeast.gov.uk](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk)

From: Mike Ellison [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2024 9:32 PM  
To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]; friendsofpoyntonpool@gmail.com  
Subject: RE: 23/4152M - Poynton Pool - deferral from SPB

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email. We note that the deferral reasons points 1 – 5 are taken from the minutes of the Strategic Planning Board (SPB) meeting of 24 April. We have considered the minutes against the recording of the meeting and find them to be inaccurate in several respects, which we will take up separately.

Regarding the reasons for deferral, reason 3 is not accurate because rather than simply request engagement with third parties be encouraged, SPB (Councillor Gardiner) specifically requested a meeting between technical representatives of Cheshire East Council and Friends of Poynton Pool (FoPP), and that if necessary a third-party arbiter should be involved. Then a report should come back to the committee if this application is considered the appropriate way forward. If it is not, he would expect a new application. This is not a minor point. Friends of Poynton Pool have considerable local knowledge and significant technical expertise and experience, and as directed by SPB, there must be a meeting or meetings for the rational discussion of the complex technical issues that are in dispute.

Regarding your proposal, FoPP would initially respond as follows:

1. We have already provided detailed information in the report submitted with our objection to the planning application, (copy attached) and our subsequent response to the Jacobs technical memorandum. In addition, since submitting these documents FoPP has identified that the main outflow pipe diameter between manhole 1 and manhole 2 is 600mm, not 450mm as stated in Jacobs' Initial Options Report.
2. Noted.
3. Engagement is a two-way process which involves working collaboratively to develop joint solutions. A meeting of technical experts was requested by SPB but not explicitly set out in the minutes. However, even though not formally documented, it was requested and FoPP considers a meeting/meetings of the parties' technical experts to be an essential part of the engagement process and in accordance with the SPB deferral decision. We dispute the inclusion of 'If a meeting is considered to be necessary'.
4. We would ask that any independent review is availed of all the information and not limited to the selective presentation that was submitted with the planning application.
5. Noted.

In conclusion, we are keen to work with the applicant to find a reasonable and proportionate solution, but we consider it unreasonable that we, as a volunteer community group are being asked to needlessly repeat ourselves while the applicant's agent is being heavily funded to support an unsustainable approach that is contrary to 22 of the council's own policies.

We would ask you to review your position on a meeting of technical experts and your request for 'a list of what information (relevant to the planning application) you consider to be inaccurate or requires updating, together with evidence to demonstrate why you believe this to be the case'.

In the public interest, please will you upload your email and this response to the planning portal.

Regards,

Mike Ellison  
For Friends of Poynton Pool

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 17 May 2024 15:50  
To: Mike Ellison [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]; friendsofpoyntonpool@gmail.com  
Subject: RE: 23/4152M - Poynton Pool - deferral from SPB

Dear Mike

The deferral from SPB is not an opportunity to re-open the whole matter of how the recommendations within the flood study are implemented. The purpose is to obtain information to further inform Members' consideration of the planning application for the specific development as proposed.

Engaging with FoPP was referred to within the reasons for the deferral, and Cllr Gardiner "encouraged" there to be a meeting between the technical advisors for the applicant and the technical advisors for FoPP. He did not specifically state that a meeting was required. I expect that a meeting will take place at some point, but not before you have clarified what information you consider to be inaccurate, to ensure that we are all 100% clear on what you are expecting the applicant to update.

Any meeting facilitated by the LPA will have a clear agenda relating to matters of disagreement that have been first been identified by the relevant parties. Without this clarification a meeting will be no use.

If you are not the appropriate contact for this, then please let me know and I will approach Mr Tennant, who spoke at the SPB meeting, directly. If you are the appropriate contact, then the level of your engagement is of course entirely up to you. I am familiar with your letters of objection, and they are summarised within the committee report. If you do not wish to add to this and provide the clarity I am seeking, then there is nothing further I can report to Members of your behalf. Your previous comments are already addressed within the original committee report.

The request for the information as set out in my email below, by Friday 31 May 2024, remains.

General correspondence on planning applications such as this email exchange is not information that is published to the planning website.

Kind regards  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Cheshire East Council  
Planning Team Leader  
Office location: Town Hall, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK10 1EA  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Mob: [REDACTED]  
[www.cheshireeast.gov.uk](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk)

From: [friendsofpoyntonpool@gmail.com](mailto:friendsofpoyntonpool@gmail.com)  
<[friendsofpoyntonpool@gmail.com](mailto:friendsofpoyntonpool@gmail.com)>

Sent: 30 May 2024 22:46

To: [REDACTED]; 'Mike Ellison'  
<[REDACTED]>  
<[REDACTED]>  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: RE: 23/4152M - Poynton Pool - deferral from SPB

Dear [REDACTED]

Please find attached a summary of inaccuracies and supporting evidence in respect of the Poynton Pool planning application 23/4152M as requested in your email below.

Kind regards

Elaine Adam  
On behalf of Friends of Poynton Pool